

GUIDO TERRENI:  
READING HOLY SCRIPTURE WITHIN  
THE SACRED TRADITION

IAN CHRISTOPHER LEVY

Guido Terreni was one of the most prolific and important theologians of the Carmelite order in the fourteenth century. A master of theology at the University of Paris by 1313, he was elected prior general of the Carmelites just a few years later in 1318. Terreni proved to be a staunch advocate of the papacy, especially the policies of Pope John XXII, and he died at Avignon in 1342.<sup>1</sup> The first few decades of the fourteenth century were tumultuous years as the Church faced the fallout from the Franciscan Spiritualist crisis and the attacks on ecclesiastical power leveled by Marsilius of Padua. Responding to these and other concerns, Terreni penned a number of substantial works which covered the nature of heresy, evangelical perfection, canon law, and papal infallibility. The focus of this study will be largely confined to two major works: his *Summa de haeresibus* and his *Quaestio de magisterio infallibili Romani pontificis*. Specifically, this study will look at the ways in which Terreni based his arguments upon the authority of Holy Scripture read within the enduring faith of the Catholic Church. As a theologian, and thus a *magister sacrae paginae*, Terreni recognized that Holy Scripture was the supreme standard of Catholic orthodoxy, but he refused to let Scripture be detached from its natural place within the life and tradition of the Roman Church. In fact, as we shall see, Terreni believed that the very authority and structure of the Church were grounded in the original apostolic witness as recorded in the New Testament.

---

<sup>1</sup> B.M. XIBERTA, *De scriptoribus scholasticis saeculi XIV ex Ordine Carmelitarum*, (Louvain: 1931), pp. 137-38.

## I. TERRENI AND THE LAW

As noted above, Guido Terreni was a theologian by trade, but he also displayed an expert knowledge of canon law. Canon law became increasingly influential among the theologians of the Late Middle Ages, perhaps driven by the secular mendicant and Church State controversies which sent them to legal texts to make their arguments. Yet, as Thomas Turley notes, Terreni was exceptional among his fellow theologians whose knowledge of the law tended to be rather superficial. Terreni did not simply acquaint himself with the law. In his 1336-1339 *Commentarium super Decretum* he actually set out to correct the errors he found therein errors which he believed to be born of the canonists' insufficient knowledge of theology. Terreni spares no one, as he contends that Gratian himself had not understood the full theological significance of the material incorporated into his *Decretum*. Against the modern canonists, Terreni appealed to the Church fathers in their original sources, rather than the excerpts found in the canon law collections. This approach to the sources also had direct practical application to his battle against Spiritual Franciscans and Marsilians, since he believed that their misreading of Scripture and canon law had stemmed from the commentaries upon which they relied. Terreni set out, therefore, to reclaim the tradition from his opponents. It is noteworthy, as Turley suggests, that Terreni may actually have learned this technique of correction when studying at Paris where defenders and detractors of Thomas Aquinas issued various *correctoria* in their battle over the true meaning of patristic texts.<sup>2</sup>

When Terreni commented upon Gratian's *Decretum* he made numerous corrections, ranging from the proper citations of book titles or chapter numbers to a restatement of the cited source's actual meaning. He often filled out and clarified Gratian's citations in order to aid the reader.<sup>3</sup> This was all vitally important because Terreni knew that the *Decretum* was not only a book for canonists; theologians also depended upon it for their knowledge of the historical sources. Thus it was imperative to get them right.<sup>4</sup> Terreni's emphasis on reading

---

<sup>2</sup> THOMAS TURLEY, "Guido Terreni and the Decretum," *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law* 8 (1978): pp. 29-34; and TURLEY, "Guido Terreni, Heresy, and the Reconstruction of Tradition: 1317-1342," in *Tradition and Ecstasy: The Agony of the Fourteenth Century*, ed. Nancy van Deusen (Ottawa: 1997), pp. 51-68.

<sup>3</sup> P. MELSEN, *Guido Terreni, Ord. Carm. Iurista* (Rome: 1939). Melsen provides selections from the text which I cite below.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.

the original sources in their entirety is evident when he notes that Gratian's selected quotes lack the authority that the sayings of the saints possess in their unadulterated form.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, Terreni often takes issue with Gratian's use of sources, reckoning them misapplied or not to the point. Sometimes he must supply words in order to capture the true meaning of a given citation.<sup>6</sup> Terreni did not comment on all the chapters of the *Decretum*, however, but only those that pertained to theology. His lack of confidence in the judgments of the canonists is sometimes vividly displayed as he forthrightly asserts the superiority of the theologians in matters of doctrine. At one point he even tells Huguccio to be quiet (*taceat*) and leave the matter to the theologians (*virī theologi*). Terreni, for his part, will always take his stand with the fathers and holy doctors.<sup>7</sup>

Before we move on to a deeper study of Terreni, it will be instructive to say a few words about two fellow Carmelites in this period: Sibert of Beek and John Baconthorpe. Sibert had been a student of Terreni and had defended the papalist cause against Marsilius of Padua in his 1327 *Reprobatio sex errorum*. Like Terreni, he immersed himself in the historical sources, in his case drawn largely from *Causa* 23 of Gratian's *Decretum*, in order to demonstrate the long history of the Church as an institution of property and legal rights. His point, as Turley has shown, was to prove that the hierarchical Church and papacy of the fourteenth century was in perfect continuity with the Church of previous ages, and thus had not fallen into a decadent state as Marsilius claimed. Hence, rather than construct an elaborate metaphysical justification as other papalists were doing, Sibert would stake the papacy's claim in the historical record borne out by ancient texts.<sup>8</sup> Most Carmelite theologians tended

---

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11: "Unde verba doctrinae purioris et maioris ponderis sunt in originali quam in exteriori allegante .... Ex quo pater cum Gracianus ad probandum dicta inducat dicta sanctorum, quod dicta sanctorum in originalibus suis sunt maioris auctoritatis quam posita in rivulo libri Graciani."

