



**Oliviana**

Mouvements et dissidences spirituels XIII<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècles

**4 | 2012**

**Ubertyn de Casale / Olivi / varia**

---

## New Annotations of Pope John XXII and the Process against Peter of John Olivi's *Lectura super Apocalipsim*

The Marginalia of MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A

**Patrick Nold**

---



### **Electronic version**

URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/oliviana/521>

ISBN: 978-2-8218-1895-8

ISSN: 1765-2812

### **Publisher**

Groupe d'anthropologie scolastique (Centre de recherches historiques-EHESS-CNRS)

### **Electronic reference**

Patrick Nold, "New Annotations of Pope John XXII and the Process against Peter of John Olivi's *Lectura super Apocalipsim*", *Oliviana* [Online], 4 | 2012, Online since 14 March 2013, connection on 24 July 2023. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/oliviana/521>

---

This text was automatically generated on 24 July 2023.

All rights reserved

---

# New Annotations of Pope John XXII and the Process against Peter of John Olivi's *Lectura super Apocalipsim*

The Marginalia of MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A

Patrick Nold

---

*I would like to express my thanks to Sylvain Piron for much help and encouragement, and to Robert Lerner and Raphaela Schmid for their critical comments, and to Katelyn Mesler for her editorial improvements.*

- 1 MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 3381A is a witness to one of the first theological consultations of John XXII's long and intellectually consequential pontificate (1316-1334)<sup>1</sup>. It contains an assessment by a theologian of 84 passages exacted from the *Lectura super Apocalipsim* (LSA) of Peter of John Olivi OM († 1298). Historical understanding of the LSA condemnation process which ended in 1326 has been transformed through a series of articles by Sylvain Piron, who has brought to light new manuscript material and reinterpreted published sources known to scholarship<sup>2</sup>. MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A is not an unknown manuscript, having been studied by Franz Ehrle, Ignaz von Döllinger, Joseph Koch, and David Burr<sup>3</sup>. Yet it may be considered new material for the LSA condemnation process, since none of these scholars have focused on the marginal annotations in the manuscript which, as it happens, are in the hand of Pope John XXII<sup>4</sup>.
- 2 Scholars who have worked on MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A have often contrasted its report to that of a papal commission of eight Masters of Theology from 1319. That report, conventionally referred to as the *Littera Magistrorum* (LM), whose original copy for John XXII does not survive, was one of a series of texts preserved in the notebook of the Dominican Inquisitor John of Beaune in the Doat collection in Paris<sup>5</sup>; it was published several times in the early modern period and has been much cited by scholars due to its easy availability<sup>6</sup>. There are a number of formal differences between the *Littera Magistrorum* and the censure in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A. The single theologian treats 84 LSA extracts, whereas the masters consider a selection of 60 – the numbering of articles

in the two texts thus differs<sup>7</sup>. Those passages commonly treated by both are largely the same, but not entirely identical – the incipits of articles always differ because the masters begin by indicating where a particular passage in the *LSA* comes from (often with the relevant biblical verse), whereas the theologian starts with just the excerpt<sup>8</sup>. Variation also occurs because the theologian's extracts from the *LSA* tend to be more extensive than those of the masters.

- 3 But that is not the only way in which the report in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A is more detailed than the *Littera Magistrorum* : whereas the masters' committee reproduces the extracted *LSA* articles and provides a judgment rarely longer than the original passage, the single theologian first reproduces the extract and then divides it up into a series of errors which are treated individually. His analysis, therefore, is always longer than the passage from the *LSA* cited.
- 4 David Burr has noted that the theologian is more nuanced in his opinion than the masters – he is less likely to call a *LSA* passage « heretical » and more likely to deem it « erroneous » and « temerarious ». The author, in Burr's words,
 

attempts a genuine refutation of them [the passages from Olivi] ... At the same time... he argues that Olivi's reading of the Apocalypse is wrong both because it attacks established ecclesiastical power and because it is bad scholarship at odds with the exegetical tradition incarnated in the Glossa and Richard of St. Victor<sup>9</sup>.
- 5 Burr further notes that there are points « where the writer makes an effort at fairness, suggesting how far he might go toward accepting one of Olivi's dubious opinions »<sup>10</sup>.

## The author

- 6 Who is the author of the report in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A ? In the absence of a manuscript colophon indicating authorship, Koch hypothesized that it was William of Laudun OP, in his official capacity as Master of the Sacred Palace<sup>11</sup>. *Prima facie*, this theory is not impossible. Koch, however, supplied no textual basis in the manuscript to support his attribution, nor did he provide contextual evidence that either William of Laudun OP personally, or the Masters of the Sacred Palace officially, played a special role in John XXII's theological consultations. Another author has suggested Guido Terreni OCarm., a man considerably closer to John XXII than William of Laudun OP was<sup>12</sup>. But again no evidence, textual or contextual is provided, and the author may have simply confused this report with another censure authored by Terreni together with Pierre de la Palude of an Olivi-inspired vernacular work<sup>13</sup>.
- 7 It is difficult to rule out definitively Terreni or a Dominican<sup>14</sup> as the author of the report in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A. What can be said for certain is that the author is not a Franciscan<sup>15</sup>. One clue to authorship in the text might be the frequent citation of Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job* which is often quoted as a counterpoint to the *LSA*, as if to hold up an alternative eschatology of unquestionable orthodoxy<sup>16</sup>. Two financial records from late 1321 and early 1322 testify that John XXII granted a sum of money for the Augustinian Hermit Gregory of Lucca to work on a commentary on the *Moralia in Job*<sup>17</sup>. The commission seems connected to the *LSA* condemnation process : the fact that John XXII's annotations in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A sometimes occur next to quotations from the *Moralia* indicates an interest<sup>18</sup>. Gregory of Lucca had previous experience with theological censure : he was on the panel of theologians that condemned the work of Marguerite Poretein 1309-1310<sup>19</sup>. Furthermore, Gregory would, until his death in 1327

be involved in many more theological consultations of John XXII<sup>20</sup>: that is to say, on demonic magic in 1320, on marriage in 1322, on apostolic poverty in 1322, and on William of Ockham in 1326. On 7 June 1322<sup>21</sup> Gregory was made bishop of Sorra in Sardinia and, a year later, on 6 June 1323, he was promoted by John XXII to Belluno-Feltre in the Veneto<sup>22</sup>. Both benefices can reasonably be seen as a reward by John XXII for intellectual services rendered. Textual and contextual evidence thus provides some basis for a tentative attribution of the text in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A to Gregory of Lucca OESA (which is more than can be said for Koch's attribution to William of Laudun OP). Although the attribution is mere conjecture<sup>23</sup>, I will refer to the author of the report in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A as « Gregory », for the sake of convenience.

## The date of the report

- 8 The dating of the report in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A goes back to Ehrle who noted following passage :

Finally, the present supreme pontiff tried, by himself and through several cardinals, both in public and in private, to call back the aforementioned pestilent ones from their stupidities: however, he could not bend them that they, on his order, with the novelty of their mocking robes having been rejected, should receive humble habits consonant with the Rule of St. Francis according to the judgment of their brothers, and that they should consent somewhat to the declaration of his predecessor and his own [declaration] on the storage and keeping of provisions which they entirely disdained to do<sup>24</sup>.

- 9 Ehrle saw this as a reference to the 1317 curial hearing of the appeals of the rebel friars from the convents of Narbonne and Béziers described by Angelo Clareno in his *History of the Seven Tribulations of the Franciscan Order* and by Raymond of Fronsac in *Sol ortus*. The dual emphasis on papal conciliatory efforts and Franciscan intransigence bears some resemblance to Raymond's account<sup>25</sup>. The passage obliquely refers to John XXII's constitution *Quorundam exigit* which ordered the friars to return to the obedience of their superiors. The author seems to echo, here and elsewhere in the manuscript, the view of John XXII who saw his bull as little more than a restatement of Clement V's *Exivi de Paradiso*<sup>26</sup>.
- 10 Ehrle also noted two occasions where the author refers to the year of composition as 1318<sup>27</sup>. Two other passages give an indication based on the liturgical year: The thirteen-hundredth anniversary of the Passion is said to be 15 years away which suggests that the dating could be anytime after Good Friday 1318 which fell on 21 April of that year<sup>28</sup>. Ehrle and Koch separately noted allusions to the inquisitorial enforcement of *Quorundam Exigit* beginning with the burning of four Franciscan friars in Marseilles on 7 May 1318<sup>29</sup>.
- 11 Although he never mentions *Quorundam Exigit* (or any other constitution of John XXII) by name, Gregory outlines the grounds for the condemnation of the Spiritual Franciscans as heretics – something several other texts of the time do as well<sup>30</sup> :
- ... Indeed not to acquiesce to or to abide by this declaration or ordering [*Exivi de Paradiso* and *Quorundam Exigit*] is not in fact heretical but only schismatic. But [it is heretical] to say that his [Olivi's] understanding is the [correct] understanding of the Gospel, and that the pope cannot change anything around it, just as he cannot change anything around the Gospel, and that he could not dispense from the content of this Rule [of St. Francis], just as he could not dispense from the content

of the Gospel, and that the evangelical perfection which Christ and his Apostles observed is nothing but the way of living according to that rule<sup>31</sup>.

- 12 Gregory goes on to say that it is heretical because they understand the Gospel against the explicit declaration of the universal Church in *Exivi de Paradiso*, and they pertinaciously defend their sectarian understanding of Scripture – something that the decretal *Ad abolendam* associates with heresy<sup>32</sup>.
- 13 Ehrle and Koch thus made it clear that the author, with his talk of schismatics and heretics, writes in the shadow of the persecution of the Franciscan Spirituals and Beguins beginning in May 1318<sup>33</sup>. More can be said about this : Gregory seems to assume that the LSA's account of the evangelical life cannot be correct because Olivi's followers have been condemned. And so Gregory sometimes refers to what the « heretical » followers say, rather than to the text of the LSA<sup>34</sup>. In other words, the persecution of the Spirituals and Beguins provides one hermeneutic key to his understanding of the LSA. But, although Gregory does use subsequent events as a guide to the meaning of the text, there is not an absolute conflation between authorial intent and reader reception : he does, as Burr has noted, make a distinction between the how the text sounds and the intention of the author.

## John XXII's annotations in MS BnF lat. 3381A : their extent and nature

- 14 It is instructive to compare John's marginalia in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A to two annotated manuscripts in the Vatican Library concerning theological *causes célèbres* : Borghese 348 and vat. lat. 3740. The Borghese manuscript is an artifact of the 1320 consultation of 10 experts about whether the invocation of demons constitutes a heresy<sup>35</sup>. MS vat. lat. 3740 contains the *consilia* of over 60 theologians and lawyers on whether it is heretical to assert that Christ and the Apostles had nothing either individually or in common<sup>36</sup>.

	Borgh. 348	Vat. lat. 3740	Lat. 3381A
Total Folios	60	261	288
Approximate number of annotations	14	48	256

- 15 As the chart above shows, there are several times more marginal annotations in the Paris manuscript than in the two Vatican ones. Moreover, MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A is the most intensively annotated : these 256 or so annotations come almost entirely in the first 52 folios which treat up to article 18 of the 84-article *censure*<sup>37</sup>.
- 16 Most of John XXII's annotations consist of the repetition in the manuscript margin of words or phrases occurring in the text – sometimes he makes his annotation next to an excerpt from the LSA, or from an authority like the *Moralia in Job*, but the majority of annotations concern Gregory's judgment. For example, the pope repeats the word « erroneous » roughly 24 times, the word « heretical » seven times, the word « temerarious » eight times, and the word « absurd » once. John never disagrees with Gregory in the annotations (as he did in the *consilia* in MS BAV vat. lat. 3740) –

sometimes, however, he does draw out the implications of a statement of Gregory or Olivi in a question or summary. The repetition of words and phrases is frequently accompanied by a marginal brace } placed next to the relevant lines of the text – something John XXII did as well in MS BAV vat. lat. 3740<sup>38</sup>. Often such bracketing occurs without the repetition of words and, in fact, marginal braces are the most common form of annotation in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A. In exceptional cases, instead of using a brace, John draws a horizontal line – a next to a key word or phrase. A third type of annotation in this manuscript is not in the margin, but within the text where John sometimes draws a half circle or a right angle where a notable sentence begins<sup>39</sup>. These annotations, with their highlighting of crucial words, concepts, and sentences, seem intended to serve as an *aide-mémoire* for the pope's reference.

- 17 References of another sort are also found in the annotations. Several times John XXII notes in the margin that a subject had been treated elsewhere in the report<sup>40</sup> – for example, when Gregory cites the condemnation of *The Eternal Gospel* of Gerard de Borgo San Donnino in article seven, John notes that this had been previously cited in the first article<sup>41</sup>. But John's cross-references go downward in the manuscript as well as upward, and this suggests that his annotations were not the result of a single read-through<sup>42</sup>. Furthermore, there are three occasions at the very beginning of the report where John makes a cross-reference, not to the text that he is reading, but to the *LSA*<sup>43</sup>. In each case, John correctly identifies where a particular article has come from in the *LSA* prologue. These cross-references indicate that John had an exposure to the *LSA* independent of Gregory's report; the references might have come from the *Littera Magistrorum*<sup>44</sup>. But that this exposure was not limited to the *LSA* prologue nor to *Littera Magistrorum* is confirmed by the fact that, at another point, John supplies a phrase from the *LSA* found neither in the masters' report nor in the prologue<sup>45</sup>. And indeed Paolo Vian has hypothesized that John XXII might have used and annotated a surviving manuscript of the *LSA*: MS Paris BnF lat. 713<sup>46</sup>.
- 18 Familiarity with the *LSA* perhaps suggests a papal appreciation for Gregory's distinction between the sound of the words in the extracted articles and the intention of Olivi – something that John XXII occasionally notes in the manuscript margin<sup>47</sup>. The concern for authorial intention leads the pope to supply, several times, the name « brother Peter » in his annotations where the friar had not been mentioned by name in the text<sup>48</sup>. He also notes several instances where Gregory asserts that Olivi contradicted himself<sup>49</sup>. Interestingly, John XXII adds another layer of the interpretation of the *LSA* by inserting the censor into the equation. So the pope writes things like: « See that he [Gregory] says: 'according to his [Olivi's] understanding'... »<sup>50</sup>, or « See that he [Gregory] attributes to him [Olivi] this understanding »<sup>51</sup>, and « Note that he [Gregory] says: 'it is indeed his [Olivi's] intention' »<sup>52</sup>. In doing so, John XXII seems to acknowledge ambiguity in the *LSA* and the need for expert opinion to pin down the meaning of the text and intent of the author.

## Content of the Annotations

### Articles 1-3

- 19 John XXII annotates only the first 18 of the 84-article censure (that is, until fol. 52v) with four stray annotations at the end of the manuscript related to the eighty-second

and eighty-third articles (fol. 269r-274v). As the censure is highly repetitive, with certain core themes being returned to again and again, it is not surprising that the pope did not actively engage the entire report. One is tempted to suggest that after a certain point, John XXII flipped to the end of the manuscript to see if there were any surprises. The core themes of the censure are present in its first three articles and for this reason I will examine them in detail below. Likewise, John XXII's notes on the first three articles are quite representative of his annotations as a whole.

- 20 Before beginning, it is perhaps useful to summarize the vision of history found in the *LSA*. Olivi interpreted the seven visions of the Apocalypse as seven sequential states (*status*) of the Church: the first four were those of apostles, martyrs, doctors, and anchorites. So far, so conventional. However, in the fifth state or time period, beginning roughly with Charlemagne, Olivi saw the Church as growing in wealth and becoming corrupt. The sixth state, beginning roughly with St. Francis of Assisi, is characterized « by the renewal of the evangelical life ». In addition to this seven-fold division, history is also divided into three ages: that of the Father in the Old Testament, that of the Son from Christ to St. Francis, and that of the Spirit from St. Francis to the end of time. This last age, in the sixth and seventh states of the Church, would witness a conflict between the followers of the evangelical poverty and Babylon, the carnal elements in the Church. The Babylonian Church, led by a mystical anti-Christ would persecute the new spiritual men until she is destroyed by a non-Christian invading army. The elect, or new spiritual men, would, with their poverty and new knowledge, convert the Jews to Christianity, and a new Church would be transferred to Jerusalem. From Jerusalem the whole world would be converted again to Christianity. That will be the seventh age of the Church lasting until the end of time<sup>53</sup>.
- 21 The first article, taken from the *LSA* prologue and corresponding to the second article of the *Littera Magistrorum* (LM 2), reads:

Seventhly is how the sixth state [of the Church] is always described: as notably preeminent over the first five ones, and as if the end of previous ones, and, in the same way, the beginning of a new age emptying out the old, just as the state of Christ emptied out the Old Testament and the oldness of human kind, whence, and as if circularly, it is thus joined to the first time of Christ, as if the whole Church were a circumvolution, and, as if in the sixth state, the state of Christ should begin a second time, having its seven time periods just like the entire course of the Church. Thus the seventh state of the sixth time period should be identical with the seventh state of the whole Church<sup>54</sup>.
- 22 The first error of the article runs to the words « the first five ones ». Gregory opines that this implies that the sixth state of the Church with its « notable pre-eminence » would supersede the first state of the Church, that is, of the Apostles. Whether Olivi intended it, these words recall, according to Gregory, the errors of *The Eternal Gospel* by Gerard of Borgo San Donnino OM which was condemned by Pope Alexander IV in 1254<sup>55</sup>. John XXII brackets these words in the margin and writes next to them « Note: Concerning the Gospel entitled Eternal »<sup>56</sup>. After quoting the condemnation, Gregory concludes: « To put any state of the Church before the state of the Apostles and the primitive Church is erroneous and temerarious, or at least appears presumptuous »<sup>57</sup>. John writes a cross-reference in the margin to the end of Gregory's treatment of the first error where his judgment on this sentiment is stronger: there Gregory says that Olivi resembles the heretics of old who used to say that they were holier, more perfect, and more pure than everyone else<sup>58</sup>.



- 23 The second error in article one is the phrase « as if the end of previous ones ». Gregory again paraphrases the first, second, and sixth articles of the condemnation of *The Eternal Gospel*<sup>59</sup>, and again John XXII notes « concerning *The Eternal Gospel* »<sup>60</sup>. Gregory underscores that Olivi characterized the sixth state as the end of the previous five (understanding « end » as purpose or goal, being more perfect and better than what went before) – just as the Church is the « end » of the Synagogue. Gregory counters that it is erroneous to say that any way of life or rule, however understood, can be the « end » of previous states<sup>61</sup> – and John repeats « erroneous » in the margin<sup>62</sup>. Moreover, to imply that there is no salvation with riches possessed individually or in common (as with the Church of the fifth state) is the error of the Waldensians<sup>63</sup>. John XXII notes in the margin that this is the error of the poor men of Lyons<sup>64</sup>.
- 24 For the third error of the first article, the phrase « [the sixth state is] in the same way, the beginning of a new age », John merely supplies a cross-reference to the third error of the third article further along in the report where Gregory confronts the subject of innovation directly<sup>65</sup>. The fourth error of article one, the phrase « just as the state of Christ emptied out the Old Testament and the oldness of human kind » attracts no attention from John XXII. John's annotations around the fifth error, « It is thus joined to the first time of Christ as if the whole Church were a circumvolution », chiefly consist of notes about what Olivi meant here<sup>66</sup>; Gregory points out that the metaphor implies a departure from the point of origin to an opposite point and then back again. « This is erroneous because the Church never, either in this time or in a future one, will be so obscured that it is the opposite of the life of Christ »<sup>67</sup>. John echoes that it is erroneous<sup>68</sup>. Likewise, Olivi is said to understand that : « Just as at dawn the darkness recedes little by little until all the air is light, so the carnal Church will fail, with a spiritual one succeeding, so that almost all are perfect and spiritual, and few evil as in the primitive Church »<sup>69</sup>. John then repeats the judgment of « erroneous »<sup>70</sup> in the margin because « many are called, few are chosen » (Mt. 22:14); as John XXII notes at several other points in the manuscript, the Church is always a mixed group with both good and bad in her, and to say the contrary is heretical and against Scripture<sup>71</sup>.
- 25 The sixth and last error is the phrase, « in the sixth state, the state of Christ begins a second time, having its seven time periods just like the entire course of the Church ». Gregory judges that this is erroneous according to Olivi's understanding, because he  
 ... wishes, indeed, that the state of Christ will have become completely deficient in the Church aside from in those people in whom there is the abdication of all things individually and in common, just as the Rule of St. Francis has it, and that in the whole Church before blessed Francis there was neither the life of Christ nor evangelical life<sup>72</sup>.
- 26 John XXII notes in one margin « See that he says : 'according to his understanding' »<sup>73</sup> and in the other margin « erroneous »<sup>74</sup>. Gregory compares Olivi's idea to that of a group of heretics referred to in canon law :  
 This is similar to the error of the Adamites who, abnegating everything of this world, considered themselves alone to be in a state of perfection — concerning these Augustine in the *Book of Heresies* says that they imitate the nudity of Adam in paradise<sup>75</sup>.
- 27 John XXII places a brace in the margin next to this authority. In response, Gregory paraphrases another authority from canon law often cited in the apostolic poverty debate of 1322-1323 :



But Prosper proves the contrary by the example of the saints: It is expedient for the love of perfection for individual goods to be scorned, but common things can be possessed without detriment to perfection<sup>76</sup>.

