JOHN WYCLIF:  
Morning Star of the Reformation  

by Ray McLaughlin

John Wyclif was both a great champion of the Reformation and a dismal failure. He assaulted the papacy and the church in ways that had previously been unthinkable, yet he was cut down at nearly every turn. He pioneered ideas such as sola Scriptura and vernacular Bibles, trying to sweep away centuries of extra-biblical tradition, but met with little to no success. Though his reforms did begin to take hold, they were put down within his lifetime. John Hus managed briefly to rekindle Wyclif’s ideas in the early fifteenth century, but the church extinguished Hus’ voice even more quickly than it had Wyclif’s. Not until Martin Luther nailed his theses to the door at Wittenberg did the seeds of Wyclif’s legacy bloom into the Reformation - but then how glorious was their flowering!

The Life of John Wyclif

The date and circumstances of Wyclif’s birth are not entirely clear. Many scholars believe he was born around 1330, based in part on the dates of his schooling. Others opt for a somewhat earlier date, based on his paralysis and strokes in 1382 and 1384, which may be indicative of his more advanced age. He appears to have been the son of Roger and Catherine Wyclif, and to have been born in Ipreswel, about a mile from Richmond in Yorkshire. His surname identifies his family as one that owned property near the village Wycliffe-(up)on-Tees in the same vicinity.

What is thought of Wyclif’s early life is highly speculative. He may have begun his education under a local priest, and/or he may have attended grammar school in Oxford. On the religious side, the common people in his locale were evidently interested in piety, perhaps because the church’s activities offered a much appreciated break from the rest of life. Many attended church regularly, and almost everyone enjoyed the cycle plays and other events of the Christian calendar. Some believe that in Yorkshire at this time the people were unusually interested in Christian themes, including the composition and study of written works on preaching and spirituality. It is possible that these works became his primers in grammar.
What is more certain is that Wyclif and his family fell under the rule of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, in 1342. Gaunt’s patronage served Wyclif well over the course of his life, and may have contributed to his ability to attend Oxford (which was expensive), where he may have begun studies around 1345 or 1346, or perhaps as early as 1335. Probably, the plagues between 1349 and 1353 slowed his scholastic progress as they disrupted academic life at Oxford. With the death of his father in 1353, he became the lord of his family manor.

Thereafter, his academic career is somewhat easier to chart because there are more public records related to it. Possibly, he was a Fellow at Merton College in Oxford in 1356. He then resided as a Fellow at Balliol College sometime between 1356 and 1360 until his election as Master of Balliol somewhere around 1360. After earning his Master of Arts degree in 1361, he left Balliol in short measure to accept the college living rectorate of Fillingham in Lincolnshire, probably residing in Oxford and using the money from Fillingham to fund his studies, as was a regular practice for rectors. He resided in Queen’s College from 1363 to 1365, and perhaps was Warden of Canterbury Hall from 1365-1367.

In 1366 Wyclif entered the political fray for apparently the first time, producing the document *Determinato quœdam de Dominio* in defense of the Parliament’s refusal to pay tribute to the Pope. The fact that Parliament appealed to him for help demonstrates that his reputation had already begun to grow. In this document Wyclif initially presented the doctrine of lordship that he would continue to develop and eventually publish as *On Civil Lordship*, which would draw the censure of five papal bulls. Specifically, in *Determinato quœdam de Dominio* he argued that the king’s lordship was sovereign over the pope’s lordship, that the pope should not have been a proprietor of civil lordship in any manner, that the pope ought only to have received taxes for services rendered, and that the pope in fact had aided the enemies of England and therefore was due no tribute. This was only the first of Wyclif’s many attacks on the power of the papacy.

In 1368 (or perhaps 1369), having been deposed from his position as Warden of Canterbury Hall, Wyclif exchanged, or more descriptively “sold,” his rectorate at Fillingham for a much less lucrative rectorate at Ludgershall. He probably did this to obtain ready cash to pay legal bills for his failed lawsuit to recover the position of Warden. In any event, the reduced income sent him back to residency at Queen’s College. Wyclif then devoted himself to studies until he earned his Bachelor of Divinity in 1369. Sometime thereafter, as early as 1370 and as late as 1374, Wyclif then received his Doctorate, at which point in time he would have been as young as 40 or as old as 54. In 1371 Pope Gregory XI appointed him a canon of Lincoln, and in 1374 the crown not only gave him the rectorate of Lutterworth in Leicestershire, but also appointed him as an ambassador to discuss matters of church appointments with a papal commission at Bruges.
Thus far in his life, Wyclif had rather successfully navigated his career to a fairly enviable position. He had not received every appointment he had wanted, but he had earned great respect, and held enough appointments to pay for his needs and his schooling. More importantly, by 1371 he was “renowned as the leading philosopher and theologian of the age at Oxford, that is to say, he was second to none in his scholarship in western Europe in which Oxford ... had come to surpass Paris in its reputation and attainments.” His rise through the church ranks was certainly due at least in part to his great intellect, but it also may have had something to do with the fact that his patron John of Gaunt was, for much of Wyclif’s life, the most powerful man in England. This relationship was not one-sided, however, as Wyclif’s work *On Civil Dominion* provided the theological basis for John of Gaunt to seize great wealth from the church - which caused no small amount of trouble for Wyclif.