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11: "Praeterea Gracianus omisit, quae ad rem faciunt"; Hec verba Augustini interserui satis ad propositum, quae omisit Gracianus"; p. 2: "Et miror Gracianum quod haec verba Augustini inducit, quoniam Augustinus non loquitur de iure naturali ibi, sed de iure illo divino quo bona Ecclesiae voluit esse communis."

<sup>7</sup> B.M. XIBERTA, *Guu Terrena: Carmelita de Perpinyà* (Barcelona: 1932), p. 65: "Sed taceat Hugucio, quia viri theologi omnes tenent et sequuntur Augustinum"; "Nec crederem contra hoc Hugucionem nec Speculatori, sed magis teneo S. Thomam et Raymundum"; "De Hugicione et Bernardo, in hac materia parvipendo, ubi patres et doctores eis contrarios reperio."

<sup>8</sup> THOMAS TURLEY, "Sibert of Beek's Response to Marsilius of Padua," *Carmelus* 52 (2005), pp. 81-104.

to adopt a rather conservative stance towards their adversaries. Thus Guido and Sibert followed the moderate path of the decretists when making their historical case, rather than adopting the more extreme arguments of the decretalists who claimed that the pope was free to change so many practices as he saw fit. These Carmelites were, like their opponents, much more attuned to the *ecclesia primitiva* and the need to maintain continuity with the apostolic Church.<sup>9</sup>

John Baconthorpe, however, seems to have adopted a less reactionary stance. Beryl Smalley points out that, whereas Baconthorpe's master Terreni had defended the ecclesiastical hierarchy largely on the basis of the fathers and the later theologians, Baconthorpe chose instead to make his case from a whole host of canon law extracts. She finds that he "transferred the legal outlook of the Curia to the pages of his postill." This affection for canon law was a sign of Baconthorpe's willingness to embrace development within the Church just at a time when many were hearkening back to the *ecclesia primitiva*. Ecclesiastical wealth and papal power were, for Baconthorpe, necessary elements of the Church's healthy progress.<sup>10</sup> Relying on the *Decretum*, Baconthorpe had argued that the mendicant life could actually be traced back to the apostles, but that a series of popes had, by their power to dispense, relaxed these strict requirements over time for the good of the wider Church when they allowed for the accumulation of property. In this way, as Turley notes, Baconthorpe could argue that the friars were not really introducing anything new; they were simply the ones who adhered to the most rigorous form of apostolic law. In that sense, Baconthorpe was taking a page out of the decretalists' playbook by emphasizing the pope's right to dispense from apostolic law as the times required *oportet leges moderari et mutare*.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> THOMAS TURLEY, "The Impact of Marsilius: Papalist Responses to the *Defensor Pacis*," in *The World of Marsilius of Padua*, ed. Gerson Moreno-Riaño (Turnhout: 2006), 47-64. For more on the positions of the decretalists see Walter Ullmann, *Medieval Papalism: The Political Theories of the Medieval Canonists* (London: 1949); J.A. WATT, "The Use of the Term 'Plenitudo Potestatis' by Hostiensis," *Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Medieval Canon Law*, ed. S. Kuttner and J. Ryan (Vatican City: 1965), pp. 161-87; JOHN HACKETT, "The State of the Church: A Concept of the Medieval Canonists," *The Jurist* 23 (1963): pp. 259-90.

<sup>10</sup> BERYL SMALLEY, "John Baconthorpe's Postill on St. Matthew," *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 4 (1958): pp. 91-145.

<sup>11</sup> THOMAS TURLEY, "Tradition, Papal Power, and John Baconthorpe," *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law* 12 (1982): pp. 81-89.

## II. DEFINING AND COMBATING HERESY

We can now turn directly to Terreni's *Summa de haeresibus* which provides a very good look of how Terreni understood the way in which the Catholic faith is to be determined. Very early on in this work Terreni presented a definition of heresy and what precisely makes someone a heretic. "Heresy is a false and erroneous opinion in the intellect through which the intellect opines falsely and erroneously about something contrary to the truth of the faith." Heresy is a sort of infidelity, therefore, inasmuch as it opposes faith. And while not every error is a heresy, every heresy is an error. Hence it must be noted that there are various sins that run contrary to the truth of Scripture which are nevertheless not heresies. For example, a person can be a thief and thus violate one of the Ten Commandments without being a heretic. After all, were this not the case, then every sinner would have to be classified as a heretic.<sup>12</sup>

From here, Terreni will run through different standards according to which someone can be classified as a heretic. The first among these requirements would be that a person hold a false and erroneous opinion contrary to the truth. More specifically, a person would hold a false and erroneous opinion contrary to the truth of the faith and the determination of the Church in matters pertaining to faith and morals, and those necessary for salvation. And we see that, for Terreni, Holy Scripture will be at the center of the Church's determination. "The Church believes in the steadfast content of the faith and the infallible truth of Holy Scripture."<sup>13</sup> The Church's authority is also manifested in her promotion of the sacraments wherein the divine power is at work, some of which have been exhibited immediately and expressly by Christ himself. These include Baptism, Eucharist, and Holy Orders, which the Church has received from the Lord and then hands down. There are other sacraments whose institution is not expressly recounted in Scripture (*non legatur expresse*), and yet they

---

<sup>12</sup> *Summa de haeresibus et earum confutationibus*, ed. Iodocus Badius Ascensius (Paris: 1528), *De haeresibus generatim*, ch. 3, f. 3r: "Est enim haeresis falsa opinio et erronea in intellectu per quam false et erronee intellectus opinatur de aliquo contra fidei veritatem."