- 28 The authority was meant to show that in the fifth age common possessions were no bad thing. Gregory then attempts to excuse Olivi of slighting earlier saints, by saying that the entire article can have a meaning beneath the superficial sense : « that the life of Christ had been much obscured, and through the teaching and life of St. Francis and his order was renewed in many ways »<sup>77</sup>. The state of Christ can therefore be said to « begin a second time », not from the total destitution of the previous age, but from a certain deficiency in it.<sup>78</sup> This concludes the vetting of the first article.

## Article 2

- 29 The second article of the censure (LM 3), also taken from the LSA's prologue, reads :

The sixth [vision], which is about the damnation of the whore and of the seven-headed beast, as well as concerning the new nuptials of the Lamb and His spouse after the damnation of the whore is accomplished, looks more directly on the rejection of Babylonian oldness and the renovation of the form of Christ, and the seven-formed nature of the aforementioned rejection and renovation, for in the killing of the first head of the beast was the first renovation, and in the killing of second the second, and so on concerning the others<sup>79</sup>.

- 30 In the first error (« The sixth vision is about the damnation of the whore »), Gregory, followed by John XXII, notes that Olivi appears to understand the whore to be the Church which had previously been the true bride of Christ<sup>80</sup>. Gregory concedes that Olivi's statement :

... can be true concerning numerous particular churches which through heresy or schism were alienated from Christ, such as the Church of the Greeks or many other oriental churches. However, it is erroneous to say this concerning the universal Church whose head is Roman, and concerning the Roman Church herself, because Christ will never leave his Church<sup>81</sup>.

- 31 John duly notes the error<sup>82</sup>. Gregory proposes, however, that there are other ways to understand Church divisions : not geographically, but morally.

Again, though, inside the Church [there are those] who prostitute themselves morally through sin away from God, however the Church ought not simply to be called a whore on this account. She is always a virgin because in her there are some good ones in whom she principally consists<sup>83</sup>.

- 32 The Church can be taken in two ways : those who are members in number and merit, and those who are members only in number – that is, those who have faith, and are not separated from the Church by heresy or schism<sup>84</sup>. If one understands the Church in the later way, in a certain sense she can be called a whore but not absolutely<sup>85</sup>. John XXII notes this distinction repeating the phrase, « Note : the Church of the faithful is taken in two ways »<sup>86</sup> and he places a brace next to the passage saying that the Church « in a certain sense » can be called a whore but not « absolutely » (*secundum quid sed non simpliciter*).

- 33 In the second error (« About the new nuptials of the Lamb and His spouse after the damnation of the whore is accomplished »), Gregory returns to the all-important question of what exactly Olivi thinks the whore is : « Indeed he does not understand the whore and Babylon to be anything other the universal and Catholic Church of which the Roman Church is the head, mother, and teacher »<sup>87</sup>. John XXII writes in the margin :

« Note what the postillator understands for the whore »<sup>88</sup>, adding a description of Olivi not found in the text. Glossing the passage from the Apocalypse, Gregory cites Richard of St. Victor who reads the nuptials of the Lamb eschatologically, before concluding : « Whence there could not be new nuptials with a new Church, as this one pretends, otherwise Christ would be incarnated again »<sup>89</sup>. The pope writes in the margin « Note : ‘as this one pretends’ »<sup>90</sup>. Gregory continues : if the whore is understood according to the « true sense of Scripture », it is the congregation of adherents to the anti-Christ whose damnation will not occur until the Final Judgment. The pope then summarizes Gregory : « Note how the whore is taken according to the true sense of Scripture »<sup>91</sup>. Immediately underneath follows a contrasting marginal note : « How the whore is taken according to the false understanding of brother Peter »<sup>92</sup> which, Gregory repeats, seems to be equated to the Church of the day<sup>93</sup>, especially the Roman Church which overflows « in pomp, gold, silver, and precious stones »<sup>94</sup>. Gregory finds this to be an error and a blasphemy, a judgment repeated by John XXII in the margin<sup>95</sup>.

- 34 Closely connected to the understanding of the whore is that of Babylon which is addressed in the third error of article two : « the sixth vision [...] looks more directly on the rejection of Babylonian oldness ». Gregory continues in the same vein as previously : « ... For ancient Babylon to be rejected, he [Olivi] understands the present Church »<sup>96</sup>. John XXII copies almost exactly : « Note that for Babylon he understands the present Church »<sup>97</sup>. Gregory judges that to call the Church Babylonian – in the sense that Babylon is to be condemned – is to blaspheme the Church of God and is heretical<sup>98</sup>. John repeats : « It is to blaspheme and is heretical »<sup>99</sup>.
- 35 This is not merely a question of the sound of the words, as becomes clear in the fourth error of the second article : « For the sixth vision [...] looks on [...] the renovation of the form of Christ, and the seven-formed nature of the aforementioned rejection and renovation ». Gregory declares that it is Olivi’s intention that Church of the day, the Roman Church, is the Babylonian whore riding on the beast ; power and glory will be withdrawn from her and a new spiritual Church will be built up through which the form of Christ will be renewed<sup>100</sup>. John notes that Gregory judges this indeed to be Olivi’s intention<sup>101</sup>. Gregory here comes close to calling Olivi a heretic : he notes that Olivi perverts Scripture, understanding the beast and the whore<sup>102</sup> « otherwise than the Holy Spirit » – an echoing of one definition of heresy<sup>103</sup>. Indeed, Olivi’s words do violence to the text just as Gregory the Great in the *Moralia in Job* said is a property of heretics<sup>104</sup>. John writes the word « erroneous » in the margin where Gregory provides a correction : « In the second place it is erroneous because the Church of Christ is not to be seven times renewed or seven times her oldness rejected »<sup>105</sup> ; « To say this is to imply that the Passion of Christ was not efficacious ; the Church indeed will serve the evangelical teaching through which she is renewed until the end of time »<sup>106</sup>. The reassuring prediction of the future is noted by the pope here and elsewhere<sup>107</sup>.

### Article 3

- 36 The consequences of the identification of the Roman Church with the whore and Babylon continues in Gregory’s assessment of third article (*LM* 4) which reads :
- And when Babylon, the whore, and the beast carrying her will be at her height, then it will be a most dark night, of which it is said in the Psalms. *You have appointed darkness and it is night; in it shall all the beasts of the wood go about* (Ps. 103: 20). These same ones are the beasts created on the sixth day, after which man was formed in

the image of God, because after these, Israel will be converted, and there will appear the Christ-formed life and image of Christ. From the aforementioned, however, it is clear how the sixth and seventh visions describe principally the final state of the Church alone. This is done to designate more fully that, in the sixth and seventh states, there is a solemn end of the previous times and a certain new and solemn age<sup>108</sup>.

Immediately following the article is Gregory's gloss :

This, according to his understanding, is erroneous in many ways. He understands, indeed, as is clear from what follows, that this whore is the Roman Church which is now in flower and honor, and when she will be in greater temporal honor, then she will be in a worse state as far as God is concerned, and she will do much evil, by favoring the bad and persecuting the good, and she will be blinded to the knowledge of God<sup>109</sup>.

- 37 John brackets the text, repeating « erroneous in many ways »<sup>110</sup>, and writes : « See, according to his understanding, what brother Peter understands for the whore »<sup>111</sup>. Gregory shifts his focus from Olivi to the heretics (i.e. Olivi's contemporary followers, alluding to this passage of the *LSA*) who « say this concerning the Church herself which they see honored in the world, and therefore they call her, on this account, 'blinded and repudiated by God' »<sup>112</sup>. A long quotation from the *Moralia in Job* is then produced about the utility of worldly goods, at the end of which Gregory concludes : « From all this it is apparent concerning the Church of which he [Gregory the Great] speaks : she holds temporal goods, though she is not held by them »<sup>113</sup>. John XXII draws a brace next to this conclusion.
- 38 The second error of the third article is : « These are 'the beasts created on the sixth day, after which man was formed in the image of God, because after these, Israel will be converted, and there will appear the Christ-formed life and image of Christ' »<sup>114</sup>. Gregory explains how Olivi understands this passage<sup>115</sup> : that, just as on the fifth day the beasts of the earth and the fish of the sea were created, and on the sixth day man was formed in the image of God, so :
- ... after five states of the Church there should be a future sixth in which there will perfectly be the imitation of Christ, as if all previous [states] would have been bestial or null. Thus, the perfectly imitative state of the life of Christ just as this one [...] should be preferred to all others<sup>116</sup>.
- 39 John writes : « Note how the sixth state is preferred to the other five falling before »<sup>117</sup>. Gregory pronounces all this erroneous and blasphemous<sup>118</sup> – words unsurprisingly repeated by John XXII in the margin<sup>119</sup>. Gregory's justification is unexpected but revealing. He asserts that the statement is blasphemous because of the authority of the « Nicene synod » : « The Roman Church has always had primacy »<sup>120</sup>. The citation is a well-known interpolation preceding the Council of Nicea's sixth canon<sup>121</sup>. But Gregory adds, as if still quoting the interpolated canon, « and she must always have primacy »<sup>122</sup>. This authority, avers Gregory, would not be true if the Roman Church would lose the primacy, cease to be the Church of Christ, be destroyed, and another new one substituted in her place – just as this one [Olivi] says and in this article thinks<sup>123</sup>. John repeats the words of Gregory : in the right margin « Note that the Roman Church would lose the primacy and cease to be the Church of Christ and another new one in her place substituted »<sup>124</sup>, and in the left : « Just as this one says and in this article thinks »<sup>125</sup>. Unexpected but revealing is the focus on the primacy of the Roman Church in the comparison of the fifth and sixth ages. At first glance, it looks like Gregory is simply catering to his audience : John XXII naturally had a vested interest in

the fate of the Roman Church and its primacy, and he certainly returns to the theme again and again in his annotations in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A<sup>126</sup>. But, as we will see later, the language of primacy is taken from the *LSA* itself<sup>127</sup>.

- 40 Gregory emphasizes that the authority of the Roman Church proves erroneous the claim that the life and image of Christ should appear anew in the sixth state<sup>128</sup>. After all, she has written into the catalogue of the saints many monks and priests of the fifth age as perfect imitators of Christ, though they did not have the perfection which Olivi attributes to the sixth state, that is, of not having anything individually nor in common<sup>129</sup>. John XXII first notes that this is erroneous<sup>130</sup> and then draws attention to the explanation with a brace, but in his annotation he concentrates on the final line about poverty: « Note that to the sixth state he appropriates ‘not to have anything individually or in common’ »<sup>131</sup>. To have nothing individually or in common was a distinctively Franciscan understanding of poverty, and here is the first time in the manuscript (the reference to the Waldensians being excepted) that John XXII’s annotations focus on a subject that he addresses in the apostolic poverty controversy of 1322-1323. But here the matter is explored no further with John XXII noting that those who consider others bestial and themselves Christ-like are like the friends of Job who, according to Gregory, play the role of heretics<sup>132</sup> to whom it is said: *Are you then men alone ... I also have a heart as well as you, neither am I inferior to you* (Job 12:1-2)<sup>133</sup>.
- 41 The third error of article three reads: « This is done to designate more fully that, in the sixth and seventh states, there is a solemn end of the previous times and a certain new, solemn age ». Gregory immediately registers that he had already treated the subject of innovation in the third error of the first article; there John XXII had inserted a cross-reference in the margin to this very article<sup>134</sup>. Here John XXII repeats in the margin a line from early Gregory’s earlier treatment: « Note that to prefer any state to the state of the Apostles is erroneous »<sup>135</sup>. But Gregory adds some additional arguments beyond what he had already said: for example, he cites a maxim of Roman law: « ‘the most potent part of something is its beginning’, the Apostles are the most potent (*potentissima*) part of the Church because they are her beginning, inasmuch as they are her fundamentals »<sup>136</sup>. John brackets the text and provides his own conclusion in the margin: « On account of which it is erroneous to say that the sixth and seventh states should be the end of all previous states »<sup>137</sup>.
- 42 Gregory hypothesizes that if these states were better than the previous ones, it would be: 1) with regard to holiness or perfection of life, or 2) with regard to knowledge, or 3) with regard to power<sup>138</sup>. Gregory takes it for granted that there cannot be holiness greater than that of the Apostles given all the miracles associated with them. Nor could it be, for that matter, because of perfection of life: « Concerning the eminence and perfection of life, it should not be greater in the future sixth and seventh states than it was in the first state, that is, in the time of the Apostles »<sup>139</sup>. The pope here paraphrases: « That there should not be a future perfection of life greater than there was in the first state »<sup>140</sup>.
- 43 Gregory then turns to the second criterion: « With regard to the clarity of knowledge, no future state in this life exceeds all prior ones especially those of the Apostles to whom Christ said: *Whatsoever I have heard from my Father I have made known to you* [Jo. 15:15] »<sup>141</sup>. John paraphrases in the margin: « That with regard to the clarity of knowledge there is not some future state greater than the first, that is, the state of the Apostles »<sup>142</sup>. Gregory continues:

But to him and to his [followers] who say the door of the Scriptures and of knowledge is open to them above others, just as is had in the tenth article, it can be said what Job says to his friends, just as the person of the Church to heretics, *When you die, wisdom must die too ?* (Job 12:2)<sup>143</sup>.

- 44 John repeats : « Note that to those saying the door of the Scriptures is open [to them] before others, it can be said what Job had said from the person of the Church to the heretics »<sup>144</sup>. As the cross-reference suggests, Gregory returns to the question of knowledge and contemplation in later articles (*viz.* 10 and 12) which concern the conversion of the Jews and the reconversion of the world in the last age.
- 45 Gregory then turns to the third criterion to measure superiority : power. We have already seen Gregory's description of the Apostles as *potentissimi* in the context of a Roman law maxim. Here he provides more specific and conventional considerations of temporal and spiritual power. Temporal power as such is barely worth considering since the *LSA* testifies that the Roman Church will lose her temporal power and the whole world will be subject to the anti-Christ. In terms of spiritual power, however, Gregory simply mentions that Christ gave to St. Peter the *plenitudo potestatis* which is the greatest power that can be given – therefore it can never be exceeded in a subsequent era. The pope repeats the first sentence of Gregory's treatment, noting : « That a greater power should not be given to the sixth state than what was originally given »<sup>145</sup>.
- 46 After considering the specific criteria by which historical change may be measured, Gregory turns to address the general notion of progression – whether the sixth and seventh state are the principal or « solemn end » of what preceded. Gregory notes that if this is true, then there is not one Church. John summarizes : « He concludes : if the sixth state is the solemn end of what preceded, there is not one Church »<sup>146</sup>. Here there is a suggestion of heresy with the contradiction of the Nicene creed, *Credo ... unam ... ecclesiam*.
- 47 We have seen from articles two and three extracted from the *LSA* that it is not merely a question of the sixth and seventh states of the Church being « the end » of what preceded, but being the beginning of something else : a solemn new age. Gregory expands upon the concept of novelty in the final age of the Church.
- [the novelty and solemnity] which he, indeed, intends [is] just as it appears from what has preceded and what follows: that the Church in the fifth state which he calls 'of those having something individually or in common' will fall so greatly from the life of Christ and evangelical perfection in life and in knowledge and in teaching, because she will be totally rejected from God and a spiritually-founded Church will be renewed again in which the life and image of Christ will be reformed in living according to the Rule of Blessed Francis<sup>147</sup>.
- 48 Gregory's words, echoing something he had already said in the first article examined<sup>148</sup> and something already noted by John as Olivi's erroneous understanding<sup>149</sup>, here provoke one of the longest annotations in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A :
- How he understands that the Church of the fifth state which, he calls of 'those having something in common', should be completely rejected by God, and a new spiritual Church will be renewed and founded in which the life and image of Christ will be reformed<sup>150</sup>.
- 49 In the opposite (right) margin is a brace next to a sentence providing an antidote to Olivi's pessimistic view : « the Church will endure in her perfection until the end of the world and she will never lose it »<sup>151</sup>. The article ends with a more orthodox (and

somewhat insipid) consideration of historical progression based on the words of the Song of Solomon 6 (9) : *Who is she who comes forth like the morning rising*. Gregory quotes the Ordinary Gloss which identifies the « she » as the Church which « was firmly instituted and everywhere in her multiplicity spread out, and is begotten in steps and in succession until the end of time »<sup>152</sup>. Gregory uses this passage to note that the advance of the Church « like the morning rising » is not to be understood such that, the more the Church advances, the more perfect she is in knowledge and in life. If this were so, then the state of the primitive Church would thus be the most imperfect. Rather :

Only to this extent does the Church advance 'like the morning rising' : because until the clear day of her homecoming, she does not fail but always goes forward in the light insofar as she continuously kindles anew the light of faith and justice in some<sup>153</sup>.

- 50 John repeats : « How the progress of the Church, 'like the morning rising', is to be understood »<sup>154</sup>. This interpretation of the dawn contrasts with that of Olivi which Gregory and John had already noted in the first article whereby the darkness of the night was the carnal church, and the dawn, a new spiritual one<sup>155</sup>.

## Relation of MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A to the 1324-1326 condemnation process

- 51 John reserved final judgment on the *LSA* to himself on 27 September 1322 and eventually condemned the work on 8 February 1326. The period in between has been termed the second stage of the condemnation process : it is generally held to have begun in the aftermath of John XXII's bull *Quia quorundam mentes* from 10 November 1324<sup>156</sup>. Joseph Koch discovered texts datable to this period containing passages of the *LSA* extracted by John XXII and prefaced with a question about orthodoxy : « Whether it can catholically be said that... » or « Whether it is erroneous to say that... ». The first tract, called the *Allegationes*, is found, without the name of the author, in MS Paris BnF lat. 4190. The second is a series of four *consilia* written by Francesco Silvestri, bishop of Florence from 1323 to 1341, found in the Vatican Archive (in ASV Arm. XXXI, t. 42)<sup>157</sup>. After Koch's brief treatment, Edith Pásztor and David Burr studied these texts in detail<sup>158</sup>. Sylvain Piron subsequently attributed the *Allegationes* to Bonagrazia of Bergamo OM<sup>159</sup> and discovered additional texts from this second stage of the *LSA* condemnation process : one by Jacques Fournier OCist. found in MS Avignon BM 1087<sup>160</sup>, and another one by Francis of Meyronnes OM, preserved in a privately-owned manuscript of the *Sexdequiloquium* of John of Roquetaillade OM<sup>161</sup>. From these texts, a list of some nine questions has been assembled<sup>162</sup>. The questions circulated were based on passages from the third chapter of the *LSA* (4 extracts), the prologue (4 extracts), and from chapter seven (1 extract). Some of these passages had not been treated at all in the original censure, others had – but the fact that they were circulated again suggests that John XXII thought that something was wanting in the original analysis. This later consultation was meant to complement the earlier one<sup>163</sup>.
- 52 Being datable to 1318, the report in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A was clearly a part of the first stage of the condemnation process of the *LSA*. But there is some relation between John XXII's annotations, undated as they are, and the second stage which was characterized by the personal involvement of the pope. Generally, John XXII's annotations of the censure of *LSA* excerpts in Paris BnF lat. 3381A run from the *LSA*



prologue until the end of the third chapter, and the stray annotations at the end of the manuscript touch on the relevant passage from chapter seven. Thus, much (but not all) of the *LSA* material from the 1324-1326 consultation is covered in this manuscript : only two questions (# 6 and # 7, concerning extracts from the *LSA* prologue) seem to have no connection to the articles in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A<sup>164</sup>. What follows is a comparison of questions and articles in order of degree of correspondence, rather than strict numerical order.

## Question 1

- 53 In one case, the connection between MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A and the consultation of 1324-1326 is instantly recognizable. In annotating Gregory's treatment of the first error of article 7 (*LM* 8)<sup>165</sup>, John XXII writes in the upper right hand margin of the manuscript : « It is clear that 'the pontificate of Christ was truly given to the heirs of the evangelical life' »<sup>166</sup>. This line was not a repetition of something in the main text but was supplied by John XXII, and it is a quotation (with minor variations) from the *LSA* not found in the original 84 extracted articles in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A. Moreover, the line does not even come from the part of the *LSA* that Gregory was then discussing (the thirteenth *notabile* of the *LSA* prologue). Rather, it is a sentence taken from the seventh *notabile* of the prologue to the *LSA* which fell between the third and fourth excerpts of MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A. The full sentence reads :

... the pontificate of Christ was first given to the heirs of the evangelical and apostolic life in Peter and in the Apostles, and afterwards it was usefully and rationally changed to the state of having temporal things, at least from the time of Constantine until the end of the fifth state<sup>167</sup>.