As a result of Wyclif’s teachings in *On Civil Dominion* and elsewhere (particularly in support of John of Gaunt), William Courtenay, Bishop of London, summoned Wyclif to St. Paul’s in London to defend himself against charges of heresy. The charges are not now known, but speculation is that they had to do with Wyclif’s teaching on lordship and dominion that attributed to civil rulers the power to seize church property, as well as with Wyclif’s stand against the church’s power of excommunication. On February 19, 1377, Gaunt himself accompanied Wyclif, and brought an entourage of theological doctors from various mendicant orders to aid in Wyclif’s defense. Also attending Gaunt was Henry Percy, the marshal of England. It was clear that Courtenay was really using the court of church discipline to fire at Gaunt, for whose unpopular political actions Wyclif had written a theological defense. During the course of the trial, Gaunt threatened Courtenay, and the London parishioners rioted in defense of their pastor. Without ever having uttered a word of defense, Gaunt, Wyclif and their party were forced to flee for their lives. Of course, this action failed to settle the theological unrest surrounding Wyclif, and three months later Pope Gregory XI issued five papal bulls against Wyclif.

Gregory XI’s bulls listed eighteen (or nineteen) charges against Wyclif, drawn largely from his teaching on lordship that challenged the church’s right to own property protected from civil powers. Gregory XI sent one bull to Oxford University, one to the king, and three to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London jointly, but they were not published until December 18, 1377. According to a commission of Oxford doctors, the bulls accurately reflected Wyclif’s teachings on lordship and dominion, and moreover Wyclif’s statements accurately reflected the truth. The bulls stated that if Wyclif did indeed hold these teachings, he was to be arrested and to await the pope’s sentence. King Edward III’s death prevented the execution of the bulls initially, but Wyclif came to trial at Lambeth Palace in 1378 - not, however, without gaining a form of safe conduct: the princess of Wales ordered that the bishops not condemn him. While the bishops debated how to prosecute Wyclif without offending the princess, a London mob broke up the trial. Shortly
thereafter, Gregory XI died, and the Great Schism split the church, leaving the bulls against Wyclif all but forgotten.\textsuperscript{53}

Thereafter, Wyclif largely withdrew from public life, residing at Queen’s College and teaching until 1381 when he retired to Lutterworth\textsuperscript{54} and was subsequently banished from the university.\textsuperscript{55} During these last years of his life, he wrote prodigiously, producing significant works such as \textit{On the Eucharist},\textsuperscript{56} \textit{The Crusade},\textsuperscript{57} \textit{On Simony}, \textit{On Blasphemy}, \textit{On Apostasy},\textsuperscript{58} and most importantly the English translation of the Bible.\textsuperscript{59} He did appear publically at the “Earthquake Council” of 1382 at Black Friars in London to appeal to the laity to support the government in seizing church holdings and prohibiting payments to Rome.\textsuperscript{60} While Wyclif himself was not actually on trial at this council, his followers and teachings were. The council condemned twenty-four of Wyclif’s teachings, labeling ten as heretical and the remainder as erroneous.\textsuperscript{61} Among those teachings found heretical were Wyclif’s views of “the Eucharist, the papacy, the uselessness of confession and the indefensibility of a property-owning clergy.”\textsuperscript{62} Wyclif himself was not personally condemned or censured at this juncture.\textsuperscript{63} After this, he suffered a stroke in 1383 that left him paralyzed,\textsuperscript{64} and another on December 28, 1384, that resulted in his death on New Year’s Eve of that year.\textsuperscript{65} He was buried at Lutterworth\textsuperscript{66} as an officially orthodox Christian.\textsuperscript{67}

As an epilogue to his life, in 1414-1415 the Council of Constance resurrected charges against Wyclif and condemned him on 260 to 300 or so counts of heresy:

The holy Synod did declare and define the said John Wyclif to have been a notorious heretic, and to have died obstinate in heresy, excommunicating him and condemning his memory; and did decree that his body and bones, if they could be distinguished from those of the faithful, should be disinterred, or dug out of the ground, and cast at a distance from the sepulchre of the church.\textsuperscript{70}