<sup>13</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 3, f. 3r: "Secundo requiritur ad hoc vt quid haereticus dicatur quod habeat falsam et erroneam opinionem contra veritatem fidei et ecclesiae determinationem quoad ea quae ad fidem pertinent et bonos mores, et quoad ea quae necessaria sunt ad salutem et consecutionem vitae aeternae. ... Credit autem ecclesia indubiam fidei et scripturae sacrae infallibilem veritatem."

too must be maintained. This is because Jesus Christ instituted all the sacraments in an immediate manner. Indeed, it only stands to reason according to Terreni, for if Moses had immediately instituted the sacraments of the Old Law, then surely Christ the head of the Church would have personally instituted those of the New Law.<sup>14</sup> Although Terreni does not say so explicitly, he surely has the Franciscan theologians in his sights, those such as Alexander of Hales and St Bonaventure who would extend the institution of the sacraments beyond Christ's own lifetime even as they connected them to Christ via the intermediary role of the Holy Spirit.<sup>15</sup> As we shall see, Terreni is extremely keen to root all Catholic doctrine in the most primitive community: Christ together with his apostles prior to the Ascension.

All of this is connected to the question of heresy precisely because Terreni reckons that it would run contrary to the truth of the sacraments and against Holy Scripture to reject the aforementioned principles. Holy Scripture and the truth of the sacraments go together for Terreni, since it is in Scripture that Christ's institution of the sacraments is recorded, even if not expressly, then at least implicitly. That is why Terreni invokes Jerome's definition of a heretic here: one who understands Scripture in a way other than the Holy Spirit requires. Of note also is that Terreni cites Jerome from the original source of his Galatians commentary, rather than the more traditional citation taken from the *Decretum*.<sup>16</sup> This cannot be an accident, since it is in keeping with Terreni's emphasis on the original sources (*originalia*) as the basis of sound doctrine, rather than what may have been mangled by the decretists.

Moving on to the third standard: a heretic must have been properly baptized and have professed the Catholic faith. Someone who

---

<sup>14</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)*, ch. 3, f. 3r-3v: "Et quamuis de omnibus non legatur expresse, tenetur tamen communiter quod omnia sacramenta immediate Christus instituit, quod videtur multum rationabile ...".

<sup>15</sup> Cf. BONAVENTURE, *Sent.* 4.7.1-2 in *Opera Omnia* (Paris: Vives, 1866), Vol. 5. pp. 402-404. See also J. Bittremieux, "L'Institution des Sacraments d'après Alexandre de Halès," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 8 (1932), pp. 234-51; P. HIPPOLYTE BARIL, *La Doctrine de Saint Bonaventure sur L'Institution des sacraments* (Montreal: 1954), pp. 41-50.

<sup>16</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 3, f. 3v: "...vnde sentientes contra veritatem sacramentorum et contra scripturam sacram eam aliter intelligens quam efflagitet spiritus sanctus haereticus appellari potest vt Hieronymus dicit super epistolam Pauli ad Galatas." See JEROME, *Comm. in Epist. ad Galatas*, PL 26, 417a; and the *Decretum* chapter C. 24, Q. 3, c. 27 in *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, 2 vols., ed. Emil Friedberg (Graz: 1959), 1: 997-998.

never held the faith cannot properly be a heretic, therefore, but simply an infidel; this is the case with pagans and Saracens. Hence the Church does not render judgment on those who are completely outside of the faith (1 Cor 5:12). The Jews, for their part, are on the outside in matters pertaining to the New Testament, and thus are not judged by the Church in that regard. Yet, says Terreni, if Jews err when it comes to the truth of the Old Law, then the Church may indeed judge and punish them, since such things would fall under the Church's jurisdiction.<sup>17</sup> Terreni is actually echoing a long established position. When the Talmud was ordered burned in 1242 this was in keeping with the general belief among the canonists that the pope had a duty to protect the correct interpretation of the Old Testament within Judaism. The Talmud, therefore, was regarded as a distortion of the Jews' own Law.<sup>18</sup>

At all events, the fourth requirement concerns the person who is divided from the truth of the faith and the unity of the Church through error, and is thus a schismatic.<sup>19</sup> The fifth pertains to the person who errs against some truth of the faith that he ought to hold, since in erring against one particular article of faith he actually falls away from the truth of the faith as a whole. Thus even as he may indeed believe some of the articles, to err in one is to be guilty in all (Jas 2:10). One does not believe with the requisite integrity when erring in a single article of faith, therefore, since we should believe in all that the Catholic Church and the apostolic see hand down.<sup>20</sup> The sixth requirement speaks to those who, with an obstinate and pertinacious will, choose an error contrary to the faith, thereby reckoning their own doctrine superior to that of the Church. Again, Terreni returns to Jerome's Galatians commentary rather than the *Decretum* for this definition. Heretics are not simply those who beget erroneous opinions, but those who defend them pertinaciously (*pertinaciter defendunt*). Hence the person who wrongly understands some point of doctrine, yet is willing to be corrected, is not a heretic.<sup>21</sup>

In the next chapter, Terreni very clearly affirms his strict adherence to Holy Scripture as the ultimate standard in all matters of doctrine. He writes: "An opinion is heretical which expressly and

---

<sup>17</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 3, f. 3v.

<sup>18</sup> BENJAMIN Z. KEDAR, "Canon Law and the Burning of the Talmud," *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law* 9 (1979), pp. 79-82.

<sup>19</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 3, f. 3v.

<sup>20</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 3, f. 3v.

<sup>21</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 3, f. 3v-4r.

evidently stands opposed to Holy Scripture, such that it runs contrary to the express text of the Old or New Testament. For this canonical and Catholic Scripture is of the most eminent authority. ... Hence the canonical Scripture contains nothing but the truth. ... It is not licit to say that doctors of the holy books uttered a falsehood, nor is it licit to doubt Holy Scripture, inasmuch as it speaks the truth.”<sup>22</sup> Following the classic text, Wisdom 7:26, Terreni affirms that Scripture is the radiance of the eternal light and the mirror without taint or fault. Consequently, someone who pertinaciously holds an opinion contrary to Scripture stands opposed to divine truth itself.<sup>23</sup>