- 54 This passage, without the final reference to Constantine and the fifth state, was circulated as a question sometime after 1324 to Silvestri, Bonagrazia, Fournier, and Meyronnes<sup>168</sup>. The only other mark by John XXII on the folio in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A is a brace besides a text about the election of a pope from the *Liber Sextus*<sup>169</sup>. The connection between John XXII's quotation from the *LSA* and a canon law authority about papal election may seem tenuous, so some words should be said about the context. The citation ends a discussion begun on the previous folio about the condemnation of *The Eternal Gospel* of Gerard de Borgo San Donnino OM. The condemnation was quoted :

Just as in the first state of the world, the kingdom or rule of the whole Church was committed by God the Father to some of the order of the married by which that order was approved, so in the second state of the world, it was committed by God the Son to the order of clerics by which that order was glorified by Him. Thus even in the third state of the world, it will be committed to one or several of the order of monks by the Holy Spirit in whom or in which this order will be glorified by Him<sup>170</sup>.

- 55 Gregory produces a battery of objections against this interpretation of history. Before the Incarnation of Christ, he says, the world was ruled by the four monarchies – pagan states not sanctioned by God. Moreover, after Christ, it cannot be said that the governance of the Church was entrusted exclusively to a specific order or group : be it an order of clerics, an order of monks, or an *ordo evangelicus*. If that were so :

Thus, with Peter having died, neither Linus nor Cletus nor Clement should have been selected [pope], nor could anyone be selected pope unless they were an Apostle [...] or led the apostolic life<sup>171</sup>.



- 56 Gregory notes that St. John the Evangelist was still living when St. Peter died : If Christ had entrusted the governance of the Church to the heirs of the evangelical life, St. John should have been made pope. Here Gregory adds that the positing of a break between the pontifical and apostolic orders is the error of the Waldensians « who say that from the time of Sylvester there was no true pope in Rome because from then on the Roman Church had possessions which the Apostles had rejected »<sup>172</sup>. But Christ, in fact, had conferred the government of the Church to Peter (who, indeed, had been married) and his successors (many of whom were monks), not to a particular order in the Church<sup>173</sup>. The election of the pope is a free one and he who denies this goes against the Holy Spirit. Gregory first cites Alexander III's election decretal *Licet de vitanda* from the Third Lateran Council (X. 1. 6. 6.) and then an additional decretal from the *Liber Sextus*. His citation of canon law about the freedom of choice of the cardinals thus concludes this discussion. John XXII placed a brace next to this citation and wrote in the upper margin the line from the *LSA* : « It is clear that 'the pontificate of Christ was truly given to the heirs of the evangelical life' ». Presumably, the pope thought the line from the *LSA* contradicted the conclusion. His citation, preceded by « it is clear » and with the substitution of « truly » for « first », seems ironic.
- 57 It is noteworthy that John XXII here quotes only the first part of the sentence from the *LSA* which was circulated in the consultation of 1324-1326 : «The pontificate of Christ was first given to the heirs of the evangelical and apostolic life in Peter and in the other Apostles, and afterwards it was usefully and rationally changed to the state of having temporal goods »<sup>174</sup>. The omission suggests that at this point in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A, John XXII was not interested in the poverty that the second half of the sentence invokes. This is all the more remarkable because, in dealing with this article's second error which immediately follows the citation of canon law about papal election, Gregory employs language resembling John XXII's own constitutions *Ad conditorem canonum* (1322) and *Cum inter nonnullos* (1323). In analyzing Olivi's conception of the evangelical order, Gregory concludes :
- If indeed he understands that this order, according to the observance intended by blessed Francis, should be more perfect than all others, this would not be an obvious error because there can be the question: whether the state of voluntary poverty that has nothing in common is more perfect than the state that has something in common – various doctors have opined contrary things about this<sup>175</sup>.
- 58 There is no sign in the manuscript that John XXII took notice of this passage.

## Question 2

- 59 Another unambiguous connection between MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A and John XXII's 1324-1326 consultation concerns question two :
- Whether it can catholically be said that in the sixth state, 'not only by simple intelligence but even by taste and touch experience, all the truth of the incarnate Word of God and the power of God the Father will be seen because Christ promised that *When he, the Spirit of truth comes, he will teach you all truth*'<sup>176</sup>.
- 60 This passage can be found in article 12 in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A which comprises a massive extract from chapter three of the *LSA*<sup>177</sup>, where Joachim of Fiore is cited without acknowledgement<sup>178</sup>. The twelfth article in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A encompasses the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth articles of the *Littera Magistrorum*,

containing lines not treated in it; John XXII brackets one of these lines in the margin<sup>179</sup>. The first error of the article is :

In the third time, the Holy Spirit will exhibit himself just as a flame and furnace of divine love, and as a steward of spiritual inebriation, and as the apothecary of divine fragrances and of spiritual oils and unguents, and as the joy of spiritual jubilation and jocundity<sup>180</sup>.

- 61 Gregory says that this implies that those of this age will be « more inflamed with the Holy Spirit and more inebriated with his new wine [...] than the Apostles on whom He descended... »<sup>181</sup> Alongside the text, John XXII poses a question : « Whether the promise of the sending of the Holy Spirit should be fulfilled more in the sixth state than it would have been in the time of the Apostles ? »<sup>182</sup> John XXII, no doubt, intended the question for himself but Meyronnes addresses a similar one in the 1324-1326 consultation<sup>183</sup>. Here the pope brackets Gregory's answer: this approaches the error of the Cathafrigans, a group of heretics described in Augustine's *Book of Heresies* and in Isidore of Seville's *Etymologies* – descriptions which later found their way into Gratian's *Decretum*<sup>184</sup>. The pope writes : « Nota : de errore cathafrigarum »<sup>185</sup>. Gregory's conclusion against the text of Olivi is then cited almost word for word by John XXII in the margin : « That a greater flame and greater abundance and joy of the Holy Spirit were present in the first times of the Church than in the future »<sup>186</sup> – something supported in the text by references to Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job*<sup>187</sup>. Still, it is conceded in Olivi's favor that if the gifts of the Holy Spirit are understood in a certain sense (*secundum quid*) rather than absolutely (*simpliciter*), then it may be said that they could be greater in a later age of the Church – a distinction which, again, John XXII notes in the margin<sup>188</sup>. But qualifications aside, Gregory concludes : « That the Holy Spirit will have shown 'the dance of the spirit, in jubilation, and in pleasantness' more, simply speaking, in the first times than in the last times »<sup>189</sup>. John repeats almost the exact phrase in the margin<sup>190</sup>.

- 62 The second error of article twelve in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A reads :

That in the sixth time period through the abundance of the Holy Spirit, 'All truth of the wisdom of the Word of the incarnate God and the power of God the Father is seen not only through simple intelligence but by taste and touch experience'<sup>191</sup>.

- 63 This error, minus the Scriptural citation (Jo. 16:13-14), is the same as question two circulated to Silvestri, Bonagrazia, Fournier, and Meyronnes<sup>192</sup>. Gregory here notes that God cannot be known by *simplex intelligentia* in this life and likewise the « certain experience » of God would seem to exclude faith<sup>193</sup>. John XXII, in response, poses a question in the margin : « Concerning simple intelligence and certain experience, whether they should pertain to the clear vision ? »<sup>194</sup> Here we have an early instance of John XXII musing on the nature of the Beatific Vision<sup>195</sup>, sparked off by a passage from the *LSA* which the pope cites in a Candlemas (2 February) sermon<sup>196</sup> – probably from 1326, which would be six days before his condemnation of the *LSA* in a consistory. Further down the page, Gregory attempts to explain the meaning of the words :

... Either therefore through 'the simple and experiential cognition of God', they take as their meaning the clear vision, and this is erroneous because such is not of the common law during the state of faith. Or they take as their meaning an enigmatic or dark vision, yet however greater and more certain than any other which the Church would have ever otherwise had, and this is an error, or it is at least temerarious : that is, that some future state of the pilgrim Church in which men should commonly have a fuller understanding of those things of the faith than what the Apostles, the Doctors of the Church, would have had<sup>197</sup>.

- 64 John XXII notes the « either they take as their meaning »<sup>198</sup> and that first interpretation is « erroneous »<sup>199</sup>, while the second option is « erroneous or at least temerarious »<sup>200</sup>. It would seem that the pope leaned towards this first interpretation and had a more allergic reaction against it than Gregory. In his sermon for the Purification of Mary, John XXII reasons that it follows from this passage that « men in this life are not pilgrims (*viatores*) but comprehensors »<sup>201</sup>. The pope then insists, against those who claim that the passage is merely temerarious and presumptuous, that the statement is in fact erroneous and heretical<sup>202</sup>. The discussion of this *LSA* passage in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A is surely one of the sources for John XXII's sermon<sup>203</sup>.
- 65 When Gregory arrives at the sixth error of article 12 which John had bracketed in the manuscript margin in original citation of the article<sup>204</sup>, he returns to the theme of knowledge that had already been raised in articles two and three of the censure<sup>205</sup>. In this error, Gregory speaks of two conversions in the third age of the world : that of the Jews to Christianity in the time of the anti-Christ and of the whole world (again) to Christ after the anti-Christ's death<sup>206</sup>. Gregory denies that the world would need be converted again to Christ in the third age :
- Indeed, with regard to that which the words say that 'the world will be again converted to Christ' : these are not only random because they are proven by no authority, but are indeed erroneous, as it seems, because they are expressly against Scripture: for Christ said in Mt. 24 [14]: *And this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world, for a testimony to all nations: and then shall the consummation come.* This preaching ought to be completed before the advent of Antichrist ...<sup>207</sup>
- 66 John poses the question in the margin : « Whether the world will be again converted to Christ ? »<sup>208</sup>, and notes that the words are « erroneous » and « expressly against Scripture »<sup>209</sup>.
- 67 Gregory and John are interested less in the conversions of the Jews and of the world to Christianity per se than in the mechanism involved : was « new knowledge » the key ? Gregory had already approached the subject of knowledge in the third age several times in his report. We have seen that John XXII made notes in the third article about those of the sixth state having an understanding of the Scriptures and knowledge greater than anyone else's, including the Apostles<sup>210</sup>. Moreover, the treatment of the conversion of the Jews in article 10 contains more consideration by John and Gregory on the opening of Scriptures to the sixth state of the Church. The text of the *LSA* runs : « The sixth Church is said to have opened the door of the Scriptures and of preaching and of converting hearts »<sup>211</sup>. Gregory objected to the idea that some future necessity will bring about a greater or superior knowledge than what was had previously<sup>212</sup>. Nor did Gregory think that the Jews would be converted with a greater opening of hearts to Scripture (*viz.* contemplative knowledge) than there had been in the initial spread of Christianity with the fullness of the Gentiles (*cf.* Rom. 11:25) being converted in the first age of the Church<sup>213</sup> ; John notes in the margin : « That there will not be such a opening of hearts in the time in which the Jews are converted as much as there had been for the fullness of the Gentiles to be converted »<sup>214</sup>.

## Question 5

- 68 We have seen that the second question circulated by John XXII finds a precedent in the first and second errors of article 12 in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A. Likewise, the fifth

question treated uniquely by Meyronnes<sup>215</sup> can also be found in the twelfth article ; its eighth error (corresponding roughly to LM 15) is : « The sixth state will be so much greater than the preceding ones in the taking up of grace and of the intimate signs of the love of Christ »<sup>216</sup>. Next to the LSA extract in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A, the pope writes in the margin words not found in the text as a kind of summary ; the words echo a judgment repeatedly noted in the manuscript : « He [Olivi] prefers the sixth state to others »<sup>217</sup>. Gregory dismisses the passage summarily : « It is clearly erroneous because the most intimate sign of the love of Christ to us in this life is the familiarity of his Incarnation »<sup>218</sup>. The pope, after marking the passage with a horizontal line, merely repeats : « Note : ‘clearly erroneous’ »<sup>219</sup>. John XXII finally notes in the margin the word « temerarious »<sup>220</sup> after Gregory judges it audacious « to say that to others is given or ought to be given greater gifts than those given to the Apostles »<sup>221</sup>.

## Question 4

- 69 The fourth question from the LSA circulated by the pope and assessed by Silvestri and Meyronnes was : « Whether it can catholically be said that blessed Francis was ‘the revealer of the evangelical life and rule in the sixth and seventh time to be propagated and the highest observer after Christ and his mother ? »<sup>222</sup> This question, based on an extract from chapter seven of the LSA, glosses the line *I saw another angel* (Apoc. 7:2), that is, the angel of the sixth seal, here identified as St. Francis<sup>223</sup>. The passage is found in the twenty-ninth article (LM 28) of MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A (fol. 106r-v). As John XXII’s annotations cease at article 18, it would seem that there is no relation between this manuscript and the consultation of 1324-1326. However, this is not the only place in the LSA where the sentiment is expressed : a similar passage occurs in the tenth chapter : « Our holy father Francis is, after and under Christ, the principal founder, initiator, and exemplar of the sixth state and of his evangelical rule »<sup>224</sup>. In the consultation of 1324-1326, Meyronnes answers a question along these lines, immediately following his consideration of the principal passage in question four about St. Francis and the mother of Christ<sup>225</sup>. In MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A the passage from chapter 10 is mentioned obliquely in the eighty-second article (LM 60), at the very end of the manuscript. This article is extracted from the chapter 21 of the LSA and, in analyzing its second error, Gregory refers back to a previous chapter.

Because he [Olivi] says ‘that it is more appropriate to the Apostles to be, with Christ, the fundamentals of the whole Church and of the Christian faith’, supply that, he contradicts himself in several other things because he said above in article 40 that ‘blessed Francis was, after Christ, the first and principal founder, herald, and exemplar, of the sixth state and of the evangelical rule’<sup>226</sup>.

- 70 John XXII here notes : « He contradicts himself »<sup>227</sup>. Further down the page, after a citation of Richard of St. Victor, Gregory adds : « From which it is apparent that, however many are converted to Christ, they are all lesser than the Apostles through whose doctrine they enter [the Church] »<sup>228</sup>. The pope then paraphrases in the margin : « That all who are converted to Christ are lesser than the Apostles »<sup>229</sup>. The implication here is that St. Francis is as well.

## Question 8

- 71 The eighth question, apparently treated only by Meyronnes, reads : « Whether it is erroneous to say that it is proper to the sixth state to profess and to serve the evangelical rule not only in its precepts but even in the counsels of Christ »<sup>230</sup>. Like questions two and five of the 1324-1326 consultation, question eight comes from the third chapter of the *LSA*. It is treated in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A in article 13 (LM 16).

Note how it is clearly appropriate to the sixth state, whose character is to confess and serve the evangelical law or rule not only of the precepts but even of the counsels of Christ ...<sup>231</sup>

- 72 The first error of the extract runs to the words « sixth state ». Gregory says that this wants « to prefer the sixth state to the first ones in grace, in faith, and in spiritual gifts ». Such a statement is temerarious, as the words sound, but it is also a property of heretics who put themselves above all others, just like the friends of Job (alluding once again to the *Moralia*)<sup>232</sup>. John XXII writes in the margin : « ‘temerarious’ and it follows : ‘but is a property of heretics’ »<sup>233</sup>. Gregory says that those who think that they alone have the apostolic life, being contemptuous of others, assimilate themselves to the *Apostolici* described in St. Augustine’s *Book of Heresies*<sup>234</sup>. John XXII notes that « In this they are assimilated to the heretics et cetera »<sup>235</sup>. Gregory continues :

Those who call the Church of today ‘carnal’, the whore, or Babylon which they say is to be damned and from it will exit the spiritual elect who will found their own, other Church just like the Church is other from the damned synagogue — these are similar to the *Apostolici* heretics inasmuch as they say that they alone before all others serve evangelical perfection. But in this they are worse than them; they place themselves ahead of the Apostles by saying that to them the charismatic reception of spiritual things is appropriate, as if in them and not in others the promise of the sending of the Holy Spirit is fulfilled<sup>236</sup>.

John XXII copies this almost verbatim :

Note that he [Gregory] says that these ones say that the Church of today is to be dammed and from it will exit a spiritual elect who will found their own, other Church from it, just as the Church is other from the damned synagogue. Likewise: Note that he says these are like the *Apostolici* heretics and in this they are worse because they put themselves before the Apostles et cetera<sup>237</sup>.

- 73 This concludes the first error of article 13 in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A which was primarily taken up with the familiar theme of how the Church of the sixth state is a new one that surpasses the Church of the first state.
- 74 The second error concerns the phrase : « ...whose character is to confess and serve the evangelical law or rule not only of the precepts but even of the counsels of Christ ». Gregory considers this is an error just as the words sound because if serving evangelical perfection is proper to the sixth state, then no other state has served it, including that of the Apostles and the primitive Church<sup>238</sup>. John XXII notes : « Error, just as the words sound »<sup>239</sup>. But Gregory points out another more precise meaning in the error closer to the intent of the author :
- That no state serves the evangelical law and the rule as far as precepts and counsels unless it professes and serves the Rule of Blessed Francis according to his understanding which is repudiated by the Roman Church as erroneous and schismatic<sup>240</sup>.
- 75 This seems to be a reference to the constitution *Exivi de Paradiso* which had much to say about Gospel precepts versus counsels and the Franciscan Rule<sup>241</sup>, and which Gregory

tends to cite instead of John XXII's *Quorundum Exigit*<sup>242</sup>. In any event, John draws a horizontal line next to the passage and repeats in the margin : « Note : his erroneous and schismatic understanding »<sup>243</sup>. Gregory further stresses that there can be no doubt as to Olivi's intent : « This, however, is his understanding, as is clear below where he says that those who say that evangelical perfection does not require the abdication of everything, even in common, are in error, and badly understand the Gospel »<sup>244</sup>. John concludes with « Note : this, however, is his understanding »<sup>245</sup>. Here the relation of communal poverty and evangelical perfection aired in the apostolic poverty controversy is touched on again in passing.

### Question 3

- 76 The third question circulated, found in the texts of Silvestri and Meyronnes, was :

Whether it is erroneous to say that the number of the elect to complete the fabric of the heavenly city to be thus prefixed, so that if one through his fault falls, it is necessary to substitute another, lest that fabric remain incomplete<sup>246</sup>.

- 77 The passage is taken from chapter three of the *LSA* and is not to be found among the extracts in MS Paris BnF lat 3381A or in the *Littera Magistrorum*. However directly preceding this passage in the *LSA* fall two paragraphs which are articles 16 and 17 (LM 18 and 19) in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A. As it provides a context for the third article of John XXII's 1324-1326 consultation, the treatment of these articles by Gregory and John XXII will be briefly summarized here. The articles are also of some significance on their own. Article 16 shortly follows in the *LSA* the line *Hold fast what you have, that no man take your crown* (Apoc. 3:11) :

Likewise just as to the first state alone the translation of the Church from her place was threatened (cf. *Hold fast what you have etc*), thus to the sixth state alone it signifies that, if she were not to persevere, her crown would be transferred to another. The mystical reason of which is because just as the first state has primacy with respect to the second general state of the world, which by the Apostle is called the 'time or entry of the fullness of the gentiles' (Cf. Rom. 11:25), so the sixth state will have primacy with respect to the third general state of the world lasting until the end of time. Lest therefore they should be proud and overbearing from the primacy, as if they could not lose it, and, as if another cannot be substituted for them or be made equally worthy, the aforementioned translation is insinuated to them<sup>247</sup>.

- 78 This passage is concerned with the same issues of transference, replacement, and substitution found in question three of the consultation of 1324-1326 when Bonagrazia of Bergamo commented on the *LSA* excerpt beginning *Hold fast what you have* in a supplement to this extract<sup>248</sup>. Gregory says that the *LSA* extract suggests one primacy from the beginning of the Church to the fifth age, and another primacy from the sixth age until the end of the world. John notes : « The twofold primacy of the Church according to him »<sup>249</sup>. Recall that Gregory brought up the primacy of the Roman Church in article three of his censure<sup>250</sup>. Here Gregory explains further Olivi's idea that just as God gave *dominium* to various monarchies of the world, so he gave the primacies to various churches – and the primacy given to the Roman Church must be born away from her on account of her crimes and transferred to a « spiritual » Church<sup>251</sup>. Gregory deems this « heretical » – a word that John notes in the margin<sup>252</sup>.
- 79 But there is more than simply the loss of Roman primacy involved. Gregory draws attention to sectarianism : « The second error is in this : because he [Olivi] intended



that the primacy to be transferred in the sixth state to those of his 'sect' through whom, he says, the Jews and the whole world is to be converted »<sup>253</sup>. John XXII here notes : « Concerning the translation of primacy »<sup>254</sup>. This note resembles a series of annotations that John had made earlier in the manuscript in article 11 (LM 12) about the translation of primacy from Babylon to the New Jerusalem<sup>255</sup>. It also resembles a question fielded by Meyronnes between 1324-1326, apparently in connection with the first question<sup>256</sup>. Gregory further notes that : « These people will leave the carnal church just like the Apostles left the synagogue » and that this is « erroneous »<sup>257</sup> – John only repeats the latter word in the margin here<sup>258</sup>, but he had made a more extensive annotation on the subject earlier in the manuscript<sup>259</sup>.