Bishop Philip Repton of Lutterworth’s diocese did not act on the decision, but his successor Richard Fleming finally followed through with the judgment in 1428, disinterring, burning and scattering Wyclif’s bones.\textsuperscript{71}

\textbf{The Thought and Work of John Wyclif}

\textbf{The Church}

As he set it out in his 1378 work \textit{On the Church}, Wyclif’s doctrine of the church closely resembled the modern doctrine of the invisible church - he believed the church consisted of the “congregation of the predestined.”\textsuperscript{72} He also taught the priesthood of all believers, and added as a corollary that all clergy were also
laymen. Not surprisingly, he rejected the equation of the clergy with the church. Interestingly, and in seeming contrast to the doctrine of the invisible church, he also rejected the suggestion that the church consisted of “the community of all faithful believers, clerk and lay, alive and dead,” because he held that anyone might believe “and yet for want of God’s grace be damned.” This doctrine greatly challenged the established church because it argued that even the pope himself might not belong to the church.

The Pope and Papal Decrees

For most of his life, Wyclif was not opposed to the idea of a papacy, but rather supported it wholly, as long as the office were held by a righteous man. Later in his life, however, he condemned not only the papacy as an institution, but every level of church government save priests and deacons, for which he found scriptural support. He did not ascribe any authority to the office of pope in and of itself. Rather, the pope’s authority depended on Wyclif’s doctrine of lordship, such that a pope who was not righteous had no authority. Moreover, because he believed only God’s will could be truly authoritative, and because God would not will an erroneous decision, even a righteous pope’s decrees were invalid if the pope erred in his judgment. To use excommunication as an example, Wyclif taught that a man could not be excommunicated unless he had truly sinned enough to warrant it. Therefore, any excommunication that did not judge the facts rightly was null and void. Excommunication became simply a pronouncement of preexistent fact, not an authoritative or effective action. In accordance with this, papal decrees were also valid only insofar as they conformed to Scripture. He also believed that the pope and the clergy at large had no business owning more than they needed to support themselves, that this was the right only of civil leaders, “for the pope ought above all to be a follower of Christ, but Christ would not be a proprietor of civil lordship, and so neither should the pope.” He did allow that the pope could receive taxes for services rendered.

Lordship and Dominion

Wyclif’s ideas about the authority of the pope and clergy can be better understood in light of his doctrine of lordship, as expressed in On Civil Dominion and Determinato quœdam de Dominio. Wyclif believed that the immediate dependence of the individual man upon God … made him worthy or unworthy; it was his own character, and not his office, that constituted him what he really was. The pope himself, if a bad man, lost his entire right to lordship.
For this reason, he effectively ascribed lordship over the church’s decisions to the individual. Authority lay in truth, not in office. Therefore, whoever judged rightly was authoritative, guided in his judgment by God. Thus, when the church acted badly, it lost authority to rule.

This doctrine was particularly problematic for the church when embraced by England’s powerful civil leaders like John of Gaunt, who defended their seizure of church properties partially on these grounds. Additionally, Wyclif emphasized that civil leader determining to seize the church’s property had the right of judgment:

If the church fail in its duty, the temporal lords may rightly and lawfully deprive it of its temporal possessions; the judgment of such failure lying not with the theologian but with the civil politician.\(^85\)

He went so far as to state that the pope himself could actually be arraigned by laymen.\(^86\) To this he then added that the civil government might also seize properties “for its own defense in the case of need.”\(^87\) Wyclif extended this idea of lordship and goodness to the secular realm, enlarging the government’s power even further as it was able to seize the property of unrighteous laymen as well.\(^88\)

The average man did not obtain authority by this doctrine even if he were righteous because Wyclif added the qualification that one could not have lordship only if he were lord over something\(^89\) - and he did not become lord over anything simply by being good.

**The Eucharist**

In true Reformation fashion, Wyclif rejected the conclusions of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) regarding the nature of Christ’s presence in the elements of the Lord’s Supper in favor of the opinions of earlier church Fathers,\(^90\) such as Berengarius of Tours.\(^91\) Specifically, he rejected transubstantiation.\(^92\) In his works *On the Eucharist* (1380) and *On Apostasy* (1379),\(^93\) he expressed the view that Christ was figuratively present, but not essentially or corporeally present. He also taught the receptionist view that the nature of the elements depended upon the faith of the recipient.\(^94\) After a council of friars and other doctors condemned his view as heretical,\(^95\) Wyclif published his *Confession* in 1381 to defend his position.\(^96\)

**Forgiveness and Salvation**

Wyclif sounded remarkably Protestant when speaking of forgiveness and salvation. He taught that salvation could be had only by faith apart from works:
Trust wholly in Christ; rely altogether on his sufferings; beware of seeking to be justified in any other way than by his righteousness. Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ is sufficient for salvation.97