### III. THE RANGE OF SCRIPTURAL TRUTH

Having established the absolute authority of Scripture, Terreni must probe more deeply into the ways in which the truth is revealed therein. All heresy, as we have just seen, resolves to a contradiction of Holy Scripture. Now we must see how this would be determined. Terreni contends that there are three ways in which someone can speak in ways contrary to Scripture. First of all, there are those who would say something that runs directly (*directe*) against what is expressly (*expresse*) stated in Scripture; for instance, denying that God created heaven and earth or that Christ was conceived from the Holy Spirit. Second, one might speak against evident deductions from Scripture which cannot be reasonably contradicted, even though such a truth might not be expressly (*expresse*) written in the text. An example of this would be the fact that the opening words of Genesis state that God created heaven and earth, but does not expressly state (*exprimat*) that this occurred at the beginning of time. Yet this truth can nevertheless be proven by way of an evident and immediate deduction through some other text of Scripture. Hence to speak in this way against Scripture is the mark of a heretic. Another example

---

<sup>22</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 4, f. 4v: “Opinio etenim illa haeretica quae expresse et euidenter scripturae sacrae aduersatur, sic quod est contra expressum textum novi vel veteris testamenti. Haec enim est scriptura canonica et catholica eminentissimae auctoritatis. ... Vnde scriptura canonica nil continet nisi verum. ... Non licet dicere doctores sacrorum librorum falsum dixisse, nec de canonica scriptura licet dubitare, quantum verum dixerit.”

<sup>23</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 4, f. 4v: “Et ita quis pertinaciter contra scripturam novi vel veteris testamenti aliquid tenet est haereticus contra diuinam veritatem.”



Terreni offers pertains to the person of Christ. Although Holy Scripture does not expressly (*expresse*) state that Christ is an animal, it does clearly (*clare*) say that he is a genuine man who feels sorrow and otherwise acts as a sentient being. By rational deduction, therefore, one can conclude that Christ is an animal, since every man is an animal. Because this is an evident deduction, anyone who denies that Christ is an animal, or says that he assumed a body without a soul, is a heretic. The third and final way in which one can speak heretically against Scripture would involve matters that are “very remote, distant, hidden, and not evident: things about which even holy and Catholic men offer contrary opinions.” Now there are instances in which wise men, who agree on first principles and those things that can be deduced immediately from them, might nevertheless disagree about remote and particular conclusions. So too, then, in matters deduced from Scripture which are not obviously contrary to Scripture, otherwise holy men might differ without danger of lapsing into heresy until such time as the Church has determined in favor of one side and against the other. Indeed, we find that the saints often varied in their opinions. Many saints, for instance, said that God created the universe over the succession of six days, whereas Augustine said God created all things at once. Both sides cannot maintain the truth of Scripture in this matter, seeing as they are contrary to one another, while Scripture itself contains no such discord. One party in this debate, therefore, must have spoken contrary to Holy Scripture. Of course, we would not deem these saints heretics. Hence one will have to suspend judgment until such time as a given position is expressly and evidently (*expresse et evidenter*) censured through Holy Scripture and the Church. One is a heretic, therefore, only if one pertinaciously defends what has clearly been shown to be an error.<sup>24</sup> It must be emphasized that Terreni connects all heresy to the refutation of Scripture. Thus even the third category of remote and hidden truths are nevertheless scriptural truths which merely require ample time to resolve fully. The Church will render the authoritative definition, but it will always be a decision rendered regarding the truth as it is revealed in Scripture however obscurely at times.

Terreni then goes on to demonstrate how an opinion can be proven heretical which is opposed to an article of faith. Right away, though, he binds the articles of faith to Scripture. “An error contrary

---

<sup>24</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 4, f. 4v-5r.

to the faith deviates from the right faith, and is not an error contrary to the faith except for the fact that it runs contrary to Holy Scripture, since the articles of faith come down expressly (*expresse*) from Holy Scripture.” An example of this would be the unity of God which is clearly (*clare*) derived from Deuteronomy 6:4, “Hear Israel, the Lord your God is one,” and various other passages of the Old and New Testaments. Likewise, the article concerning the Trinity is clearly revealed (*clare patet*) in the different Gospel passages.<sup>25</sup> Such passages can then be cited against the heretics. For example, Christ’s words, “I and the Father are one” (John 10:30) can be used to refute the Arians, since it affirms unity of substance while still maintaining the plurality of persons. Terreni finds a great deal of testimony to support Christ’s divine sonship, all of which “expressly and evidently proceeds from Holy Scripture.” He will move methodically through the entire Nicene Creed, citing passage after passage in defense of each article, all of which are “expressly drawn from Holy Scripture.” And all of this leads to the conclusion that those who contradict the articles of faith are thereby contradicting Scripture. Shoring up the connection between Holy Scripture and the Catholic faith, Terreni appeals to Augustine (*De doc. chr.* 1.37.41) where the saint had remarked that the very faith of the Church will totter if the authority of Scripture should ever waver. The creeds still serve an important function, however, in that they present a concise extract from Holy Scripture, thereby pulling together in a few sentences what is necessary for faith. The point is that the creeds are really nothing but a distillation of scriptural truth. The articles of faith are the truths of Scripture in compendious form; a creed is not an addition to Holy Scripture. That is precisely why Terreni can say that to contradict the articles of faith listed in the Creed is to stand in opposition to Holy Scripture itself the very source of those articles.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 5, f. 5r: “... qui error contra fidem deuiat a recta fide, nec est error contra fidem quin sit contra scripturam sanctam eo quod articuli fidei descendunt ex scriptura sancta expresse.”

<sup>26</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 5, f. 5r-6r. See f. 6r: “Igitur carnis resurrectio ad vitam aeternam et caeteri fidei articuli contenti in symbolo Apostolorum expresse trahunt de sacra scriptura, quare qui expresse seu propinqua et evidenti deductione dicunt contra articulos fidei dicunt contra sacram scripturam consimiliter: vnde Augustinus ... Titubat fides si sacrarum scripturarum vacillet auctoritas. Nec tamen, inutile fuit, immo multum expediens et vtile fuit habere symbolum fidei extractum de scriptura sacra in quo sub certis breuibisque sententiis et articulis necessaria ad fidem continentur.”