- 80 This ecclesiological discussion carries over to article 17 (LM 19) in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A which reads :

The second reason is because each of these [primacies] are substitutes for another: for the glory which was prepared for the synagogue and her priests, if they had believed in Christ, was translated to the primitive Church and her pastors, thus even the glory prepared for the final Church of the fifth state should be transferred on account of her adultery to the elect of the sixth state. Whence in this book she is called Babylon, whore, to be damned around the beginning of the sixth state<sup>260</sup>.

- 81 John summarizes Gregory's conclusion from the previous article in the margin : « That the glory of the Church of the fifth state should not be transferred to the Church of the sixth state »<sup>261</sup>. Gregory contends that if the glory of sacerdotal, pontifical, and papal dignity given in the New Testament to Peter, the Apostles, and the Church were to be transferred, consequently the observance of the New Law would change and it would not be a New Testament, an Eternal Gospel, but a mutable one that would be vacated just like the Old Testament. That is heretical<sup>262</sup> – a judgment that John notes<sup>263</sup>.

- 82 The second error of article 17 concerns the words : « Whence in this book she is called whore, Babylon to be damned around the beginning of the sixth state ». Once again, Gregory returns to subjects he had already treated in the initial three articles of his censure. He reiterates :

It is evident that he impugns the law of Christ in calling his spouse, 'whore', and similarly through this he calls her 'Babylon', that is, worthy of confusion, but she is rather worthy of glory of which Ephesians *Christ loved the Church and gave himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life, that he might present it to himself, a glorious Church*<sup>264</sup>.

- 83 As per his usual practice, John XXII repeats in the margin Gregory's judgment : « that he who calls the Church of God 'whore' or 'Babylon' impugns the law ». But, crucially, John XXII, on fol. 46v in his last substantial annotation in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A until fol. 269v<sup>265</sup>, goes further and adds a judgment about orthodoxy which Gregory did not make – the only time in the manuscript that the pope does so. John XXII adds : « and he is to be considered a heretic »<sup>266</sup>.

## ***Gloriosam Ecclesiam revisited***

- 84 It is quite a coincidence that at St. Paul's words, a *glorious Church*, John XXII should depart from his usual practice of simply repeating Gregory's judgment and effectively declare, in one of his last annotations in the manuscript, that Olivi is to be considered a heretic. After all, the line from the *Letter to the Ephesians* had supplied the opening words of John XXII's constitution of 23 January 1318 : *Gloriosam Ecclesiam*. This



constitution condemned a band of renegade Franciscans in Sicily and several of their theological errors<sup>267</sup>. Two particular errors are worth nothing in relation to MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A. One error condemned was that the friars claimed :

that the Gospel of Christ in them alone in this time is fulfilled, and that up to this point, it was hidden, or rather extinguished ... They assert that the promise of our Lord concerning the Holy Spirit was not fulfilled in the Apostles but in themselves<sup>268</sup>.

- 85 John XXII had corrected this in saying : « The Holy Spirit, adjoining the faithful promise of the Savior, was most fully poured out on the day of Pentecost to the Apostles, so that he *should teach them all the truth* [cf. Jo. 16:13] that pertains to salvation »<sup>269</sup>. The other relevant error condemned in *Gloriosam Ecclesiam* was that the rebels :

imagine two churches : one carnal, overwhelmed with riches, overflowing in ornament, stained by evil deeds to which, they assert, their Roman protectors are subjected ; the other a spiritual church, pure with frugality, decorated with virtue, girdled with poverty, in which they and their accomplices alone are a part of, which they, by virtue of their spiritual life, rule over<sup>270</sup>.

- 86 John XXII had corrected this error in saying there is only one holy, catholic, and apostolic Church : the Roman Church founded on divine authority and enjoying primacy. Whosoever denies this is to be considered a heretic. The Roman Church has been ruled by an unbroken succession of popes since Christ bestowed power on St. Peter and she will last forever, never being stained by heresy or by the election of an illegitimate pastor<sup>271</sup>.

- 87 Clearly, there is a strong correlation between John XXII's annotations in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A and two of the errors condemned in *Gloriosam Ecclesiam*. As we have seen, in the very first article Gregory called attention to the idea of a « carnal church » and John XXII took note on how Olivi understood the term. Afterwards, the term is repeated alongside other descriptions of the Church of the fifth state, such as whore and Babylon. Over 100 of John XXII's annotations – roughly 40 percent of the total – either contain or are adjacent to the word *ecclesia*. For the pope, ecclesiological matters were of fundamental importance. Likewise ubiquitous in the manuscript and the annotations is the related theme of sending of the Holy Spirit : Whether it was complete in the Apostles or whether new gifts in the new age of the Spirit to those elect of a new spiritual church were to come. In MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A there are around 75 annotations, about a third of the total, on the Age of the Spirit and its new gifts – some of which have been summarized above, but there are still other questions posed by John XXII in the manuscript's margins about the distinctiveness of the sixth state<sup>272</sup>.

With a process beginning in 1318 and ending in 1326, the pope was slow to condemn the LSA, despite prominent members of the Franciscan order baying like bloodhounds for it all the while<sup>273</sup>. Scholars have often been puzzled by the slowness. As no written condemnation survives, it is not clear what exactly the pope condemned in the end. But the annotations in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A may provide an insight : that, in John XXII's eyes, the two most important theological errors had already been condemned in *Gloriosam Ecclesiam*<sup>274</sup>.

## The apostolic poverty controversy at a remove

89 If the annotations in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A echo *Gloriosam Ecclesiam*, it is worth asking: do they have any connection to John XXII's other constitutions, such as those on apostolic poverty (*Ad conditorem canonum*, *Cum inter nonnullos*, *Quia quorundam mentes*, and *Quia vir reprobus*)? Already on the second folio of MS Paris BnF lat 3381A, John had made a note about « the error of the poor men of Lyons »: that there was no salvation in riches possessed individually or in common.<sup>275</sup> Likewise, the pope repeatedly noted that the Church in the fifth state would « have things in common » and she would be damned, while the new Spiritual Church would « have nothing individually or in common », just like professors of the Rule of St. Francis.<sup>276</sup> Though the relation of poverty to evangelical perfection is touched on<sup>277</sup>, apostolic poverty, as such, receives relatively little attention. We have seen, for example, that in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A John XXII seemed interested only in the first part of Olivi's phrase that he circulated in 1324-1326: « the pontificate of Christ was first given to the heirs of the evangelical and apostolic life in Peter and in the other Apostles, and afterwards it was usefully and rationally changed to the state of having temporal goods ». This is to some extent typical: John XXII's annotations show a greater concern for poverty's place in the future than in the past, and for how the Apostles are exceeded rather than equaled.

90 The closest connection between the material in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A and the apostolic poverty controversy occurs in article 14 (LM 17) in a discussion of the words spoken to St. John « *Because you have kept the word of my patience, I will also keep you from the hour of temptation* » (Apoc. 3:10). The article reads:

In both ways it conforms more perfectly to the sixth state, and even in a third way: because he has served the word or rule of evangelical need and humility and patience, since with no one for any temporal thing was he of a litigant, however with his persecutors and enemies with great peace and patience was he most perfectly of a lover<sup>278</sup>.

91 Gregory finds that, according to Olivi's intention, there are three errors in this passage, and John XXII repeats in the margin « Note: according to his intention »<sup>279</sup>. The first error encompasses the « rule of evangelical need » while the second error concerns the idea that he (St. John? Christ?) was never « of a litigant ». Concerning the first, Gregory says:

Though indeed it is true that in the sixth state the rule of evangelical poverty is served by many and especially by those professors and observers of the Rule of Blessed Francis, understood according to the declaration of the Holy See. However, to say, just as these words sound, that it should be appropriate only to those of the sixth state to serve the rule of evangelical poverty is erroneous because the primitive church served it in selling all things and in putting the price at the feet of the Apostles [cf. Act. 5] whose teaching fulfills the Gospel counsel *If you wish to be perfect* [Mt. 19:21]<sup>280</sup>.

92 In the right margin, John XXII draws a horizontal line next to the word « erroneous » and repeats it;<sup>281</sup> in the left margin, he poses the question: « Whether it is appropriate only to the sixth state to serve the rule of evangelical need? »<sup>282</sup> On the next folio, Gregory concludes that the Apostles possessed nothing as their own but had everything just as common things. Since the Church is perfect, it is erroneous to say that for any period of time she should deny evangelical perfection<sup>283</sup>. John again draws a horizontal line next to the word « erroneous » and repeats it in the margin<sup>284</sup>. Then Gregory

explains that it is Olivi's intention that no one literally observes the words of Christ concerning voluntary poverty *Go and sell all you have* (Mt. 19:21) who follow the Rule of St. Francis even according to his own understanding.<sup>285</sup> John notes in the margin : « Note : he says : 'it is his intention' ». <sup>286</sup> Moreover, Gregory remarks that the error is twofold – a horizontal line is yet again drawn by the pope and the words « erroneous in two ways » are repeated in the margin<sup>287</sup>. The first reason (which seems to be a non-sequitur) is because Olivi's understanding has been condemned by the Church ; the second reason (which John XXII brackets) is that no single state in the Church is perfect, serving all the counsels of Christ. But rather the Church as a whole is perfect, always having members serving each counsel of the New Testament.

93 The second error of article 14 concerns litigation. Gregory continues :

And if indeed he understands that anyone who for whatever temporal thing litigates does so against the rule of an evangelical precept, it is an error because that word in Mt. [5:40] *And if a man will contend with you in judgment, and take away your coat, let go your cloak also unto him*, if it is as a precept, should be understood only as far as the preparation of the soul<sup>288</sup>.

94 John in the margin repeats the words « if he understands », « it is an error »<sup>289</sup>. But next to the quotation of Scripture interpreted spiritually by Gregory, John writes something not in the text : the pope poses yet another question : « Whether to litigate for something should be against the rule of evangelical precept »<sup>290</sup>. Gregory concedes that if Olivi were talking about an evangelical counsel (rather than a precept), then he would be in some sense correct and cites 1 Cor. 6 (7) in his favor along with an exposition of St. Augustine and a Gloss.

95 But in three other ways, it is erroneous or false<sup>291</sup> – and John repeats « it is erroneous or false » in the margin<sup>292</sup>. The second way in which it is false is significant : this concerns litigation for common things.<sup>293</sup> Gregory thinks that this sort of litigation can be done without any imperfection, but he infers that Olivi disagrees because of his assumption that the possession of common things is itself an imperfection. « Therefore, according to him, for no temporal thing can one litigate without the infirmity of imperfection »<sup>294</sup>. Gregory remarks that this assumption seems to be erroneous, and John again repeats « it seems to be erroneous »<sup>295</sup>. This is because of the Gospel line *If you wish to be perfect, go and sell all that you have* (Mt. 19:21) :

[If] someone should go, sell all that he has, give it to the poor, and then enter a religious order of those having things in common, you say that this man does not fulfill the words of the Gospel because he has something in common. Against : Christ did not wish that all things be sold, but [only] those that he had and those things that he could sell. But it follows that he could not sell a common thing, nor have it to sell. Therefore, the words of Christ do not prohibit having something in common, but rather having things individually, in one's own will and by *dominium*<sup>296</sup>.

96 John XXII writes in the margin words not in the text, as if in summary : « That it should not be of an imperfection to have things in common, provided that one does not have [things] individually »<sup>297</sup>. The concluding remarks of Gregory, which are bracketed by John XXII, highlight that all the other saintly writers of monastic rules like Basil, Benedict, Augustine, and Gregory, believing themselves to be fulfilling the Gospel counsel *If you wish to be perfect*, instituted the common possession of a moderate amount of necessities<sup>298</sup>. On the previous folio, Gregory had quoted canon law that those who do not believe the wiser doctors turn out themselves to be masters of error ; in a paraphrase, « the presumption of one's own sense is the road to heresy »<sup>299</sup> a phrase

John XXII repeats in the margin.<sup>300</sup> The entire discussion of Olivi's words « since with no one for any temporal thing was he of a litigant » ends with Gregory saying : « as they sound, that is, generally, and, without any exception, and as they are understood, according to his assumption, they seem not well said »<sup>301</sup>. John echoes : « They seem not well said »<sup>302</sup>.

- 97 In this article, some of the issues later aired in John XXII's bulls on poverty are treated by Gregory in embryonic form – something not unexpected as his report anticipates the apostolic poverty controversy by several years. Clearly, John's annotation « That it should not be of an imperfection to have things in common, provided that one does not have [things] individually » distantly parallels *Ad conditorem canonum* of 1322. Similarly, in *Ad conditorem canonum* John XXII mentions briefly litigation over Franciscan goods with disapproval<sup>303</sup>, and Ubertino da Casale, following Olivi, argued in the apostolic poverty controversy that Christ and the Apostles did not litigate<sup>304</sup>. John XXII also notes the use of the words « consulo » and « litigare » in his annotation of the Franciscan Rule<sup>305</sup>. But the matter of litigation is treated most extensively in *Quia vir reprobus* of 1329 where John XXII affirms the right of religious and prelates to litigate<sup>306</sup>. In the later case, it seems clear that the treatment in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A, annotated by John XXII sometime before the *LSA*'s condemnation in 1326, was an influence on the pope in his bull against Michael of Cesena OM.

## Dating of the Annotations

- 98 Parallels with *Gloriosam Ecclesiam* (1318), *Ad conditorem canonum* (1322), *Quia vir reprobus* (1329) and John XXII's consultation of 1324-1326 have all been noted. They lead to a final question : When exactly did John XXII annotate MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A ? Unfortunately, no certain answer can be given ; only theories of probability can be proposed. One hypothesis would be that the pope annotated the report soon after it was written, say, in 1319. This dating would account for the echoing of the recent *Gloriosam Ecclesiam* and the pope's noting of the grounds for the persecution of the followers of Olivi as heretics<sup>307</sup> – a burning issue at the time. It would also explain his granting of funds in 1322 for Gregory of Lucca to write a commentary on the *Moralia in Job* which had been much cited in the report. The marginalia about communal poverty and religious perfection could be seen as an anticipation of the apostolic poverty controversy. According to this theory, the pope would have returned to the manuscript for the consultation of 1324-1326 – taking up themes and issues anew that he had been previously noted in the manuscript. Another hypothesis would be to identify the annotations with the consultation of 1324-1326 itself, when the pope extracted passages from the *LSA* and circulated them for opinions about their orthodoxy. This theory is the simpler dating solution, with John XXII personally considering the errors of the *LSA* once not twice, by working with a copy of the *LSA* and Gregory's report in tandem in 1325. It would explain John XXII's lack of action in condemning the *LSA* after receiving the negative judgment of the *Littera Magistrorum* in 1319 and his reservation of the verdict to himself in 1322. Annotations echoing *Gloriosam Ecclesiam* and the apostolic poverty controversy would thus be reminders of past issues already settled<sup>308</sup>.

## Conclusion

- 99 But whatever the date of the annotations, we are dealing with an old man and the « simple fact of use » of a manuscript. MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A is an impressive witness to the intellectual energy, the mental concentration, and, indeed, the eyesight of the aged Pope John XXII<sup>309</sup>. The manuscript is also a testament to the importance of Peter of John Olivi's *Lectura super Apocalipsim* itself.
- 

## APPENDIXES

### Appendix

Concordance between articles in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A and those of the *Littera Magistrorum*

- 1 (fol. 1r) « Septimum est quare ... septimo statu totius ecclesie » = LM 2
  - 2 (fol. 4r) « Sexta autem ... et sic de aliis » = LM 3<sup>310</sup>
  - 3 (fol. 5v) « Et cum Babilon meretrix ... solenne seculum » = LM 4
  - 4 (fol. 6v) « Sextum vero membrum ... tempori sexto » = LM 5
  - 5 (fol. 12v) « Secunda est quia ... VI et VII status » = LM 6
  - 6 (fol. 13r) « Notandum igitur ... abbreviatus » = LM 7
  - 7 (fol. 15r) « In sexto autem die ... quinto formati » = LM 8<sup>311</sup>
  - 8 (fol. 17v) « Sicut in sexto etate ... configuratus » = LM 9
  - 9 (fol. 22v) « Sexto vero ... capite ipsorum » = LM 10
  - 10 (fol. 24r) « Sexta autem ... quam aperti » = LM 11<sup>312</sup>
  - 11 (fol. 26v) « Consimiles fere ... celestem Ierusalem » = LM 12<sup>313</sup>
  - 12 (fol. 27v) « Significatur etiam ... rationem meriti » = LM 13<sup>314</sup>
  12. Error 6 (fol. 33r) « Sicut primo tempore ... ad tempora illa » = LM 14
  12. Error 8 (fol. 35r) « Quod sextus status ... rationem meriti » = LM 15<sup>315</sup>
  - 13 (fol. 35v) « Nota quomodo ... totum israelem » = LM 16<sup>316</sup>
  - 14 (fol. 38r) « Utroque modo ... perfectissime diligentis » = LM 17
  - 15 (fol. 42r) « Loquitur etiam ... iterum seminande »<sup>317</sup>
  - 16 (fol. 43v) « Item sicut soli ... predicta translatio » = LM 18
  - 17 (fol. 45r) « Secunda ratio ... status dampnanda » = LM 19
-

- 18 (fol. 50r) « In sexta vero ... apertio narrat » = LM 20
- 19 (fol. 55r) « Referendo vero ... statu complendam » = LM 21<sup>318</sup>
- 20 (fol. 66r) « Ad evidentiam huius ... sollenniter predicatum »<sup>319</sup> = LM 22<sup>320</sup>
- 21 (fol. 70r) « Hoc igitur commemorato ... exterminium Sinagoge » = LM 23
- 22 (fo. 71r) « Sciendum autem quatuor ... Zacharie primo »<sup>321</sup>
- 23 (fo. 76r) « Verumtamen ea ... ad secundum et tertium »<sup>322</sup>
- 24 (fol. 77v) « Ad secundum quidem ... dissipaverunt »<sup>323</sup> = LM 24<sup>324</sup>
- 25 (fol. 82v) « Quantum etiam ad tertium ... multitudinis reproborum »
- 26 (fol. 85r) « Si autem queras ... ordinis sui » = LM 25<sup>325</sup>
- 27 (fol. 88r) « Dicendum quod ad hoc ... iam previsis » = LM 26
- 28 (fol. 95r) « Quia vero<sup>326</sup> ... cooperite nos »<sup>327</sup> = LM 27<sup>328</sup>
- 29 (fol. 106r) « Hic ergo angelus ... similitudini consignatum »<sup>329</sup> = LM 28<sup>330</sup>
- 30 (fol. 114r) « Ex predictis autem ... breviter subinsinuo » = LM 29
- 31 (fol. 116v) « Decet ipsam preire ... philosophicam [recte philosophiam] paganorum = LM 30<sup>331</sup>
- 32 (fol. 130r) « Sicut sinagoga propagata ... ordo evangelicus » = LM 31
- 33 (fol. 131r) « Nota quod Richardus per signatos ... sexti signaculi » = LM 32<sup>332</sup>
- 34 (fol. 136r) « Et nota quod prima ... subsequens illam » = LM 33
- 35 (fol. 138r) « Quamvis per has locustas ... multis nocentes »<sup>333</sup>
- 36 (fol. 140v) « Tertia vero tribulatio ... e contra » = LM 34
- 37 (fol. 142r) « Sed ille qui dicitur ... sectarum » = LM 35
- 38 (fol. 143v) « Referendo tamen hoc ... illius temporis » = LM 36
- 39 (fol. 145v) « Item prout hec ... in ipsum » = LM 37
- 40 (fol. 147v) « Sciendum est quod sicut ... huiusmodi libri » = LM 38
- 41 (fol. 159r) « Quia vero hec ... habuerit predam » = LM 39
- 41 Error 10 (fo. 164v) « Nam in prioribus ... » = LM 40
- 41 Error 11 (fo. 165r-v) « ... tandem in iudeis » = LM 40
- 42 (fol. 169v) « Et dixit michi ... et gentibus » = LM 41<sup>334</sup>
- 43 (fol. 174r) « Sed cum Grecorum ... a Christo traditam »<sup>335</sup>
- 44 (fol. 177v) « Secundum Augustinum et Gregorium ... a sinistris »<sup>336</sup>
- 45 (fol. 185r) « Deinde subit de efficacia ... reprobis abscondunt »<sup>337</sup>
- 46 (fol. 191r) « Et cum finierint ... mensibus xl duobus »<sup>338</sup> = LM 42<sup>339</sup>
- 47 (fol. 195r) « Potest etiam dici<sup>340</sup> ... persecutiones antichristi<sup>341</sup> » = LM 43<sup>342</sup>
- 48 (fol. 200r) « Attamen sciendum quod ... ceperunt Ierusalem » = LM 44<sup>343</sup>