He also insisted that confession was useless,98 and thoroughly condemned the effectiveness of indulgences99 and other forms of penance such as pilgrimages, hearing Masses, founding institutions, and giving alms to the poor.100

Scripture

Wyclif came to believe strongly that Scripture alone was the “all-sufficient authority for right conclusions,” as he made evident in his 1378 work On the Truth of Holy Scripture.101 This same emphasis can be seen in his insistence that papal decrees are not binding when they contradict Scripture.102 In his Trialogue (1382),103 Wyclif argued that all church institutions were to be judged by Scripture.104 He also asserted that holy Scripture was the highest authority for every believer, the standard of faith and the foundation for reform in religious, political and social life... In itself it was perfectly sufficient for salvation, without the addition of customs or traditions such as canon law, prayers to the saints, fastings, pilgrimages or the Mass.105

Moreover, he insisted on the perspicuity of the Scriptures, arguing that any man could learn the gospel from the Scriptures106 as long as he read in faith and sought the guidance of the Holy Spirit.107 As a result, he believed that the Bible ought to be available in English, the vernacular language of his country.108 No doubt this was the motivation for his greatest work, the translation of the Bible into English.109

Wyclif began the translation of the work now known as the Wyclif Bible by working first on the New Testament while his student Nicholas Hereford began to translate the Old Testament. After finishing the New Testament, Wyclif completed the Old Testament where Hereford’s had ended.110 He engaged in this work probably between the years of 1381 and 1384.111 Later, the whole was revised by John Purvey.112

Wyclif also saw the need for preachers who related God’s Word to the people in their own language, so he trained itinerant preachers and equipped them with partial translations of the Bible to accomplish this task. Many of these preachers were Fellows of the various Oxford colleges.113

Clues and Insights Relating to Wyclif's Personal Greatness
Wyclif’s personal greatness depended on several factors, among the greatest of which was his incredible intellect. One cannot begin to fathom his influence without accounting for the fact that he was recognized as the greatest scholar in the western world while he lived. Even his enemies granted that Wyclif was “the flower of Oxford, in philosophy second to none, without a rival in the discipline of the schools.” He was the “greatest clerk ... then living.” Moreover, he was known as a man of pure morals, such that “no one of his many detractors ever accused him of incontinence or the lower forms of self-indulgence.” William Thorpe, his younger contemporary, said of him:

Master John Wyclif ... was considered by many to be the most holy of all men in his age... He was absolutely blameless in his conduct. Wherefore very many of the chief men of this kingdom, who frequently held counsel with him, were devotedly attached to him, kept a record of what he said, and guided themselves after his manner of life.

Certainly also the mark he made on the world depended in some degree on his good connections. He knew the right people, or more particularly, the right person: John of Gaunt. His benefactor protected him many times in the midst of controversy, and appealed to his aid in high-profile situations. What about Wyclif inclined John of Gaunt to do this? Again, it was Wyclif’s intellect, but not his intellect alone. He also held to doctrines that were politically expedient - not necessarily a trait to be emulated for the sake of expedience, but a contributing factor to his success nonetheless.

In this writer’s opinion, however, the most important aspects of Wyclif’s character that propelled him to greatness were his passion for truth, and his commitment to the Word of God as the final arbiter of truth. He did not always understand Scripture aright, but he recognized its value and its authority. He stood on the Word in opposition to the world. He saw in Scripture the living God in action, and developed a commitment to God above creatures like popes and cardinals. He was not afraid to test his own doctrines or traditions by Scripture, or to change his position when the Bible showed him a truer path. He was submissive to the Word.

It seems to have been Wyclif’s commitment to Scripture that propelled him into becoming the Morning Star of the Reformation. Because of his loyalty to the Word above the church, he prefigured the Reformation in his doctrine of sola Scriptura. He also prepared the way for reform by holding to justification by faith alone, abandoning transubstantiation, and even in some ways through his view of the church. He challenged the church authority structures repeatedly, right up to the pope himself, and stood confidently on his understanding of Scripture. Even in his appeal to political authority for support he prefigured Luther who relied so heavily on the German princes. As one writer has summarized so well, Wyclif
had not only embodied and vocalised the aspirations for reform which he found at Oxford in his early days: he had infused into the movement so much of new energy and virility that the Reformation in England was virtually effected at the moment of his death, and there was nothing to come but the outward and political manifestations of its completeness. . . . It was not Cranmer, nor Cromwell, nor Henry VIII and his two Protestant children, who banished papal authority from the Anglican Church. They were the accidents, or at most the instruments of a victory already accomplished. For the true moment of victory, and for the effective Reformer, we must look back to the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{118}
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