## IV THE COUNCILS AND THE FATHERS

From the creeds, Terreni moves on to the teaching of the general councils as affirmed by the apostolic see. Of prime importance are the first four ecumenical councils: Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, all of which proclaimed right doctrine in keeping with Holy Scripture and condemned heretics who maintained the contrary. Once more we see that Scripture takes precedence as Terreni contends that the Council of Nicea condemned Arius “because his aforementioned error is opposed to Holy Scripture.” Rather than appealing to the fathers, however, Terreni makes the case for Christ’s full divinity based solely upon the Scriptures. The point is to prove that the Council of Nicea is in complete conformity with Holy Scripture. Indeed, according to Terreni, the Arian heresy was condemned based upon the express witness of Holy Scripture and the evident deductions drawn from it. He continues down the list of councils, confirming their censure of various heretics from the testimony of Holy Scripture as he goes. The authority of the councils is thereby upheld by their steadfast adherence to the biblical witness which is clearly sufficient to defeat everyone from Arius to Nestorius.<sup>27</sup> It is interesting to note that Terreni nowhere commends the authority of the councils by an appeal to their divine inspiration and operation under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The key, for Terreni, is that they correctly applied the teachings of Holy Scripture. Like the articles of faith which they produced, their authority is based entirely on their adherence to Scripture.

The special inspiration of the fathers was widely accepted throughout the Middle Ages and Terreni never denies it, but as we will see below he appears to a little wary of exalting the fathers if that might compromise the absolute authority of Scripture. Terreni writes: “Although the writings of the holy doctors which fall outside of the canon of the Bible should be examined and read, and received with due reverence, they are nevertheless not of such firm authority and inviolability that one would not be permitted to contradict them or raise doubts concerning them. Such is the case with those statements which are not proven expressly and evidently through Holy Scripture,

---

<sup>27</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 6, f. 6v: “... eius errorem damnat vt haereticum, synodus Nicena, quia dictus error aduersatur scripturae sacrae ...” See 7r: “... et Nicena synodus conformis per omnia sacrae scripturae ... Merito ergo Arii damnatur impietas et comprobatur Nicenae synodi auctoritas per ecclesiam expressis sacrae scripturae testimoniis et euidentibus deductionibus confirmata.”

nor confirmed, nor authorized through the Church, and so determined to contain the steadfast and certain truth. Hence the opinion of heretics cannot positively be refuted through the statements of the saints which remain outside of the biblical canon. For where there is no infallible truth, there can be no steadfast and certain faith, since a steadfast faith depends upon the infallible truth. Yet there is no infallible assent with regard to these writings, nor any certain and steadfast adherence. And so, because there is no certain and infallible truth, there is no steadfast and certain faith, which means that assent in these instances will always be coupled with doubt and the fear of falsehood.”<sup>28</sup>

Unlike the patristic writings, however, Holy Scripture does indeed contain the infallible truth, and does so in everyone of its parts, such that one may firmly believe in it with a steadfast faith. Terreni calls upon Augustine’s own admission of error and his desire to be corrected. He made it very clear that he did not want his own works to rival the authority of Holy Scripture. The saint speaks humbly, says Terreni, but truthfully. Here again, Terreni recounts the various instances in which the holy doctors have been at odds with each other when only one could be right. “The statements of the saints, therefore, do not rest upon infallible truth when they contradict one another, since one side is necessarily false.”<sup>29</sup> Here too Terreni cites Augustine’s famous remark to Jerome that the canonical Scriptures take precedence over all other writings and, free as they are from all error, any apparent contradiction must be the result of faulty texts or one’s own incomprehension.<sup>30</sup> Terreni concludes that, although the sayings of those saints listed in the canon *Sancta Romana* (D. 15, c. 3) are read and accepted in the

---

<sup>28</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 7, f. 7v: “Quamuis autem sanctorum doctorum scripta extra canonem Bibliae sint tractanda, et legenda, et cum debita reuerentia suscipienda, non tamen sunt sicut summae auctoritatis et inuioabilitatis, quin liceat eis contradicere, et circa eu dubitare: vbi per scripturam sanctam euidenter et expresse non probantur, nec firmantur, nec per ecclesiam auctorizantur, ac determinantur: firmam veritatem et indubiam continere: vnde per dicta sanctorum extra canonem Bibliae praecise non conuinceretur opinio haeretica. Nam vbi non est infallibilis veritas, ibi non est fides certa et indubia, cum certa fides veritati infallibili innitatur, immo circa talia non est assensus infallibilis, nec indubius, nec adhaesio firma. Ex quo enim non est certa et infallibilis veritas, ibi non ets fides certa et indubia, et semper assentitur cum dubio et cum formidine falsi.”

<sup>29</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 7, f. 8r: “Igitur dicta sanctorum non innituntur infallibili veritati quum sibi contradicunt, quorum vna pars necessario est falsa.”

<sup>30</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 7, f. 8r. See Augustine, *Ep.* 82.1; PL 33:277.

Church, they are still not on a par with Holy Scripture or the Four Councils, neither of which may be contradicted.<sup>31</sup>

Terreni then turns to the authority of the papacy a topic we will return to when taking up the question of papal infallibility. Here Terreni notes that while it is not permissible to contradict what has been determined by the apostolic see and commanded to be held by all the faithful since one must obey God and Holy Mother Church not everything held in the Church is of such an obligatory nature that one would be condemned as a heretic for failure of observation. This is because the Church contains truths of varying magnitude. There are some things that are wholly necessary and must be believed as a matter of faith, such as those which are in Scripture, or deduced expressly from it, and the articles of faith. One may not doubt such things, since doubt here amounts to infidelity. Yet the Church holds other things that need not necessarily to be believed as matters of faith, even as they are quite likely and are in keeping with the statements of the saints. For instance, Pope Innocent III's decree regarding Baptism, *Maiores*, left open for discussion among the masters the precise effect of the sacrament upon children. Thus one could have disagreed with the decree without fear of condemnation up until the time of the promulgation of the *Clementines* that collection of decrees and decretals issued by Pope Clement V in 1314. Another question concerns the sort of bread used in the Mass and at the Last Supper. The Roman Church reckons it more probable that Christ consecrated the host from unleavened bread, but she does not condemn the Greeks for their use of the leavened. Even the form used by the Roman Church for the ordination of a priest ("Accept the Holy Spirit ...") is not observed by many churches, nor are they condemned on that account. Terreni says that he could come up with many more examples of this sort were he not concerned to keep things brief. On the other hand, the Church holds as an immutable truth, and determines as a matter of faith—as she did at the Second Council of Lyons in 1274 that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son as from one principle, thereby condemning as heretics those who assert the contrary. So too did the Council of Vienne in 1312 determine as a matter of faith (against Peter John Olivi) that the