- 49 (fol. 208r) « Quidam ex pluribus ... introductus » = LM 45
- 50 (fol. 213r) « Secundus autem angelus ... monte immenso » = LM 46
- 51 (fol. 221r) « Tertius autem angelus<sup>344</sup> ... evangelicum fienda<sup>345</sup> » = LM 47<sup>346</sup>
- 52 (fol. 225v) « Et quintus angelus ... sedes et ecclesia »<sup>347</sup> = LM 48<sup>348</sup>
- 53 (fol. 227v) « Super huiusmodi vero ... abhominacione »<sup>349</sup> = LM 48
- 54 (fol. 229v) « Per hanc autem sedem ... subiectis » = LM 48
- 55 (fol. 230r) « Et quia secundum Ioachim ... erumpunt »<sup>350</sup>
- 56 (fol. 230v) « Nota quod V effusiones ... ire Dei »<sup>351</sup>
- 57 (fol. 232r) « Quidam dicunt ... presidentem » = LM 49
- 58 (fol. 233r) « Potest etiam dici ... opulencia Christi » = LM 50<sup>352</sup>
- 59 (fol. 234r) « Ex quo sequetur ... orientalium regum » = LM 50
- 60 (fol. 235v) « De quorum adductione ... omnipotentis »<sup>353</sup>
- 61 (fol. 235v) « Per hos tres ... ecclesiam carnalem »<sup>354</sup>
- 62 (fol. 236v) « Dicunt [*recte* Dicuntur] autem ... a dracone » = LM 51
- 63 (fol. 238r) « Unde et quidam putant ... ut deum » = LM 52
- 64 (fol. 239r) « Ecclesia etiam carnalis ... consurgens temptatio »<sup>355</sup>
- 65 (fol. 241r) « Secundum preambulum ... Spiritum Christi »<sup>356</sup> = LM 53<sup>357</sup>
- 66 (fol. 243r) « Designatur etiam ... Spiritum Christi »<sup>358</sup>
- 67 (fol. 244r) « Ex hiis autem ... disponentium »<sup>359</sup>
- 68 (fol. 245v) « Potest etiam per hoc ... sit impletum »<sup>360</sup>
- 69 (fol. 245v) « Item fient in ea ... super ecclesiam »<sup>361</sup>
- 70 (fol. 246r) « Secundo igitur ... confusio interpretatur »<sup>362</sup>
- 71 (fol. 247v) « Et nota quod ... potius adulteros »<sup>363</sup> = LM 54<sup>364</sup>
- 72 (fol. 249r) « *Hii unum consilium* ... et concordabunt »<sup>365</sup>
- 73 (fol. 250r) « Nota quod duplici ... de terra »<sup>366</sup>
- 74 (fol. 251v) « Subditur [*recte* subditurque] hic ... gloria dei » = LM 55
- 75 (fol. 253r) « *Et audiui aliam vocem* ... et destruenda »<sup>367</sup>
- 76 (fo. 254r) « Et nota quod principaliter ... in regnum Agripe » = LM 56<sup>368</sup>
- 77 (fo. 255v) « Si queratur ... et regibus » = LM 56
- 78 (fol. 260r) « *Post hec audiui* ... celebrari » = LM 57
- 79 (fo. 262v) « *Missi sunt hii duo* ... dicet se Deum »<sup>369</sup>
- 80 (fol. 264v) « Nos autem sumus ... generalium numerorum » = LM 58
- 81 (fol. 268r) « Nota etiam quod ... intret civitatem » = LM 59
- 82 (fol. 269r) « Sciendum igitur quod ... paupertatem parvuli » = LM 60<sup>370</sup>



83 (fo. 274v) « Postquam autem ... et aperta »<sup>371</sup>

84 (fo. 276r) « Quantum ergo ad primum ... consumationis omnium » = LM 1

## NOTES

1. See Sylvain Piron, « Avignon sous Jean XXII : l'Eldorado des théologiens », in *Jean XXII et le Midi* (Cahiers de Fanjeaux, 45), Toulouse, 2012, p. 357-391.

2. See S. Piron, « Bonagrazia de Bergame, auteur des *Allegationes* sur les articles extraits par Jean XXII de la *Lectura super Apocalipsim* d'Olivi », in *Revirescunt chartae, codices, documenta, textus. Miscellanea investigationum medioevalium in honorem Caesaris Cenci OFM collecta*, ed. Alvaro Cacciotti and Pacifico Sella, Rome, 2002, p. 1065-1087 ; Id., « Censures et condamnation de Pierre de Jean Olivi : enquête dans les marges du Vatican », *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Moyen Âge*, 118-2, 2006, p. 313-373 ; Id., « Un avis retrouvé de Jacques Fournier », *Médiévales*, 54, 2008, p. 113-134 ; Id., « La consultation demandée à François de Meyronnes sur la *Lectura super Apocalipsim* », *Oliviana*, 3, 2009 [online] <http://oliviana.revues.org/index330.html>.

3. The manuscript was described by Franz Ehrle, « Petrus Johannis Olivi, sein Leben und seine Schriften », *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, 3, 1887, p. 409-552 (at p. 453-455) ; excerpted by Johann Joseph Ignaz von Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*, Munich, 1890, vol. 2, p. 527-585 ; described again by Joseph Koch, « Der Prozess gegen die Postille Olivis zur Apokalypse », *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 5, 1933, p. 302-313 (at p. 303-304) ; and also in *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*, Paris, 1966, vol. 5, p. 321 which notes « Quelques notes marginales du xv<sup>e</sup> s. ». Identified as part of the library of the Popes in Avignon in Marie-Henriette Julien de Pommerol and Jacques Monfrin, *La Bibliothèque Pontificale à Avignon et à Peñíscola pendant le Grand Schisme d'Occident et sa dispersion : inventaires et concordances*, Rome (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 141), 1991, vol. 2, p. 940. David Burr treated the manuscript in two articles : « Ecclesiastical Condemnation and Exegetical Theory : The Case of Olivi's Apocalypse Commentary », in *Neue Richtungen in der Hoch- und Spätmittelalterlichen Bibelexegese*, ed. Robert Lerner, and Elisabeth Müller-Luckner, Munich, 1996, p. 149-162 and « The Antichrist and the Jews in Four Thirteenth-Century Apocalypse Commentaries », in *Friars and Jews in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. Stephen McMichael and Susan Myers, Leiden and Boston (The Medieval Franciscans, 2), 2004, p. 23-38. After this article was completed, David Burr kindly made me aware of Alberto Forni and Paolo Vian, « Un codice curiale nella storia della condanna della *Lectura Super Apocalipsim* di Pietro di Giovanni Olivi : Il Parigino Latino 713 (I) », *Collectanea Franciscana*, 81, 2011, p. 479-558 which has a description of Paris BnF 3381A on p. 492-3. It notes « numerose note marginali », but does not identify the hand.

4. For the identification of John XXII's hand in a series of diplomatic letters, see Angelo Mercati, « Dagli instrumenta miscellanea dell'Archivio Segreto Vaticano », *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, 27, 1937, p. 137-177 ; the hand was then matched with annotations in Vatican manuscripts by Anneliese Maier, « Annotazioni autografe di Giovanni XXII in Codici Vaticani », *Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia*, 6, 1952, p. 317-332, reprinted with corrections and additions in *Ausgehendes Mittelalter. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geistesgeschichte des 14. Jahrhunderts*, Rome, 1967, p. 81-97, 492-495. MS Paris BnF lat. 3290, a manuscript of John XXII's sermons, also contains his annotations, see Edith Pásztor, « Una raccolta di sermoni di Giovanni XXII », *Bollettino dell'Archivio paleografico italiano*, new ser. 2/3, 1956-1957, pp. 265-289 ; Id., « Le polemiche sulla 'Lectura super Apocalipsim' di Pietro di Giovanni Olivi fino alla sua condanna », *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano*, 70, 1958, p. 365-424 at p. 411 ; and Marc Dykmans, *Les sermons de Jean XXII sur la vision béatifique*, Rome (Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae 34), 1973, p. 28 (with a general discussion of John XXI's annotations from

p. 22-27). Manuscripts of the works of Thomas Aquinas were also annotated by the pope in preparation for the canonization in 1323, see Antoine Dondaine, « La collection des oeuvres de saint Thomas dite de Jean XXII et Jacquet Maci », *Scriptorium*, 29, 1975, p. 127-152. For the study of annotations in manuscripts related to the Franciscan Order, see Patrick Nold, *Pope John XXII and his Franciscan Cardinal: Bertrand de la Tour and the Apostolic Poverty Controversy*, Oxford, 2003, p. 165-169 and Id., « Pope John XXII's annotations on the Franciscan Rule: Content and Contexts », *Franciscan Studies*, 65, 2007, p. 295-324. John XXII's annotations are also mentioned in a synthetic piece by Jacqueline Hamesse, « Les instruments de travail utilisés par Jean XXII et Clément VI, témoins de leurs intérêts scientifique », *Per perscrutationem philosophicam: neue Perspektiven der mittelalterlichen Forschung. Loris Sturlese zum 60 Geburtstag gewidmet*, ed. Alessandra Beccarisi, Ruedi Imbach, and Pasquale Porro, Hamburg, 2008, p. 333-347.

5. S. Piron, « Un cahier de travail de l'inquisiteur Jean de Beaune », *Oliviana*, 2, 2006 [online] <http://oliviana.revues.org/index26.html>.

6. Stephanus Baluzius, *Miscellaneorum liber primus, hoc est Collectio veterum monumentorum quæ hactenus latuerant in variis codicibus ac bibliothecis*, Paris, 1678, p. 213-277 ; *Conjecture de Nicolas de Cusa Cardinal touchant les derniers temps. Ecrite l'an 1452. Avec la Traduction d'une Piece Extraite des Oeuvres Mêlées de M. Baluze, imprimées a Paris en 1678. Contenant la censure faite à Rome en 1318 de 60 Articles Extraits du Commentaire de Frere Pierre Jean Olive de l'Ordre des Freres Mineurs sur l'Apocalypse. Et des Remarques sur ces deux Pieces curieuses*, Amsterdam, 1700, p. 153-215 ; Stephanus Baluzius *miscellanea novo ordine digesta*, ed. J. Mansi, 4 vols. Lucca, 1756-1762, vol. 2, p. 258-270. The Amsterdam edition can be found at <http://oliviana.revues.org/index179.html>, along with an explanatory piece by Sylvain Piron and Warren Lewis, « Chez Daniel Pain, Amsterdam, 1700 » [online] <http://oliviana.revues.org/index76.html>.

7. See the appendix below for a concordance of articles. A more detailed concordance can be found in "Tabella A" in A. Forni and P. Vian, « Un codice curiale nella storia della condanna della *Lectura super Apocalipsim* di Pietro di Giovanni Olivi: Il Parigino Latino 713 (I) », p. 496-554.

8. The exception to this rule is the first article which states that it is taken from the seventh *notabile* of the prologue. In the next three articles, John XXII himself supplies a reference in the margin. Then no further identification occurs.

9. David Burr, *Olivi's Peaceable Kingdom: A Reading of the Apocalypse Commentary*, Philadelphia, 1993, p. 205.

10. *Ibid.* ; also J. Koch, « Der Prozess », p. 304.

11. J. Koch, « Der Prozess », p. 304. There is no listing for William of Laudun OP in Thomas Kaeppeli, *Scriptores Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum*, Rome, 1970-1994.

12. Anne Cazenave, « La vision eschatologique des spirituels franciscains autour de leur condamnation », in *The Use and Abuse of Eschatology in the Middle Ages*, ed. Werner Verbeke, Daniël Verhelst and Andries Welkenhuysen, Leuven, 1988, p. 394.

13. Edited in José Pou y Martí, *Visionarios, Beguinos y Fraticelos Catalanes (Siglos XIII-XV)*, Vich, 1930, reprint., Alicante, 1996, p. 483-512.

14. St. Francis and St. Dominic are mentioned, positively, together at one point : « Quod tempore beati Francisci et beati Dominici erat ecclesia multa collapsa et per eos multum renovata », fol. 3v. For the context, see note 77 below.

15. Based on « isti (die Spirituales) enim scandalizantes ordinem suum » from F. Ehrle, « Petrus Johannis Olivi », p. 455.

16. In the folios annotated by John XXII, *Moralia in Iob* is cited nearly 30 times : 3v, 6r, 6r, 7r, 7v, 8r, 8v, 9r, 10r, 10v, 11r, 13v, 18v, 19r, 22v, 29r, 30r, 31r, 31v, 32v, 33r, 34v, 35v, 36r, 37r, 38v, 46r.

17. « 1321 Dec. 16 de mandato pape, cum fr. Gregorius mag. Theol. Ord. August., incipisset facere quoddam opus super moralibus Iob pro eodem domino nostro, pro relevamine expensarum suarum in vestibus quam aliis necessariis tradidimus eidem mag. pro 3 mensibus preteritis et

terminantes 1 Dec. 30 fol ... 1322. April 17 solvimus fr. Gregorio ord. s. August. Mag. Theol., qui operatur pro domino nostro super moralibus Iob, pro relevamine expensarum suarum, in quibus papa, ut infra sequitur, mandaverat provideri, pro 4 mensibus preteritis et terminates 1. April... 40 fl ». Karl Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter Johann XXII*. Vatikanischen Quellen zur Geschichte der päpstlichen Hof- und Finanzverwaltung 2, Paderborn, 1911, p. 427. For Gregory, see Chris Schabel and William J. Courtenay, « Augustinian Quodlibets after Giles of Rome », in *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages: The Fourteenth Century*, ed. Chris Schabel, Leiden, 2007, p. 552-553. I owe the second reference to Sylvain Piron.

18. E.g., « ...dicit Gregorius xx [ix 20] Moral. Super illud Iob xxx [3-4] *Qui rodebant in solitudinem*: 'Perverse hereticorum mentes dum sibi superbe intellectum tribuunt, quasi dare certas sententias etiam de incertis presumant [...] Unde fit ut ipsa elatio que eos intus apud se elevat a veritate foras repellat vixque in dictis Dei extriora capiant, qui se secreta spiritalia singulariter penetrasse putabant' et postea 'Heretici quia scripturam sacram intellegere sua virtute moliuntur,' non dignantes sequi expositiones sanctorum partum, 'eam proculdubio nequaquam possunt apprehendere quam non intelligunt quasi non dedunt et quia per supernam gratiam non adiuti hanc edere nequeunt quasi quibusdam illam nisibus rodunt' [Cf. CCSL 143A, p. 1018] », fol. 34r. John XXII has placed a brace next to this text and written « contra hereticos » in the right margin.

19. For which see, most recently, Sean L. Field, *The Beguine, the Angel and the Inquisitor: The Trials of Marguerite Porete and Guiard of Cressonessart*, Notre Dame IN, 2012.

20. His successor as bishop was appointed on 20 Feb. 1327 on account of his death. See C. Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica*, Rome, 1898, p. 132.

21. Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica*, p. 458.

22. Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica*, p. 132. In this listing, Eubel mistakenly suggests that Gregory was a Dominican.

23. My own primary reservation is based on style. I edited a text by Gregory of Lucca in my *Marriage Advice for a Pope: John XXII and the Power to Dissolve*, Leiden, 2009, p. 110-114 and identified Gregory's participation in a debate on poverty in my *Pope John XXII and his Franciscan Cardinal*, p. 18 n. 36. The author of the text in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A does not sound like that Gregory. But the difference may be a function of genre. With marriage and poverty, Gregory was answering a precise question posed by the pope: he thus argued succinctly and syllogistically. In MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A, we are dealing not with a *quaestio* but with an *expositio*, the prolonged analysis of a text. That could account for the difference. Or it may be that the author is not Gregory of Lucca at all.

24. « Tandem summus pontifex, qui nunc est, memoratos pestilentes ad suam presentiam evocatos per se et per plures cardinales secreto et publice studuit a suis stultiis revocare: nec tamen inflectere potuit, ut irrisor vestis novitate reiecta habitus humiles suo et fratrum suorum iudicio regule sancti Francisci consonos ad mandatum suum reciperent ac declarationi predecessoris sui et sue super congregatione et reservatione victualium aliquantulum consentirent; quod prorsus facere contempserunt », fol. 104r. I think *irrisor vestis* is probably an error for *irrisorie vestis* – a term which Pope Leo I (Sermon 59.3; PL 54, col. 339) used to describe the robe of Christ (Mt. 27:31).

25. Ed. Franz Ehrle, « Zur Vorgeschichte des Concils von Vienne », *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, 3, 1887, p. 7-32, and for the pontificate of John XXII, p. 27-32.

26. See recently Patrick Nold, « Pope John XXII, The Franciscan Order and Its Rule », *The Cambridge Companion to Francis of Assisi*, ed. Michael Robson, Cambridge, 2012, p. 258-272, here p. 261-262.

27. « Sed hoc anno, qui est ab incarnatione domini M<sup>o</sup>CCC<sup>o</sup>XVIII », fol. 156v, and « Si centenarii Christi accipiantur ab incarnatione Christi a quam nunc XVIII anni [plus] quam XIII centernarii effluxerunt », fol. 264v. See F. Ehrle, « Petrus Johannis Olivi », p. 455.

28. « ...XIII centenarii a Christi passione de quo aduc [sic] restant circiter xv anni », fol. 264v-265r. Earlier in the manuscript the author has said « fifteen or sixteen years » which implies it was earlier in the liturgical year when he wrote it : « Unde asserere tanquam certum quod saraceni et ceteri infideles inter quos iudei continentur generentur infra mille ccc annos a Christi passione hoc est infra xv annos vel xvi annos a tempore moderno... », fol. 156v.
29. F. Ehrle, « Petrus Johannis Olivi », p. 453 : « Bld. 65b art. 19 wird noch die in Marseille am 7 Mai. 1318 erfolgte Verbrennung von vier hartknäckigen Spiritualement erwähnt ». The text he has in mind reads : « a quo quidam eorum iam sunt combusti » (fol. 65v). Koch (« Der Prozess », p. 304 n. 11) refers to a similar passage on fol. 265v which seems to be the following : « Ergo cum gravior persecutio illata isti secte fuerit, expositio iusticie secularis que hoc anno invenitur publice facta ».
30. This seems to echo some of the texts found in John of Beaune OP's notebook, see S. Piron, « Un cahier de travail de l'inquisiteur Jean de Beaune »
31. « ...quidem illi declarationi et ordinationi non acquiescere, non obedire de facto non est hereticum sed scismaticum, sed dicere quod intellectus suus est intellectus evangelii et quod papa non potest immutare aliquid circa illam sicut nec circa evangelium, nec dispensare circa contenta in regula sicut nec circa contenta in evangelio, et quod perfectio evangelica quam Christus servavit et eius apostoli non est nisi in modo vivendi secundum illam regulam [...] esse hereticum », fol. 17v. John XXII has drawn a brace in the margin next to this passage and the one in the next note.
32. « Sic ut ipsi intelligunt intellectam contra declarationem ecclesie est hereticum et hoc pertinaciter asserentes sunt merito velut heretici condemnandi quia illi qui ab ecclesia romana heretici iudicantur ab universali ecclesia merito heretici sunt censendi. *De hereticis*, C. *Ad abolendam* in principio quia ad ipsam de fide et per consequens de hereticis principaliter et maxime pertinet iudicare », fol. 17v.
33. See Louisa A. Burnham, *So Great a Light, So Great a Smoke: The Beguin Heretics of Languedoc*, Ithaca, 2008.
34. E.g., « Sed hoc dicunt heretici de ipsa ecclesia quam vident in mundo honorari et ideo dicunt eam per hoc excecari et a deo reprobari », fol. 7r. See also note 112 below.
35. Alain Boureau, *Le pape et les sorciers : une consultation de Jean XXII sur la magie en 1320 (Manuscrit B. A. V. Borghese 348)*, Rome, (Sources et Documents d'Histoire du Moyen Âge publiés par l'École française de Rome 6), 2004. Boureau provides a transcription of the annotations of John XXII in his footnotes and I rely on this information.
36. See Louis Duval-Arnould, « Les Conseils remis à Jean XXII sur le problème de la pauvreté du Christ et des apôtres (MS. BAV vat. lat. 3740) », *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae III*, Rome (Studi e Testi, 333), 1989, p. 121-201. Also P. Nold, *Pope John XXII and his Franciscan Cardinal*, *passim*. Information on the annotations in MS Vatican BAV vat. lat. 3740 comes from my own inspection of the manuscript.
37. Two annotations on fol. 270v and on 274v concern articles 82 and 83.
38. Braces are relatively rare in MS Vatican BAV vat. lat. 3740, occurring fewer than 10 times. One important instance is in the *Dicta* of Bertrand de la Tour, for which see P. Nold, *Pope John XXII and his Franciscan Cardinal*, p. 73, 168. Braces also occur in MS Vatican, BAV, Borgh. 242, for which see Id., « Pope John XXII's annotations », p. 304.
39. *Ibid.* These are not counted in the *marginalia* chart above.
40. E.g. « Vide de meretrice supra articulo secundo principali in primo errore », fol. 22v sin. See also note 80 below.
41. « Supra ar. 1 », fol. 16r sin ; « tunc esset etiam iste error secundum hunc sensum simul illi qui est in allegato evangelio dampnato in cuius v librorum tractatu de vii diebus sic invenitur » (fol. 16r). See H. Denifle et E. Châtelain (eds.), *Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis*, Paris, 1891,

vol. 1, no. 243, p. 274 : « De quinto libro eiusdem partis. In tractatu de septem diebus inveniuntur in primo statu mundi fuit commissum... ».