---

<sup>31</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 7, f. 8v: "Vnde quamuis dicta sanctorum numerata in decretis xv. dist. in ecclesia leguntur, et recipiuntur: non tamen sic vt scriptura sacra aut quatuor concilia quibus non licet contradicere ..." See D. 15, c. 3; Friedberg 1:36-41.

rational soul is the form of the human body. Hence this statement must be observed by all, opposition to which is heretical.<sup>32</sup>

We have seen that Terreni believes that pertinacious error in one article of faith undermines the whole edifice thereby rendering someone a heretic. In this vein, he will then make the point that a person who errs with regard to one article of faith loses the entire infused habit of faith. This is because error in one article means the loss of the certitude of truth, not only as it concerns that one article, but all the others that one must believe. Terreni ties this principle directly to the authority of Scripture: to question one article of faith is to call the veracity of Holy Scripture itself into question. And yet, as Augustine stated, even one error renders the whole authority of Scripture suspect. If it is found to be false in one place, there is no reason to trust that it is true anywhere else. Thus, says Terreni, if someone errs pertinaciously in one article of faith, he is really saying that Holy Scripture and the judgment of the Church are false. For example, the person who claims that Christ was not born of the Virgin Mary is actually saying that Scripture and the Church speak falsely when they call Mary the mother of Jesus. Consequently, there can be no certitude of truth in this case, since one cannot infallibly hold to Scripture and the Church's judgment anymore. One will no longer believe that Scripture wholly contains the infallible truth; and it is at this point that the faith itself will begin to collapse.<sup>33</sup>

## V. REFUTATION OF THE EASTERN CHURCH

Having laid out his general guidelines for determining the standards of heresy, Terreni proceeds to devote the bulk of this work to the refutation of specific heresies. We will only examine a few, such as the Franciscan Joachite problem. First, though, it will be instructive to look at Terreni's response to the (so called) Greek heresies, since this should provide greater insight to his theory of doctrinal development. For here Terreni must justify Latin doctrines and

---

<sup>32</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 8, f. 8v-9r. For Innocent III's *Maiores* see *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, ed. H. Denzinger and A. Schönmetzer (Rome: 1976), p. 780; *Greg. IX Decr.* L. 3, t. 42, c. 3; Friedberg 2:644. For the Second Council of Lyons see Denzinger, 850. For the statement against Olivi see Denzinger, 902. See also *Liber Clementinarum* L. 3, t. 15, c. 1; Friedberg 2:1174.

<sup>33</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 9, f. 9r.

practices which the Greeks regard as corruptions of the ancient faith. The first “error of the Greeks,” not surprisingly, concerns the double procession of the Holy Spirit. The Greeks offer some formidable arguments for the fact that the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone. As far as Terreni is concerned, however, they all amount to errors. First of all, they turn to Scripture where Christ said, “I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth who comes from the Father ...” (Jn 15:26). There are also the first four ecumenical councils which all speak of the Spirit’s procession from the Father with no mention of the Son. And then, says Terreni, they attempt to bolster their error by pointing out that Pope Leo III himself had the unaltered version of the Nicene Creed inscribed upon a silver tablet. What is more, the council declared that the Creed must not be contradicted upon pain of anathema. Much of this material had been presented by Peter Lombard in his *Sentences* (1.11) and was later rehearsed in the many commentaries on this work throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

At all events, Terreni complains that it is for these reasons that the Greeks reckon Latins accursed for teaching the double procession. This may seem like a pretty strong case, but not in Terreni’s eyes. For, in fact, the Greek position is “an error expressly opposed to the determination of the apostolic see and the Holy Roman Church, which does not err in matters of faith.” Terreni declares his confidence that Christ’s prayer for the papacy and the Roman Church will ultimately confirm the truth about the Trinity. For the Lord had assured Peter that his faith would not fail (Luke 22:32).<sup>34</sup> The Roman Church remains forever immaculate. The Lord has provided that Peter and his successors would remain steadfast in the future, firmly persisting against the assaults of heresy.<sup>35</sup> Terreni makes it very clear that, because the apostolic see and the Roman Church approve the *filioque* clause, so it must be maintained. In this matter, therefore, the Greeks “prove themselves through their malevolent ignorance to be heretics

---

<sup>34</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Graecorum)* ch. 1, f. 19r: “Hic error expresse aduersatur determinationem sedis apostolicae et sanctae Romanae ecclesiae quae in his quae fidei sunt non errat, ne deficit Christo orante ... Ipse enim pro fide sedis apostolicae et Romanae ecclesiae in Petro ait Lucae xxii. Rogavi pro te ...”

<sup>35</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus generatim)* ch. 3, f. 3v: “Determinatio etiam dubiorum emergentium circa fidem maxime pertinet ad Christi vicarium summum pontificem Petri successorem cui per se et suis successoribus dominus ait Luc. xxii ... Item sancta Romana ecclesia quae semper immaculata permansit domino providente et beato Petro opem ferente in futuro permanibit ...”

rather than Catholics, since they do not believe that the One, Holy, and Catholic Church speaks the truth in this matter.” Yet this is the very Church which, by divine providence, remains forever immaculate, founded upon the unshakeable foundation of Christ and Peter’s true confession of faith. Against this Church the gates of hell, which is to say the heretics, will never prevail (Matt 16:19).<sup>36</sup>

Terreni does not rest his case on a bare assertion of Roman authority, however, for he devotes the rest of the chapter to proving that the Roman position is correct. After all, the point is that the apostolic see and the Roman Church have received the unique capacity to perceive scriptural truth and pronounce upon it infallibly. Hence Terreni turns immediately to Holy Scripture. When, for instance, Christ speaks of the Spirit of truth (Jn 15:26) this must refer to the Spirit of the Son who says of himself, “I am the truth” (Jn 14:6). Paul too speaks of the Spirit of the Son (Rom 8:9; Gal 4:6). The very phrase ‘Spirit of the Son’ cannot be taken as a genitive of possession any more than ‘Spirit of the Father.’ Rather, says Terreni, it denotes the fact that the Son, like the Father, is the principle of the Spirit and thus the one from whom he proceeds. Here Terreni enlists various Greek patristic sources to back up his claim that ‘Spirit of truth’ implies ‘Spirit of the Son’ who is himself the Truth. None of this should be seen to undermine the essential unity of the Trinity, however, as though there were two principles within the Godhead. Following the formulation of the Second Council of Lyons (1274), Terreni affirms that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son as from one principle (*tamquam ab uno principio*), because in producing the Holy Spirit the Father and Son are one, as Christ himself says (Jn 10:30). Apart from the properties of unbegottenness and begottenness, which are unique to the Father and Son respectively, the Son shares in all that the Father possesses including the capacity to spirate the Holy Spirit.<sup>37</sup>

Thus, in response to the various Greek arguments, Terreni argues that one must allow for the meaning implicit within the authoritative texts. One is not always confined to what is explicitly stated. As such,

---

<sup>36</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Graecorum)* ch. 1, f. 19v: “Igitur quia confessionem huius veritatis, scilicet quod spiritus sanctus procedit a patre et filio sedes apostolica et ecclesia Romana approbat et edocet tenendam: patet Graecos qui in hoc non culpant se probant maliuolos imperitos non catholicos, sed haereticos: non credentes vnam sanctam catholicam ecclesiam in hoc dicere veritatem: quae vt dicitur in dicto ca. semper immaculata, domino prouidente ...”

<sup>37</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Graecorum)* ch. 1, f. 19v-20r. For Lyons II, see DENZINGER, p. 850.



he contends that the biblical passages the Greeks cite should be read so as to include the Son with the action of the Father. Likewise, in the Creed, when one confesses belief in God the Father, creator of heaven and earth, this surely does not exclude the Son and the Holy Spirit from the action and omnipotence of the creator, even though the Father is the only one of the persons specifically mentioned (*exprimitur*) in this clause. The Father is spoken of here insofar as he is the origin of authority which the Son has from the Father, the person from whom the Son is creator along with the Holy Spirit. Terreni then applies this same principle to the procession of the Spirit. Speaking of the Father's primacy within the Godhead does not detract from the Son's role in the production of the Spirit. As for the fact that the Nicene council pronounced an anathema upon those who teach otherwise, Terreni appeals to the argument that the fathers were only referring to those who would teach something contrary (*aliud quod id est contrarium*). Yet if the Latin position is correctly understood, one will see that it is not contrary to the Creed. Here Terreni follows the usual course by citing the example from Galatians where Paul anathematized 'another gospel' by which he too meant something contrary (Gal 1:8). Hence the Latin Church was merely rendering explicit the truth that was otherwise implicit in the Creed; there is no opposition, nor even addition. One does not teach some other doctrine, says Terreni, when one explicates the implicit truth through a process of elucidation.<sup>38</sup>

It should be noted that in a quodlibet concerning usury Terreni had also treated the double procession of the Holy Spirit as an example of legitimate exegetical deduction. Here he points out that truth can be proven through divine law (*per ius divinum*) in two ways. The first is through express authority (*per expressam auctoritatem*), as in the fact that there is one God, "Hear Israel, the Lord your God is one" (Deut 6:4). The second way is not through such express authority, but rather through a deduction drawn from Scripture (*per scripturae deductionem*). An example of this, says Terreni, is the double procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and from the Son. There is no express authority which states this fact precisely. Nevertheless, it can

---

<sup>38</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Graecorum)* ch. 1, f. 20r: "Vnde cum dicitur quod spiritus sanctus qui a patre procedit intelligatur procedere a filio non docetur aliud sed implicitum explicatur ... Non ergo docet aliud qui implicata explicando elucidat ... Igitur fideles Romanae et catholicae ecclesiae sancti patres elucidantes hanc veritatem ..."

be deduced from Scripture which does speak of the Spirit of the Son (Gal 4:6). Given this relationship between the two Persons, therefore, it is reasonable to deduce that the Spirit is indeed from the Son.<sup>39</sup>

We have seen that Terreni did not reckon the Greek use of leavened bread in the Eucharist heretical, since this was a matter around which there could be some discussion and disagreement. Here, then, it is the Greeks who charge the Latins with heresy as they claim that the host cannot be consecrated from unleavened bread. They base their argument on the Gospel of John (13:1), claiming that the Last Supper was celebrated prior to Passover when the Jews would still have been using the regular leavened bread. Terreni, however, quickly turns this dispute too into an attack on Roman indefectibility. The Greeks “condemn the See of Peter and the Roman Church” for adoring a host in which the body of Christ does not exist, thereby charging them with idolatry and thus heresy. Of course, to believe this about the Holy Mother Roman Church is itself a heresy, says Terreni, since it violates the very words of the Creed: “I believe in One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.” What is more, this error debilitates the efficacy of Christ’s own words which are capable of transforming the substance of wheaten bread into the true body of Christ. The power of these words cannot be impeded by the accidents of the bread, whether they be leavened or unleavened, since their efficacy is directed at the substance of the bread which is transubstantiated into Christ’s body, not the remaining accidents. Hence Christ’s words must be effective for transubstantiating the bread, no matter whether leavened or unleavened. And with recourse to the biblical text itself, Terreni notes that when the Gospel records this event it simply states that Christ took bread in his hands; it does not specify whether it was leavened or unleavened. Indeed, it is of no consequence what sort of bread it was in order for the transubstantiation to have taken place.<sup>40</sup>

For Terreni this is ultimately a matter of scriptural veracity. The Greeks lapse into heresy when they contradict “the evangelical truth” by insisting that Christ did not consecrate from the unleavened bread.