42. « Vide de hoc infra articulo 4 principali, error tertius », fol. 1r sin ; « Vide finem istius erroris », fol. 1r dex ; « Vide infra articulo 3 principali, tertius error », fol. 2v dex ; « Vide infra eodem articulo principali, octavus error », fol. 31r dex.

43. « Articulus iste sumitur ex quinto notabili eiusdem prologi », fol. 4r sin ; « Articulus iste sumitur ex vii notabili circa finem », fol. 6v sin in pede ; « Sumptus est articulus iste ex octavo notabili », fol. 9v.

44. Compare the references in the previous note with those of the *Littera Magistrorum* : « Tertius articulus in quinto notabili predicti prologi... » ; « Quartus articulus circa finem septimi notabilis dicit sic... » ; « Quintus articulus in octavo notabili dicit... », *Littera Magistrorum*, Baluze-Mansi, *Miscellanea*, vol. 2, p. 259.

45. The phrase is « ... Christi pontificatus vero fuit stirpi vite evangelice datus », fol. 17r in capite. Also note 166 below.

46. Paolo Vian, « Appunti sulla tradizione manoscritta della *Lectura super Apocalipsim* di Pietro di Giovanni Olivi », in *Editori di Quaracchi 100 anni dopo*, ed. Alvaro Cacciotti and Barbara Faes de Mottoni, Rome, 1997, p. 373-409 at p. 399.

47. « Error prout verba sonant », fol. 36r dex. See also note 239 below.

48. He does this on fol. 5r dex, fol. 6v sin, fol. 30r dex, fol. 41r sin. For an example, see note 92 below.

49. « Nota quod sibi contradicere », fol. 11v sin ; « Nota quomodo sibi contradicit », fol. 35v ; « Contradicit sibi », fol. 270v dex.

50. « Vide quod dicit 'secundum intellectum suum' », fol. 3v sin.

51. « Vide quod istum intellectum sibi attribuit », fol. 3r dex.

52. « Nota quod dicit : 'est enim intentio sua' », fol. 6r dex.

53. There are many summaries of Olivi's vision of history. I have relied on a recent account : Brett Whalen, *Dominion of God : Christendom and the Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge MA, 2009, p. 204-212.

54. « Septimum est quare sextus status semper describitur ut notabiliter preeminens quinque primis et sicut finis priorum, et tanquam initium novi seculi evacuans quoddam vetus seculum, sicut status Christi evacuavit vetus testamentum et vetustatem humani generis, unde et quasi circulariter sic iungitur primo tempori Christi ac si tota ecclesia sit una spera et ac si in sexto eius statu secundo [recte secundus] incipiat status Christi habens sua septem tempora sicut habet totus decursus ecclesie, sic tamen quod septimus status sexti sit idem cum septimo statu totius ecclesie », fol. 1r. Cf. Petrus Johannis Olivi, *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, Paris, BnF lat. 713, ed. Paolo Vian, p. 238-239 [online] posted on 18 nov. 2009, URL : [http://www.danteolivi.com/Metamorfosi/pdf/Lectura super Apocalipsim.pdf](http://www.danteolivi.com/Metamorfosi/pdf/Lectura%20super%20Apocalipsim.pdf). In the absence of the long-awaited critical edition of the LSA by Warren Lewis, I have used this online critical transcription of the Paris manuscript, and I have provided page number references to it in my notes.

55. « ...sive ipse intendit hoc sive non, tamen hoc important verba ... Notandum quod hoc videtur implicare duos errores de evangelio intitulato eterno », fol. 1r. See also D. Burr, « Ecclesiastical Condemnation and Exegetical Theory », p. 53 n. 11.

56. « Nota de evangelio intitulato eterno », fol. 1r dex.

57. « Quod autem aliquem alium statum ecclesie preferre statui apostolorum et primitive ecclesie sit erroneum vel temerarium, saltem et presumptuosum patet », fol. 1r.

58. « Vide finem istius erroris », fol. 1r dex. The end of the error reads : « Unde quantum ad hoc assimilatur iste hereticis qui dicebant se omnibus aliis sanctiores et perfectiores sive mundiores », fol. 1v. The text is bracketed.

59. « Prima parte dicitur quod evangelium eternum excellit doctrinam Christi et quod evangelium Christi non est evangelium regni et quod evangelio Christi aliud evangelium succedet », cf. *Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis*, vol 1, no. 243, p. 272.
60. « De evangelio eterno », fol. 2r dex.
61. « Quod autem sit erroneum ponere modum vivendi illius regule quomodocumque intellecte esse finem quinque modorum vivendi precedentium patet quia finis est melior », fol. 1v.
62. « Erroneum », fol. 1v. sin.
63. « Non esset <salus> cum divitiis possedis in proprio vel communi quod est error pauperum de lugdn. », fol. 2r. I have inserted the « salus », carried over from a previous sentence.
64. « Nota est error pauperum de lugduno », fol. 2r dex.
65. « Vide infra articulo 3 principali, tertius error », fol. 2v dex.
66. « Vide quod istum intellectum sibi attribuit », fol. 3r dex ; « Nota secundum intellectum suum videtur erroneum », fol. 3r sin.
67. « Hoc autem erroneum quia numquam nec hoc tempore nec futuro sic ecclesia obscurabitur quod ipsa sit opposita vite Christi », fol. 3r.
68. « Erroneum », fol. 3r dex.
69. « Item intelligit quod sicut in aurora recedunt paulatim tenebre quousque totus aer sit lucidus, sic carnalis ecclesia deficiet, spirituali proficiente, ut quasi omnes sint perfecti et spirituales, pauci mali », fol. 3v. In the margin John writes, « Nota : Item intelligit », fol. 3v sin. Also note 155 below.
70. « Erroneum », fol. 3v sin.
71. Cf. « Quod ecclesia militans habet permixtos bonos et malos et contrarium dicere est hereticum », fol. 19r dex ; « Nota erroneum esse dicere quod ecclesia militans non habeat nisi electos quia contra scripturam sacram », fol. 43r dex.
72. « Vult enim quod status Christi defecerit totaliter in ecclesia, nisi in illis in quibus est abdicatio omnium in proprio vel in communi sicut habet regula beati Francisci et quod in tota ecclesia ante beatum Franciscum non erat vita Christi nec evangelica », fol. 3v.
73. « Vide quod dicit : 'secundum intellectum suum' », fol. 3v sin.
74. « Erroneum », fol. 3v dex.
75. « Item similis est iste error errori adamianorum qui omnia mundi abnegantes se solos arbitrabantur esse in statu perfectionis de quibus Augustinus libri de heresibus c. xxxi quod incipit adamiani quod 'Adam nuditatem in paradiso imitantes' », fol. 3v. Passage bracketed.
76. « Item contra hoc probat Prosper exemplo sanctorum XII q. I. Expediit pro amore perfectionis propria contempni, ~~sed possunt sine detrimento perfectionis propria contempni~~, sed possunt sine detrimento perfectionis communia possideri », fol. 4r. Reference to C. 12. q. 1 c. 13. E. Friedberg, *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, Leipzig, 1879-1881, vol. 1, col. 681.
77. « Posset tamen iste articulus habere suum intellectum sub hoc sensu quod vita Christi multum esset obfuscata et per doctrinam et exemplum sancti Francisci et sui ordinis in multis renovata », fol. 4r. Also cf. note 14 above.
78. This is not far from the vision of history of « conventual » Franciscans like Bertrand de la Tour. See Patrick Nold, « Poverty, History, and Liturgy in a Sermon Work of Bertrand de la Tour », in *Franciscans and Preaching*, ed. Timothy J. Johnson, Leiden (The Medieval Franciscans, 7), 2012, p. 175-208, especially p. 204 notes 109 and 110 for a criticism of Olivi without naming him. Bertrand de la Tour was, of course, one of the authors of the *Littera Magistrorum*. See, most recently, Patrick Nold, « Jean XXII et le franciscain Bertrand de la Tour : anatomie d'une relation », *Jean XXII et le Midi* (see note 1 above), p. 339-355.
79. « Sexta autem qui [sic] est de dampnatione meretricis et bestie habentis capita VII, et de novis nuptiis Agni et sue sponse post meretricis dampnationem fiendis, directius respicit reiectionem vetustatis babilonice et renovationem forme Christi ac septiformitatem prefate reiectionis et

renovationis, nam in occisione primi capitis bestie fuit prima renovatio, et in occisione secundi secunda, et sic de aliis », fol. 4r. Cf. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 252.

80. « 'Sexta visio de damnatione meretricis'. Sicut enim ex sequentibus aparet per hanc meretricem intelligit ecclesiam que prius fuit sponsa Christi vera », fol. 4r ; « Nota quod dicit : 'intelligit' », fol. 4r sin. This would appear to be the definitive treatment as John XXII later supplies a cross-reference to it : « Vide de meretrice supra articulo secundo principali in primo errore », fol. 22v sin. See also note 40 above.

81. « Hoc autem licet possit esse verum de multis particularibus ecclesiis que per hereses et scismata a Christo sunt alienata sicut ecclesia grecorum et multorum orientalium tamen de universali ecclesia cuius romana est caput et de ipsa romana, hoc dicere est erroneum quia Christus ab ecclesia numquam recedet », fol. 4r. Passage bracketed.

82. « Erroneum », fol. 4r dex.

83. « Item licet infra ecclesiam sint multi per peccatum in moribus fornicantes a deo, tamen non propter hoc simpliciter ecclesia debet dicere meretrix, immo semper est virgo quia semper in ea sunt aliqui boni in quibus ipsa principaliter consistit », fol. 4r. Text bracketed.

84. « Si quidem ecclesia fidelium accipitur dupliciter, uno modo pro congregatione illorum qui sunt infra eam numero et merito et sic in ecclesia sunt omnes boni et nullus malus, sed non omnes perfecti... », fol. 4r.

85. « Et sic omnes qui habent fidem et unitatem ecclesie non divisi ab ea per heresim vel per scisma dicuntur esse de ecclesia et sic propter illos et quo ad illos ecclesia dicitur meretrix secundum quid sed non simpliciter », fol. 4v. Text bracketed. Cf. note 188 below.

86. « Nota ecclesiam fidelium dupliciter sumi », fol. 4r dex.

87. « Quod autem per istam meretricem et babilonem non intelligat ipse nisi universalem ecclesiam et catholicam cuius romana ecclesia est caput, mater, et magistra », fol. 4v.

88. « Nota quid intelligit per meretricem apostillator », fol. 4v sin. Gregory had not referred to Olivi as a postillator.

89. « Unde non fient nove nuptie cum nova ecclesia ut iste fingit, alias Christus esset de novo incarnandus », fol. 5r.

90. « Nota : 'ut iste fingit' », fol. 5r dex.

91. « Nota quomodo meretrix sumitur secundum verum sensum scripture », fol. 5r dex.

92. « Quomodo sumitur meretrix secundum falsum intellectum fratris Petri », fol. 5r dex. The name is supplied.

93. « Sicut videtur describere in superficie littere ille textus agens de meretrice illa... », fol. 5r.

94. « Si vero meretrix accipitur secundum sensum suum falsum, scilicet, ecclesia moderna que secundum eum meretricatur a deo et specialiter ecclesia Romana in pompis, auro, argento, lapidibus preciosis quibus Romana ecclesia habundat... », fol. 5r. Text bracketed.

95. « Nota error et blasphemiam est », fol. 5r dex.

96. « Primo quia per babilonem vetustam reiciendam, intelligit ecclesiam que nunc est », fol. 5v.

97. « Nota quod per babilonem intelligit ecclesiam que nunc est », fol. 5v sin.

98. « Vocare eam babiloniam in sensu quo babilon condemnatur est blasphemare dei sponsam et hereticum, ut dictum est », fol. 5v.

99. « Est blasphemare et hereticum », fol. 5v sin.

100. « Est enim intentio sua quod ecclesia que nunc est vel romana que universalem ecclesiam regit quam vocat meretricem, babilonem sedentem super bestiam », fol. 6r.

101. « Nota quod dicit : 'est enim intentio sua' », fol. 6r dex.

102. « Primo quidem quia sacram scripturam pervertit, bestiam illam et meretricem aliter intelligens quam spiritus sanctus », fol. 6r. Text bracketed.

103. Cf. D. 37 c. 4 (Friedberg, vol. 1, col. 136).



104. « Unde manifestum est quod per hoc violentiam faciunt littere quod est proprium hereticorum ut dicit Gregorius super illud Iob XXVIII. *Vineam eius quam* », fol. 6r. Text bracketed. See also note 232 below.
105. « Secundo istud dictum est erroneum quia ecclesia Christi non est septies renovanda aut septies eius vetustas reicienda », fol. 6r. « Erroneum », fol. 6r dex.
106. « Unde dicere quod ecclesia sit pluries renovanda eius vetustate reiecta est dicere Christi passionem non fuisse efficacem. Ecclesia enim doctrinam evangelicam per quam renovatur usque in finem servabit », fol. 6r. Passage bracketed.
107. « Quod Romana ecclesia duret semper », fol. 25v sin ; « Nota ecclesiam que nunc est, non esse destruendam nec aliam edificandam », fol. 31v dex ; « Quod ecclesia non sit desitura », fol. 42v sin.
108. « Tertius articulus principalis ... Et cum Babilon meretrix et bestia portans eam erit in suo summo, tunc erit nox eius tenebrosissima, de qua in Psalmo dictum est : *Posuisti tenebras et facta est nox, in ipsa pertransibunt omnes bestie silve* (Ps 103:20). <Ipse sunt et bestie silve> sexto die formate, post quas et formatus est homo ad ymaginem Dei et [recte quia] post has convertetur Israel cum reliquiis gentium et apparebit christiformis vita et ymago Christi. Ex predictis autem patet quare vi<sup>a</sup> et vii<sup>a</sup> visio describunt principaliter solum finalem statum ecclesie. Fit enim hoc ad plenius designandum quod in vi et vii statu est sollemnis finis priorum temporum et quoddam novum et solenne seculum » (Cf. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 263). The article up to « bestie silve » is found in the text on fol. 6v. The full citation is found, with a homeoteleuton, at the foot of 6v. In the margin, John XXII provides a reference to the passage's place in the LSA. See also note 43 above.
109. « Hoc enim dictum secundum intellectum suum est multipliciter erroneum. Intelligit enim, ut patet per sequentia, quod hec meretrix sit ecclesia Romana que nunc est in flore et honore et quando erit in maiori honore temporalis, tunc erit in peiori statu quo ad deum et tunc plura mala faciet favendo malis et persequendo bonis et tunc execabitur ad dei cognitionem », fol. 6v.
110. « Erroneum multipliciter », fol. 6v dex.
111. « Vide secundum intellectum suum. Quid intelligit frater Petrus per meretricem », fol. 6v sin.
112. « Sed hoc dicunt heretici de ipsa ecclesia quam vident in mundo honorari et ideo dicunt eam per hoc execari et a deo reprobari », fol. 7r. Text bracketed. See also note 34 above.
113. « Ex quibus apparet quod de illa ecclesia loquitur, que temporalia tenet, licet illis non teneatur », fol. 7r.
114. « Ipse sunt et 'bestie [silve omit] vi die formate, post quas fornicatus [!] est homo ad ymaginem dei quia post has convertitur Israel cum reliquiis gentium et apparebit Christiformis vita et ymago Christi' », fol. 7v.
115. « Sed ipse intelligit quod sicut bestie terre... », fol. 7v ; « Nota : 'set ipse intelligit' », fol. 7v sin.
116. « Ita post quinque status ecclesie futurus sit sextus in quo perfecte erit imitatio vite Christi quasi omnes priores fuerint bestiales aut nullus, ita perfecte imitativus vite Christi sicut ille et quod ille omnibus preferatur », fol. 7v.
117. « Nota quomodo sextus status preferatur aliis v cadentibus », fol. 7v dex.
118. « Ista duo sunt erronea et blasphema », fol. 7v.
119. « Erronea et blasphema », fol. 7v.
120. « probatur auctoritate nicene synodi sic dicentis 'Ecclesia Romana primatum semper habuit...' », fol. 7v.
121. See, for example, the discussion of Walter Ullmann, *A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages*, London, 1972, p. 27.
122. « '...semperque habere debet' », fol. 7v.

123. « ...quod non esset verum si ecclesia romana deberet primatum perdere et desinere esse ecclesia Christi et destrui et alia nova in eius locum subrogari sicut iste dicit et in hoc articulo sentit... », fol. 7v.
124. « Nota quod sancta ecclesia romana deberet primatum perdere, et desinere esse ecclesia christi, destrui, et aliam [sic] nova in eius loca subrogari », fol. 7v dex.
125. « Nota : 'sicut ipse iste dicit et in hoc articulo sentit' », fol. 7v sin.
126. E.g. « Quod intelligit romanam ecclesiam reprobare », fol. 25r sin.
127. See notes 247-254 below.
128. « ... in stato sexto debeat de novo apparere vita et ymago Christi sit erroneum patet ex auctoritate romane ecclesie », fol. 7v.
129. « multos quinti status viros regulares et seculares non habentes perfectionem quam iste appropriat sexto statui, scilicet, non habendi aliquid in proprio nec communi, ascripsit [sic] catalogo sanctorum tanquam perfectos vite Christi ymitatores », fol. 7v. Text bracketed.
130. « Erroneum », fol. 7v sin.
131. « Nota quod sexto statui appropriat non habere aliquid in proprio nec communi », fol. 7v sin.
132. « Nota : 'in typo hereticorum' », fol. 7v sin.
133. « ...dici potest illud quod a Iob in typo ecclesie dixit amicis suis in typo hereticorum. Iob. XII *Ergo vos estis soli homines et michi est cor sicut et vobis nec inferior vestri sum* », fol. 7v.
134. « Vide infra articulo 3 principali, tertius error », fol. 2v dex.
135. « Nota quod preferre aliquem statum statui apostolorum est erroneum », fol. 8r sin. Cf. « Quod autem aliquem alium statum ecclesie preferre statui apostolorum et primitive ecclesie sit erroneum », fol. 1r.
136. « ...in primo articulo est ostensum erroneum specialiter propter statum apostolorum cui nullus alius prefertur quia enim sicut dicit lex, ff. de origine iur. l. 1 [Digest 1. 2. 1]. 'Uniuscuiusque potentissima pars est suum principium' [recte cuiusque rei potissima pars principium est], apostoli sunt potentissima pars ecclesie quia fuerunt eius principia utpote fundamenta », fol. 8r.
137. « Propter quod sit erroneum dicere quod VI et VII status sint finis omnium priorum statuum », fol. 8r dex.
138. « Preterea si status VI et VII est melior quam prioribus aut quantum ad perfectionem vite, aut quantum ad scientiam, aut quantum ad potestatem », fol. 8r.
139. « de eminentia vero et perfectione vite quod non sit maior futuri in VI vel VII statui quam fuerit saltem in primo statu, id est, in temporibus apostolorum », fol. 8r.
140. « Quod non sit futura maior perfectio vite quam fuerit in primo statu », fol. 8r sin.
141. « Per idem patet secundum sed quod quantum ad scientie claritatem nullus status futurus in hac vita excedit omnes priores specialiter apostolorum quibus dixit Christus *omnia quecumque audivi a patre meo nunc feci vobis* [Io. 15:15] », fol. 8v.
142. « Quod quantum ad scientie claritatem non sit futurus aliquis status maiore priore, scilicet, apostolorum, statu », fol. 8v sin.
143. « Sed isti et suis qui dicunt sibi super alios apertum hostium scripturarum et scientie sicut habetur supra [sic] x articulo potest dici illud quod Iob dicebat amicis tanquam ex persona ecclesie hereticis *Vobiscum morietur sapientia* [Iob 12 :2] », fol. 8v. Text bracketed.
144. « Nota quod dicentibus apertum ostium scripturarum pre aliis potest dici illud Iob ex persona ecclesie dicebat hereticis », fol. 8v sin.
145. « Quod non sit danda sexto statui maior potestas quam fuerit prius data », fol. 8v dex.
146. « Concludit : si VI status sit finis sollempnis precedentium, non esse una ecclesia », fol. 8v sin.
147. « Intendit enim sicut apparet ex precedentibus et sequentibus quod ecclesia in v<sup>o</sup> statu quam vocat 'habentium aliquid in proprio vel communi' in tantum cadet a vita Christi et perfectione evangelica in vita et in scientia et doctrina quod a deo totaliter abicietur et

renovabitur de novo fundata ecclesia spiritualis in qua reformabitur Christi vita et ymago in viventibus secundum regulam beati Francisci », fol. 9r.

148. See note 72 above.

149. See notes 73 and 74 above.

150. « Quomodo intelligit quod ecclesia v<sup>ti</sup> statu quam vocat ‘habentium aliquid in communi’ sit totaliter a deo abiecienda et renovabitur et fundabitur de novo ecclesia spiritualis in qua reformabitur Christi vita et imago », fol. 9r sin.

151. « Item ecclesia usque ad finem mundi in sua perfectione est duratura nec unquam suam perfectionem perditura », fol. 9r.

152. « Ecclesia gentium firmiter instituta et usquequaque multiplicitate sui diffusa et producta per gradus et successiones suas usque ad novissima tempora », *Biblia Latina Cum Glossa Ordinaria. Facsimile Reprint of the Editio Princeps*. ed. Adolph Rusch of Strassburg, 1480/1481, Turnhout, 1992, vol. 2, p. 720.

153. « Sed pro tanto ecclesia ut aurora procedit quia usque ad claram diem patrie non deficit, et semper in luce proficit quantum ad hoc quod continue de novo aliquos luminem fidei vel iusticie accendit », fol. 9v.

154. « Quomodo processus ecclesie ad modum aurore sit intelligendus », fol. 9v dex.

155. See note 69 above.

156. See J. Koch, « Der Prozess », p. 309-315.

157. I hope to analyze this volume in a future publication.

158. E. Pásztor, « Le polemiche sulla ‘Lectura super Apocalipsim’ » (see note 3 above); D. Burr, *Olivi's Peaceable Kingdom*, p. 221-239.

159. S. Piron, « Bonagrazia de Bergame, auteur des *Allegationes* sur les articles extraits par Jean XXII de la *Lectura super Apocalipsim* d'Olivi » (see note 2 above).

160. S. Piron, « Un avis retrouvé de Jacques Fournier » (see note 2 above).

161. S. Piron, « La consultation demandée à François de Meyronnes sur la *Lectura super Apocalipsim* » (see note 2 above).

162. See the appendix to S. Piron, « La consultation demandée à François de Meyronnes ». What is unique about the text of Meyronnes is that it has a series of sub-questions.

163. See the remarks in S. Piron, « Un avis retrouvé de Jacques Fournier », p. 126.

164. « Utrum sit erroneum dicere quod ab inicio seculi usque ad finem est una ecclesia electorum et una cathena reproborum que una meretrix et una babilon et una bestia dicitur ». Still, this passage does seem to mirror the ecclesiological concerns that animated John XXII's annotations in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A, as, for example: « Nota erroneum esse dicere quod ecclesia militans non habeat nisi electos quia contra scripturam sacram », fol. 43r dex. Likewise, John's annotations show a consistent concern about the Church being called « whore » or « Babylon ». See, for example, note 266 below.

165. The article begins: « In sexto autem die seu tempore primo creata sunt animalia... », fol. 15r. Curiously, neither the first nor second errors are direct citations from the LSA extract (for another case, see note 253 below). « Iste articulus videtur continere duos errores. Primus in hoc quod dicit ordinem novum sexti temporis habere prelationem super omnem terram et super regna etiam paganorum », fol. 15v. Cf. The *Littera Magistrorum's* treatment of the error: « ...quod in sexto tempore ordo quidam evangelicus subiciet sibi regna paganorum et omnem terram », Baluze-Mansi, *Miscellanea*, vol. 2, p. 259-260.

166. « Patet quod ‘Christi pontificatus vero fuit stirpi vite evangelice datus’ », fol. 17r in capite.

167. « ... pontificatus Christi fuit primo stirpi vite evangelice et apostolice in Petro et apostolis datus ac deinde utiliter et rationabiliter fuit ad statum habentem temporalia commutatus, saltem a tempore Constantini usque ad finem quinti status », (*Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 101).

168. See the appendix in S. Piron, « La consultation demandée à François de Meyronnes ».

169. « ...sicut patet de elect. c ult. libro VI ¶ Contra spiritum sanctum agit qui ei imponit quod successorem summi pontificis rursus in aliquem statum transtulerit, sic quod cardinalibus libera electio auferatur et quin absque exceptione quacumque de omni statu possint assumere sicut ecclesie iudicaverint expedire ». Text bracketed. The reference appears to be wrong. The last decretal of the title *De electione* in the *Liber Sextus, Quoniam electione* (VI. 1. 6. 47 ; Friedberg, vol. 2, col. 970), does not contain this sentence and indeed does not concern the election of a pope. The only decretal in the title which does is *Ubi periculum* (VI. 1. 6. 3 : Friedberg, vol. 2, col. 946) but it too does not contain this sentence.

170. « Iste error secundum hunc sensum similis illi qui est in allegato evangelio damnato in cuius v libro in tractatu de vii diebus sic invenitur : ‘Sicut in primo statu [mundi] fuit commissum regnum seu regimen totius ecclesie a [deo] patre aliquibus de ordine coniugatorum in quo auctorizatus fuit ille ordo, < et > in secundo [vero] statu commissum fuit [recte est] a filio alicui [recte aliquibus] de ordine clericorum in quo ab ipso glorificatus est ordo ille, sicut [etiam] in tertio statu [mundi] committetur alicui vel aliquibus de ordine monachorum a Spiritu Sancto in quo [vel in quibus ab ipso glorificabitur] [recte ab ipso Spiritu ille ordo clarificabitur] ille ordo.’ Hoc autem est erroneum... », fol. 16r. See *Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis*, vol. 1, no. 243, p. 274. Words in [ ] not found in edition. John has repeated the « erroneum » in the margin (fol. 16r dex). John notes on this folio that Gregory had previously mentioned *The Eternal Gospel* in the first article. See notes 41, 56, and 60 above.

171. « ...et sic Petro mortuo nec Linus nec Cletus nec Clemens debuissent assumi nec aliquis potuisset assumi in papa nisi apostolus <...> vel saltem nullus nisi vitam apostolicam duxisset », fol. 16v. Text bracketed.

172. « ...et hic est error pauperum de lugduno qui dicunt quod a tempore Silvestri non fuit Rome verus papa propter hoc quod ex tunc ecclesia romana possessiones habuit quos apostoli reiecerunt... », fol. 16v. Text bracketed.

173. « Unde regimen ecclesie commissum est a Christo, Petro et eius successoribus legitimis in perpetuum non alicui certo statui hominum, sed per electionem liberam ubicumque visum fuerit transferendum », fol. 16v. Text bracketed.

174. « Utrum catholice possit dici quod pontificatus Christi fuerit primo stirpi vite evangelice et apostolice in Petro et aliis apostolis datus ac deinde ad statum habentem temporalia utiliter et rationabiliter commutatus ». I quote the form of the question from Silvestri's text. For it and the others, see the appendix in S. Piron, « La consultation demandée à François de Meyronnes ».

175. « Si quidem intelligeret quod ordo iste secundum observantiam quam beatus Franciscus intendit esset perfectior omni alio, non esset tam manifestus error quia potest esse questio : utrum perfectior status voluntarie paupertatis in non habentibus aliquid etiam in communi quam habentibus in communi, diversis doctoribus contraria opinantibus circa illud. Videntur tamen non diminuere de perfectione habere aliquid in communi per illud quod dicit Prosper in vita contemplativa ... », fol. 17r. See note 76 above for the canon law reference.

176. « Utrum catholice possit dici quod in sexto statu huius vite ‘non solum simplici intelligentia sed palpativa et gustativa experientia videbitur omnis sapientia verbi incarnati et potentia dei patris. < Quia > Christus [enim] promisit quod Cum venerit ille spiritus veritatis docebit vos omnem veritatem (Jo. 16:13) ». See the appendix in S. Piron, « La consultation demandée à François de Meyronnes ».

177. « Significaturetiam per hoc proprium donum et singularis proprietas tertii status mundi sub sexto statu ecclesie inchoandi et Spiritui Sancto per quandam anthonomiasiam appropriati, sicut enim in primo statu seculi ante Christum studium fuit patribus enarrare magna opera Domini inchoata ab origine mundi, in secundo vero statu a Christo usque ad tertium statum cura fuit filiis querere sapientiam mysticorum [rectemisticam] rerum et misteria occulta a generationibus seculorum, sic in tertio nichil restat nisi ut psallamus et iubilemus Deo, laudantes eius opera magna et eius multiformem sapientiam et bonitatem in suis operibus et scripturarum sermonibus clare manifestatam. Sicut

etiam in primo tempore exhibuit se Deus Pater ut terribilem et metuendum, unde tunc claruit eius timor, sic in secundo exhibuit se Deus Filius, ut magistrum et reseratorem et ut Verbum expressivum sapientie sui Patris, ergo [recte sic] in tertio tempore Spiritus Sanctus exhibebat [sic] se ut flammam et fornacem divini amoris et [ut omit] cellarium spiritualis ebrietatis et ut apothecam divinorum aromatum et spiritualium unctionum et unguentorum et ut tripudium spiritualium iubilationum et iocunditatum, per quam [recte que] non solum [fol. 28r] simplici intelligentia, sed etiam gustativa et palpativa experientia videbitur omnis veritas sapientie Verbi Dei incarnati et potentia [recte potentie] Dei Patris. Christus enim promisit quod 'cum venerit ille Spiritus veritatis, docebit vos omnem veritatem' et 'ille me clarificabit'. Sicut etiam in primo tempore fuit per quandam appropriationem et anthonomiasiam labor corporalium operum, qui magis competit laycis; in secundo vero lectio et eruditio scripturarum, que plus competit clericis, sic in tertio debet prehabundare casta et suavis contemplatio, que plus competit monachis seu religiosis », MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A, fol. 27v-28r. I have not provided the entire excerpt which ends with the words « rationem meriti », see *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 345-347.

**178.** The Italicized passage in the previous note is taken from Joachim of Fiore's *Expositio in Apocalypsim* as identified by Marjorie Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A study in Joachimism*, Oxford, 1969, p. 196-197. The quotation is not noticed in Vian's critical transcription of the *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, p. 345.

**179.** « Nota etiam quod quia tunc amplius vacabitur excessibus et gustibus contemplationis quam fortibus active operibus, ideo non dabitur ei tantum robur virtutis ad fortia opera sicut datum est primis statibus et specialiter quarto, quod fiet non solum propter causam predictam », fol. 28r.

**180.** « ergo [recte sic] in tertio tempore Spiritus Sanctus exhibebat [sic] se ut flammam et fornacem divini amoris et [ut omit] cellarium spiritualis ebrietatis et ut apothecam divinorum aromatum et spiritualium unctionum et unguentorum et ut tripudium spiritualium iubilationum et iocunditatum », fol. 27v.

**181.** « Et quid illi qui tunc erunt magis erunt inflammati igne spiritus sancti et magis inebriati eius vino novo magis victi et magis eius unctione et magis eius letitia repleti quam fuerint apostoli super quos descendit », fol. 28v.

**182.** « Utrum promissio de missione spiritus sancti sit implenda plenius sexto tempore quam fuerit tempore apostolorum impleta », fol. 28v sin.

**183.** « Utrum sit erroneum dicere quod promissio de missione spiritus sancti non sit perfecta in apostolis vel in aliis cuiuscumque status sit plenius adimplenda ». See the appendix to S. Piron, « La consultation demandée à François de Meyronnes ».

**184.** « Hoc vicinatur errori 'Catafrigarum qui adventum spiritus sancti promissum in se potius quam in apostolis fuisse asserunt redditum' ut narrat Augustinus libro de heresibus c. XXVI quod incipit cathafriges et Ysi. VIII libro eth. c. v et habetur in decretis XXIII. q. III Quidam autem heretici ¶ catafriges », fol. 28v. Text bracketed. Cf. « Catafriges ... hiis adventum spiritus sancti non in apostolis, sed in se traditum asserunt », C. XXIV q. 3 c. 39 ¶ 26 (Friedberg, vol. 1, col. 1002).

**185.** fol. 28v sin.

**186.** « Quod maior flamma et maior habundantia et letitia Spiritus Sancti fuerunt primis ecclesie temporibus quam sit futura », fol. 29r dex.

**187.** « Item quod in primis temporibus ecclesie maior flamma et maior habundantia et letitia spiritus sancti quam sit futura ultimis temporibus innuit Gregorius XIX et XX moralia exponens XXIX et XXX c. Iob », fol. 29r.

**188.** « Nota : 'secundum quid' », fol. 29v dex ; « Nota : 'simpliciter' », fol. 29v dex. See note 85 above for John XXII's bracketing of this distinction in another context.

**189.** « Quod etiam spiritus sanctus magis se exhibuerit 'tripudium spiritualium iubilationem et iocunditatum' simpliciter primis temporibus quam ultimis », fol. 29v.

190. « Quod Spiritus Sanctus se exhibuerit tripudium spiritualium iubilationem et iocunditatem magis simpliciter primis temporibus quam ultimis », fol. 29v sin.
191. « in sexto tempore per illam spiritus sancti habundantiam 'non solum simplici intelligentia sed etiam gustativa et palpativa experientia videtur omnis veritas sapientie verbi dei incarnati et potentia [*recte* potentie] Dei patris », fol. 30v. In fact, the *LSA* reads « in tertio tempore » not « in sexto tempore ». See also note 203 below.
192. See the appendix to S. Piron, « La consultation demandée à François de Meyronnes ».
193. « Quia simplex intelligentia et certa experientia videtur pertinere ad claram visionem que excludit fidem », fol. 30v.
194. « De simplici intelligentia et experientia certa, utrum pertineant ad visionem claram », fol. 30v sin.
195. For « simplex intelligentia » in this context, see William Duba, *Seeing God: Theology, Beatitude and Cognition in the Thirteenth Century*, University of Iowa Ph.D thesis, 2006, p. 187. For Olivi's use of the term generally, see D. Burr, *Olivi's Peaceable Kingdom*, p. 110-115 and especially p. 190-192 which emphasizes that this statement – when seen within a Franciscan tradition of contemplative knowledge – is not as radical as it sounds (and, by extension, as Gregory and John XXII interpreted it).
196. Noted by E. Pásztor, « Le polemiche sulla 'Lectura super Apocalipsim' », p. 412 and 418.
197. « ...Aut igitur per illam simplicem et experimentalem dei cognitionem intelligunt claram visionem et hoc est erroneum quia talis non est de lege communi durante statu fidei. Aut intelligunt enigmaticam sed tamen maiorem et certiore omni alia quam numquam aliter habuerit ecclesia et hoc est erroneum vel saltem temerarium scilicet quod sit aliquis status ecclesie futurus in via in quo communitur homines habeant plenior cognitionem de hiis que sunt fidei quam habuerint apostoli doctores ecclesie », fol. 30v-31r.
198. « Aut intelligunt », fol. 30v sin.
199. « Erroneum », fol. 30v dex.
200. « Erroneum vel saltem temerarium », fol. 31r dex.
201. « Hoc autem non ponit illa scriptura mala et perversa et erronea, ymmo ponit quod in sexto statu huius vite, vel ecclesie, videbitur immediate 'omnis sapientia verbi incarnati et potentia Dei patris, non solum simplici intelligentia sed gustativa et palpativa experientia', et sic sequitur quod tunc homines in vita ista non erunt viatores, sed comprehensores et quod non indigebunt mediatore, ne ut per angelos in Deum deducantur, cum tamen hoc habeat divinitatis lex impermutabilis. Est ergo hec erroneum et hereticum », E. Pásztor, « Le polemiche sulla 'Lectura super Apocalipsim' », p. 418.
202. « Sed dicunt aliqui quod non est hereticum, nec erroneum, quamvis sit presumptuosum et temerarium hec asserere », *ibid.*
203. Both Gregory in MS Paris BnF lat. 3381A and John XXII in his sermon refer to the 'sixth state' rather than to the 'third age' which is what the *LSA* reads. See note 191 above. The question put to Silvestri contains the same mistake, but the question found in Fournier and Meyronnes has the correct wording. For the comparison, see the appendix in S. Piron, « La consultation demandée à François de Meyronnes ».
204. « ...maxime quia oportet statum illius temporis elevari et intrare ad ipsa lumina suscipienda et contemplanda comparabiturque [*recte* cooperabiturque] ad hoc tota precedens illuminatio priorum statuum et universalis fama Christi et sue fide et sue ecclesie per totum orbem diffusa a tempore prime conversionis mundi continue usque ad tempora ista », fol. 28r. Text bracketed.
205. See notes 138, 141-144 above.
206. For Olivi on the conversion of the Jews, see Robert E. Lerner, *The Feast of Saint Abraham: Medieval Millenarians and the Jews*, Philadelphia, 2001, p. 54-72 ; a summary of Gregory's opinion can be found in D. Burr, « The Antichrist and the Jews in Four Thirteenth-Century Apocalypse Commentaries », p. 34-36.

207. « Ista enim verba ... 'quod convertetur iterum orbis ad Christum' non solum sunt varia quia nulla auctore probantur, immo sunt erronea ut videtur et contra scripturam expresse quia dicit Christus Mt. XXIII [14] *Predicatur [recte predicabitur] hoc evangelium regni in universo mundo, in testimonium omnibus gentibus, et tunc veniet consumatio*. Hec autem predicatio complenda est ante adventum antichristi », fol. 33r.
208. « Utrum iterum sit orbis convertendus ad Christum », fol. 33r sin.
209. « Erronea et contra scripturam expresse », fol. 33 dex.
210. See notes 142 and 144 above.
211. « Sexta ecclesia dicitur habere ostium scripturarum ac predicationis et convertendorum cordium apertum », fol. 24r (cf. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 316); « De ostio scripturarum sexto statui aperto », fol. 24r dex; « De ostio convertendorum cordium sexto statui aperto », fol. 24r dex.
212. « Unde nulla necessitas apparet quare tunc debeat esse maior scientia quam primis, immo nec quod tanta », fol. 34r. Text bracketed.
213. « Ante adventum antichristi non erit tanta apertio cordium convertendorum tempore illo quo iudei sunt convertendi quanta ante fuerint [sic] ad plenitudinem gentium convertendam, immo tunc erit minor eo quod tunc quasi totus mundus convertetur ad Antichristum paucis in fide persistentibus », fol. 24v.
214. « Quod non erit tanta apertio cordium tempore quo iudei sunt convertendi quanta ante fuerat ad plenitudinem gentium convertendam », fol. 24v sin. John XXII corrects the « fuerint » to « fuerat ». See also note 247 below for the « fullness of the Gentiles ».
215. « Utrum sit erroneum dicere quod sextus status ecclesie maior erit precedentibus in suscepcione gratiarum et familiarium signorum ». See the appendix to S. Piron « La consultation demandée à François de Meyronnes ».
216. « Octavus error in eo quod subdit: 'Sextus status quanto maior erit precedentibus in suscepcione gratiarum et familiarium signorum amoris Christi...' », fol. 35r. Cf. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 347.
217. « Prefert aliis VI statum », fol. 35r dex. Also: « Prefert statum sextum statui glorie », fol. 12v sin and « Prefert VI statum precedentibus », fol. 34v sin. Also notes 117 and 135 above.
218. « Est manifeste erroneum quia familiarissimum signum amoris Christi ad nos in hac vita fuit familiaritas sue incarnationis », fol. 35r.
219. « Nota: 'manifeste erroneum' », fol. 35r dex.
220. « Temerarium », fol. 35v sin.
221. « Temerarium est dicere aliis data vel danda esse maiora dona quam fuerint data apostolis », fol. 35v.
222. « Utrum catholice possit dici quod beatus Franciscus sit evangelice vite et regule sexto et septimo tempore propagande revelator et summus post Christum et eius matrem observator ». This is the Silvestri form of the question. See the appendix to S. Piron, « La consultation demandée à François de Meyronnes ». As Piron notes, the actual text of the LSA reads « renovator » not « revelator ». Cf. the next footnote.
223. « Hic ergo angelus est Franciscus, evangelice vite et regule VI<sup>o</sup> et VII<sup>o</sup> tempore propagande et magnificande renovator et summus post Christum et eius matrem observator » (fol. 106r). Cf. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 416.
224. « ...sanctissimus pater noster Franciscus est post Christum et sub Christo primus et principalis fundator et initiator et exemplator sexti status et evangelice regule eius », *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 473.
225. « Utrum sit erroneum dicere quod beatus Franciscus fuit post Christum principalis fundator et exemplator evangelice vite ». See the appendix to S. Piron, « La consultation demandée à François de Meyronnes ».



226. « In hoc autem quod dicit 'quod apostolis magis competit esse cum Christo fundamenta totius ecclesie et fidei Christiane' (*Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 631)supple quod quibuscumque aliis contradicit ei quod dixit supra XL c. quod 'beatus Francisus erat post Christum et sub Christo primus et principalis fundator et nuntiator [sic] et exemplator sexti status et evangelice regule eius' », fol. 270r-v. The cross-reference is to article 40 (LM 38) whose treatment begins on fol. 147v and which correctly reads « fundator et initiator ».
227. « Contradicit sibi », fol. 270v sin.
228. « Ex quo etiam patet quod quotquot ax [sic] Christum convertuntur sunt minores apostolis et per eorum doctrinam intrant », fol. 270v.
229. « Quod omnes qui ad Christum convertuntur sunt minores apostolis », fol. 270v sin.
230. « Utrum sit erroneum dicere quod proprium erit sexto statu eidem 'profiteri et servare evangelicam regulam, non solum preceptorum sed etiam consiliorum Christi' ». See the appendix to S. Piron, « La consultation demandée à François de Meyronnes ».
231. « Nota quomodo hoc preclare competit vi statui, cuius proprie est profiteri et servare evangelicam legem seu regulam non solum preceptorum sed etiam consiliorum Christi » (fol. 35v). Cf. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 348.
232. « Quia per hoc vult quod vi status prefertur in susceptione gratiarum et felicitatis spei et omnium spiritualium donorum preterquam in agendo laboriosa opera omnibus statibus primis, hoc enim prout verba sonant est temerarium sed est proprium hereticorum qui se omnibus aliis preferunt », fol. 35v. Cf. note 104 above.
233. « 'Temerarium' et sequitur 'sed est proprium hereticorum' », fol. 35v sin.
234. « Isti qui se solos habere vitam apostolicam putant alios contempnentes in hoc assimilantur hereticis qui ab Augustinus libro de heresibus XL capitulo quod incipit Apostolici », fol. 35v.
235. « In hoc assimilantur hereticis et cetera », fol. 35v sin.
236. « Isti enim ecclesiam que nunc est quem vocant carnalem et meretricem babilonem dicunt dampnandam et de ea exituros electos spirituales qui suam ecclesiam fundabunt aliam ab illa sicut ecclesia est alia a synagoga dampnata. Sunt igitur isti similes hereticis Apostolicis in quantum se pre omnibus solos dicunt servare perfectionem apostolicam. Sed in hoc peiores sunt illis qui se preponunt apostolis dicentes preclare eis competere receptionem carismatum spiritualium quasi in se non in illis impleta sit promissio spiritus sancti », fol. 35v.
237. « Nota quod dicit istos dicere de ecclesiam que nunc est dampnandam et de ea exituros electos spirituales qui suam ecclesiam fundabunt aliam ab illa, sicut ecclesia est alia et synagoga dampnata. Item nota quod istos dicit similes hereticis apostolici et in hoc peiores sunt illis quia se preponunt apostolis et cet. », fol. 35v sin.
238. « Item prout verba sonant est error quia si servare perfectionem evangelicam est proprium statui sexte ecclesie. Ergo non convenit alicui alii statui et per consequens apostoli et primitiva ecclesia non tenuerunt perfectionem evangelicam », fol. 36r.
239. « Error prout verba sonant », fol. 36r dex.
240. « Nullus status servat legem seu regulam evangelicam quo ad precepta et consilia nisi qui profitetur et servat regulam beati Francisci secundum intellectum suum a romana ecclesia reprobatur erroneum est et scismaticum », fol. 36r.
241. See David Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans: From Protest to Persecution in the Century after Saint Francis*, University Park PA, 2001, p. 149.
242. See notes 24 and 31 above.
243. « Nota intellectum suum erroneum et scismaticum », fol. 36r dex.
244. « Iste autem est intellectus suus sicut patet infra ubi dicit quod illi qui dicunt quod ad perfectionem evangelicam non requiritur abdicare omnia etiam in communi sunt in errore et male sentiunt in evangelio », fol. 36r. Cf. « Iterum error dicentium quod habere aliqua in communi est de evangelica perfectione Christi et apostolorum ac per consequens quod nichil tale in communi habere non est de evangelica perfectione », *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 509.

245. « Nota : 'iste est intellectus suus' », fol. 36r dex.
246. « Utrum sit erroneum dicere quod numerus electorum ad complendam fabricam civitatis superne sic est prefixus, quod si unus per suam culpam corruat, alterum oportet substitui, ne illa fabrica remaneat incompleta ». This is the Meyronnes form of the question. See the appendix in S. Piron, « La consultation demandée à François de Meyronnes ».
247. « Item sicut soli primo comminatus est translationem ecclesie sue de loco suo, sic soli vi significat quod si non perseveraverit eius corona ad alium transferetur cuius mistica ratio est quia sicut primus status habuit primatum respectu totius secundi generalis status mundi, qui ab Apostolo vocatur tempus seu ingressus plenitudinis gentium, sic sextus habebit primatum respectu totius tertii generalis status mundi duraturi usque ad finem seculi. Ne ergo de suo primatu superbiant aut insolescant, quasi non possint ipsum perdere aut quasi alius non possit (*recte* nequeat) substitui eis et fieri eque dignus, insinuaturs eis predicta translatio », fol. 43v. Cf. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 351. For a treatment of the « fullness of the Gentiles », see note 214 above.
248. Labelled by Piron as Article 9. The text is attributed to Bonagrazia in « La consultation demandée à François de Meyronnes », §23.
249. « De duplici primatu ecclesie secundum istum », fol. 44r dex.
250. See notes 121-126 above.
251. « Primatus datus ecclesie romane propter eius scelera debet sibi auferri et transferri ad ecclesiam spiritualem et illa de novo debet accipere primatum et regnare [44v] usque ad finem mundi », fol. 44r-v.
252. « Hereticum », fol. 44v sin.
253. « Secundus error est in hoc quod ipse intendit quod primatus transferendus ad sextum statum transferatur ad illos de secta sua per quos dicit iudeos et totum mundum convertendos », fol. 44v. It is important to note that this « error » is not a sentence from the *LSA* (for a similar slip, see note 165 above). For the conversion of the Jews and the reconversion of the world, see notes 206-214 above.
254. « De translatione primatus », fol. 44v sin.
255. « Vide quod dicit ecclesiam in qua nunc est primatus vocat babilonem », fol. 27r sin ; « Nota de primatu ecclesie transferendo babilonem », fol. 27r sin ; « De translatione primatus », fol. 27r sin ; « Nota quod ecclesiam vocat novam iherusalem et male », fol. 27v sin.
256. « Utrum sit erroneum dicere quod primatus ecclesie romane auferendus sit illi in fine quinti status et ad paucos viros electos ordinis beati Francisci, qui se subtrahent ab obedientia ecclesie Romane, sit transferendus ». See the appendix to S. Piron, « La consultation demandée à François de Meyronnes ».
257. « Dicit de hac carnali ecclesia exituros sicut de synagoga apostolos. Hoc, ut sepe dictum est, erroneum est », fol. 44v.
258. « Erroneum », fol. 44v sin.
259. « Nota quomodo frater Petrus dicit totam ecclesiam magnam quam vocat carnalem deficient sicut synagoga, paucis inde electis eductis », fol. 30r dex.
260. « Secunda ratio est quia uterque illorum substitutus est alteri, nam gloria que fuerat sinagoge parata et pontificibus suis, si in Christum credidissent, translata fuit ad primitivam ecclesiam et ad pastores eius, sic etiam gloria parata finali ecclesie quinti status transferetur propter eius adulteria ad electos vi<sup>ti</sup> status. Unde [et *omit*] in hoc libro vocatur babilon meretrix circa initium vi<sup>ti</sup> status dampnanda », fol. 45r. Cf. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 351.
261. « Quod gloria ecclesie v<sup>ti</sup> status parata non sit ad ecclesiam vi<sup>ti</sup> status transferenda », fol. 45r dex.
262. « Si gloria dignitatis sacerdotalis, pontificalis, et papalis que cum lege nova data est a Christo Petro, apostolis, et ecclesie transferatur per consequens et observantia legis nove

mutabitur et sic non erit novum testamentum evangelium eternum sed mutabitur sicut vetus et evacuabitur quod est hereticum », fol. 45r.

263. « Hereticum », fol. 45r dex.

264. « Per hoc ergo apparet quod iste impugnat legem Christi sponsam eius vocans meretricem similiter per hoc quod vocat eam babilonem, id est, dignam confusione cum magis sit digna gloria de qua Eph. v [25-27] *Christus dilexit ecclesiam, et semetipsum tradidit pro ea et illam sanctificaret, mundans <eam> lavacro aque in verbo vite ut exhiberet ipse sibi gloriosam ecclesiam* », fol. 46v.

265. The only other annotation after this one and before the marginalia cited in notes 227 and 229 above is a brace in the margin of fol. 52v.

266. « Nota : qui ecclesiam dei meretricem vocat seu babilonem legem impugnat et hereticus est censendus », fol. 46v sin.

267. Summaries of the bull can be found in D. Burr, *Olivi's Peaceable Kingdom*, p. 202-203 ; Id., *The Spiritual Franciscans*, p. 199-200 ; P. Nold, « Pope John XXII, the Franciscan Order and Its Rule », p. 263-264.

268. « Ut evangelium Christi in se solos hoc in tempore asserant esse completum, quod hactenus ut ipsi somniant, obiectum fuerat, immo prosus extinctum ... illi enim promissionem domini de spiritu sancto non in apostolis sed in se ipsis completam esse asserunt, isti evangelium Christi, cuius virtus in sancti spiritus perceptione consistit, ita in se completum autumant, ut ab illius claro intellectu et vera observatione universitatem fidelium mentiundo secludant », *Bullarium Franciscanum*, t. v, ed. C. Eubel, Roma, 1898, p. 137-142, at p. 141.

269. « Spiritum Sanctum iuxta fidele Salvatoris promissum in beatis apostolis die Pentecostes sic plenissime fuisse refusum, ut illos omnem veritatem quae ad saltuem pertinet, perfecte doceret, ut ipso ad amorem Dei mirabiliter inflammaret... », *ibid.*

270. « ...duas fingit ecclesias : unam carnalem divitus pressam effluentem deliciis, sceleribus maculata, cui Romanum praesulem aliosque inferiores praelatos dominari asserunt ; aliam spirituales frugalitate mundam virtute decoram paupertate succinctam, in qua ipsi soli eorumque complices continentur », *ibid.*, p. 139.

271. In the last lines, I have paraphrased the following : « Una est igitur sancta, universalis, apostolica atque Romana ecclesia, quae non humana praesumptione sub potestate nititur, sed divina et prorsus incommutabili auctoritate fundatur, cuius egregium primatum, si quis impie docendo negat, non solum criminosus aut schismaticus esse convincitur, sed haereticus impietatis suae merito divina etiam atque humana ratione et auctoritate censetur [...] sic per legitimam Romanorum pontificum successionem illibata decurrat, ut illam usque ad finem saeculi nec perfidia maculet nec adulterini pastoris pontificium interrumpat », *ibid.*, p. 140.

272. « Utrum sextus status peregrini precellat precedentes in patientia », fol. 40v sin ; « Utrum vi tempore 'debeat habundare casta et suavis contemplatio' », fol. 31r dex ; « Utrum vi statui competat inimicos perfectissime diligere », fol. 40v sin.

273. For the most determined, see Eva Luise Wittneben, *Bonagratia von Bergamo : Franziskanerjurist und Wortführer seines Ordens im Streit mit Papst Johannes XXII*, Leiden, (Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, 90), 2003. Also S. Piron, « Bonagrazia de Bergame, auteur des *Allegationes* ».

274. It is telling that some would interpret John XXII's remarks on the carnal church in *Gloriosam Ecclesiam* as directed against Olivi. See S. Piron, « Le *Sexdequiloquium* de Jean de Roquetaillade », *Oliviana*, 3 (2009) [online] <http://oliviana.revues.org/index327.html>.

275. See notes 63 and 64 above.

276. See notes 73, 74, 131, 150.

277. See notes 244-245 above.

278. « Utroque [etiam omit] modo convenit perfectius sexto statui et etiam alio tertio modo, quia ipse servabit [recte servavit] verbum seu regulam evangelice egestatis et humilitatis et patientie cum nullo pro quacumque re temporali litigantis, immo suos persecutores et inimicos cum

summa pace et patientia perfectissime diligentis », fol. 38r (cf. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 349).

279. « Nota : 'secundum intentionem suam' », fol. 38r dex.

280. « Licet enim verum sit quod in sexto statu servetur verbum seu regula evangelice paupertatis a multis et specialiter ei professoribus et observatoribus regule beati Francisci intellecte secundum declarationem sedis apostolice. Tamen dicere quod isti sexto statui soli sicut illa verba sonant pro quibuscumque competat servare regulam evangelice paupertatis est erroneum quia hanc servavit ecclesia primitiva vendendo omnia et ponendo ad pedes apostolorum quorum doctrina implebatur illud consilium *Si vis esse perfectus...* », fol. 38r.

281. « — erroneum », fol. 38r dex.

282. « Utrum soli VI statui competat servare regulam evangelice egestatis », fol. 38r sin.

283. « Unde nichil possidebant tanquam proprium sed omnia tanquam communia. Cum etiam ecclesia pro omni tempore sit perfecta, erroneum est pro quinque temporibus et sic pro maiori parte, immo etiam pro quacumque parte temporis notabili, sibi negare perfectionem evangelicam », fol. 38v.

284. « — erroneum », fol. 38v dex.

285. « tamen intentio sua est quod nullus servat ad litteram illud verbum Christi de voluntaria paupertate *Vade et vende omnia que habes et cet* qui tenet regula beati Francisci etiam secundum intellectum suum », fol. 38v.

286. « Nota quod dicit : 'intentio sua est' », fol. 38v dex.

287. « — erroneum dupliciter », fol. 38v dex.

288. « Si enim intelligit quod quicumque pro quacumque re temporali litigat facit contra regulam evangelici precepti, error est quia illud verbum Mt. v [40] *ei, qui vult tecum iudicio contendere, et tunicam tuam tollere, dimitte ei et pallium*, si et prout est preceptum intelligitur quo ad preparationem animi solum », fol. 38v.

289. « Si intelligat », « Error est », fol. 38v.

290. « Utrum litigare pro re aliqua sit contra regulam evangelici precepti », fol. 38v sin.

291. « Tribus autem modis aliis erroneum est vel falsum », fol. 39r.

292. « Erroneum est vel falsum », fol. 39r dex.

293. « Secundo modo licet, salva perfectione, in iudicio agere pro rebus communibus, non propriis repetendis », fol. 39r.

294. « Ergo secundum eum pro nulla re temporali potest in iudicio litigari nisi cum infirmitate imperfectionis », fol. 39v.

295. « Hoc autem fundamentum videtur esse erroneum », fol. 39v ; « Videtur esse erroneum », fol. 39v sin.

296. « ...aliquis omnibus suis venditis et pauperibus erogatis intret religionem habentium aliquid in communi, tu dicis quod iste non implet evangelii verbum quia habet aliquid in communi. Contra : quia Christus noluit vendi omnia nisi ea que habebat et que poterat vendere. Sed constat quod rem communem non potest iste vendere, nec habet eam ad vendendum. Ergo verbum Christi non prohibet habere aliquid in communi sed in proprio et in propria voluntate et dominio... », fol. 39v.

297. « Quod non sit imperfectionis habere in communi, dummodo non habeat in proprio », fol. 39v sin.

298. « Quod autem sancti qui religiones alias fundaverunt credentes se implere illud consilium *Si vis esse perfectus etc.*, statuerunt habere necessaria non superflua in communi sicut Basilii, Benedictus, Augustinus, Gregorius », fol. 40r.

299. « Presumptio sensus proprii via est ad heresim, et qui 'sapientioribus et doctoribus' non credunt, 'sed ad semetipsos recurrunt, magistri erroris existunt' », fol. 39v. Cf. C. 24 q. 3. C. 30 (Friedberg, vol. 1, col. 998).

300. « Nota quod presumptio sensus proprii via est ad heresim », fol. 39v sin.

301. « 'Cum nullo pro quacumque re temporali litigare' prout sonant, id est, sic generaliter sine omni exceptione, et, prout intelliguntur secundum suum fundamentum, videntur non sane dicta », fol. 40v.
302. « Videntur non sane dicta », fol. 40v dext.
303. « Numquid non praefatae Ecclesiae derogatur honori si ipsam oporteat nunc in foro ecclesiastico nunc in saeculari, interdum quoque coram pedaneis iudicibus et plerumque pro rebus parvis et vilibus [continue] litigare ? », *Nicholas Minorita : Chronica*, ed. Gedeon Gàl and David Flood, St. Bonaventure NY, 1996, p. 86 ; *ibid.*, p. 125). John XXII adds the 'continuously' in the second, more argumentative version of *Ad conditorem canonum* to emphasize his point ; Also « Numquid non grave praemissis potest existere quod ipsos oporteat se opponere Romanae Ecclesiae quae ipsorum domina [caput] noscitur et magistra, ac cum ea agendo vel defendendo litigare assidue vel cedere iuri suo » (*ibid.*, p. 87 ; *ibid.*, p. 125). For the context, see P. Nold, *Pope John XXII and his Franciscan Cardinal*, p. 149-165.
304. D. Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans*, p. 271 ; Charles T. Davis, « Ubertino da Casale and His Conception of 'Altissima Paupertas' », *Studi Medievali*, 3rd ser., 22, 1981, p. 1-56, at p. 32-33.
305. See P. Nold, « Pope John XXII's annotations on the Franciscan Rule », p. 305, 310-311.
306. The relevant passages in *Quia vir reprobus* can be found in *Bullarium Franciscanum V.* p. 446-448 ; *Nicholas Minorita : Chronica*, p. 605-610.
307. See notes 31 and 32 above.
308. About the dating of the annotations, I have benefited from conversations with Sylvain Piron who emphasized to me the economy of the second theory. Additionally, it fits with the rhythm of the condemnation process outlined in his « Censures et condamnation de Pierre de Jean Olivi » (see note 2 above).
309. I owe the point about eyesight to Robert Lerner who noted how remarkable it is that a man in his seventies or, indeed, eighties should have done all this reading without glasses.
310. Explicit differs. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
311. Explicit differs. Longer excerpt in *LM*.
312. Explicit differs. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
313. Explicit differs. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
314. Incipit differs. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
315. Incipit differs. Longer excerpt in *LM*.
316. Explicit differs. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
317. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 350.
318. Explicit differs. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
319. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 406.
320. Incipit and explicit differ. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
321. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 407.
322. *Ibid.*, p. 408.
323. *Ibid.*, p. 408-409.
324. Incipit and explicit differ. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
325. Explicit differs. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
326. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 409.
327. *Ibid.*, p. 411-413.
328. Incipit differs. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
329. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 416-418.
330. Explicit differs. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
331. Explicit differs. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
332. Incipit differs. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
333. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 448.
334. Incipit differs. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.

- 335. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, Vian, p. 482-483.
- 336. *Ibid.*, p. 484-487.
- 337. *Ibid.*, p. 487-488.
- 338. *Ibid.*, p. 488-489.
- 339. Incipit and explicit differ. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
- 340. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 500.
- 341. *Ibid.*, p. 508-509.
- 342. Incipit and explicit differ. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
- 343. Incipit differs. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
- 344. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 548.
- 345. *Ibid.*, p. 553.
- 346. Incipit differs. Shorter except in *LM*.
- 347. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 565.
- 348. Incipit differs. The Paris excerpt has an extra sentence at the beginning but *LM* 48 encompasses its articles 52-54
- 349. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 565
- 350. *Ibid.*
- 351. *Ibid.*, p. 566.
- 352. *LM* 50 has the incipit of article 58 and the explicit of article 59.
- 353. *Ibid.*
- 354. *Ibid.*
- 355. *Ibid.*, p. 568.
- 356. *Ibid.*, p. 571.
- 357. Incipit and explicit differ. More extensive text in *LM* which includes all of article 66 and part of article 67.
- 358. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 571.
- 359. *Ibid.*
- 360. *Ibid.*, p. 571-572.
- 361. *Ibid.*, p. 572.
- 362. *Ibid.*
- 363. *Ibid.*, p. 576.
- 364. Explicit differs. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
- 365. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 585.
- 366. *Ibid.*
- 367. *Ibid.*, p. 589.
- 368. Explicit differs. Longer excerpt in *LM* which includes article 77.
- 369. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 605.
- 370. Explicit differs. Shorter excerpt in *LM*.
- 371. *Lectura super Apocalipsim*, ed. Vian, p. 633.

---

## INDEX

**Subjects:** Paris BnF lat. 713, Paris BnF lat. 3290, Paris BnF lat. 3381A, Vaticano BAV Borgh. 348, Vaticano BAV Vat. lat. 3740

## AUTHOR

**PATRICK NOLD**

The State University of New York, Albany