---

<sup>39</sup> Quodlibet 6.12, “Utrum punicio usare de iure diuino pertineat ad iudicem ecclesiasticum,” edited in Pier Giorgio Marcuzzi, “Una Soluzione Teologico-Giuridica al Problema dell’Usura in Una Questione *De Quolibet* Inedita di Guido Terreni (1260-1342),” *Salesianum* 41 (1979): 647-84, at p. 661: “... ut quod Spiritus Sanctus procedat a Filio expresse auctoritate non probatur; que dicat Spiritum procedere a Filio; tamen per reductionem Scripture, probando quia dicitur Spiritus Filii, igitur habitudo alicui est inter Filium et Spiritum Sanctum, igitur Spiritus a Filio.”

<sup>40</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Graecorum)* ch. 2, f. 20r.

For the Gospel plainly states (*plane dicit*) that Christ consecrated the host on the night that the Jews were not permitted leavened bread (Matt 26:17). Here Terreni will go into some detail to prove from Scripture that the bread was indeed unleavened for the sake of the Passover. The Gospel of Matthew makes it clear (*clare patet*) that Christ confected his body from unleavened bread precisely because it was unlawful to eat the leavened at this time. The Gospels of Mark and Luke make the very same point (Mk 14:12; Lk 22:7). Hence the Greeks are simply not speaking the truth. They are making erroneous assertions based upon a misreading of the texts. First of all, says Terreni, they bypass the three synoptic Gospels in order to make their case from the Gospel of John. Even this is misguided, since there is no way that John could actually disagree with the others. "There is no conflict in the teaching of evangelical truth, since the Evangelists are in complete accord." What is more, the Greeks have even misunderstood the Gospel of John. When the Evangelist said that it was before the day of Passover (Jn 13:1) he meant it was the day before the evening when Christ was going to celebrate the Passover, since the Jews count the day from evening until evening. Thus Christ would have been eating the Passover meal that night with unleavened bread. Terreni can only lament "the blind error" of the Greeks, hoping that "they might return to the light of truth and believe the evangelical doctrine that Christ confected from unleavened bread. And so might they also return to the Holy Roman Church which confects the true body of Christ from the unleavened bread. Yet she still does not condemn the Greeks in this matter, since she certainly concedes to them the right to confect the body of Christ from leavened bread."<sup>41</sup>

As one has already realized, a major issue between East and West is going to be that of papal primacy and authority. And, needless to say, Terreni finds the Greeks to be in error for saying that the Roman Church does not possess such primacy; that the patriarchs are not subject to her; and that what the pope does without the consent of the Greek patriarchs is without force. Terreni reckons, in fact, this error contains both schism and heresy. The Greeks are even worse than those who crucified Christ, for at least they did not rend his tunic (Jn

---

<sup>41</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Graecorum)* ch. 2, f. 21v: "Graeci ergo erroris caecitate percussi redeant ad lucem veritatis, et credant euangelicae doctrinae quod Chritus confecit ex pane azimo, et redeant ad sanctam Romam ecclesiam quae verum corpus Christi ex pane azimo confecit; nec Graecos damnat in hoc, immo concedit eis ex pane fermentato corpus Christi conficere."

19:24), whereas the Greek schismatics tear apart the very body of Christ which is the Church. Beyond this schism, however, they posit a manifest heresy, since they violate the basic teaching that Christ founded only one Church (Matt 16:18) and has only one bride (Song 4). They also proceed against fundamental order whereby the many factions ought to be subject to one leader (cf. Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 1076a), just as the many members of the Universal Church are subject to one head (Eph 4:15). It is for this very reason that Christ chose Peter and gave him the keys, so that he might preside over the whole Church and would surpass all others in power and primacy (Matt 16:18-19). At all events, Terreni runs through many biblical arguments for Petrine primacy, drawing on other classic passages such as Lk 22:32 and John 21:17. The point is that to deny primacy to the seat of Peter and the Roman Church is heretical because it is tantamount to saying that Peter was not really the head of the apostles and all the faithful. Moreover this is to deny that the Church as the bride of Christ is not one entity, nor subject to one head. It is all heretical, therefore, precisely because it is contrary to Holy Scripture (*contra sacram scripturam*).<sup>42</sup> These are only three Greek errors; Terreni lists twenty six in all, ranging from questions of purgatory to matrimony to dietary restrictions.

## VI. HERETICS IN THE WEST: WALDENSIANS AND APOSTOLIC BRETHERN

Closer to home, Terreni has to reckon with the claims of various dissenting groups who claim to represent the true Church amidst Roman apostasy. This means that Terreni must not simply reaffirm the power of the Church and papacy; he must prove that the very records of the apostolic Church, namely the New Testament, bear witness to the ongoing authority of Rome and the Roman pontiff. Training his sights on the Waldensians, Terreni notes that their first error is a refusal to submit to the papacy and the other Roman prelates. Hence they err in their denial that the Roman Church is the head of all the faithful (*caput omnium fidelium*).<sup>43</sup> That they do not recognize the authority of the decretals and constitutions of the pope, nor the decrees of the fathers, amounts to a denial that the apostolic see is the head of the Church with the power to bind and loose. All such opinions must be false for the very good reason that they are contrary to the

---

<sup>42</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Graecorum)* ch. 3, f. 21r-21v.

<sup>43</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Valdensium)* ch. 1, f. 79r.

Holy Gospel (*contra sanctum evangelium*).<sup>44</sup> Here we see that Terreni is not attempting to outline a theory of development so much as he is trying to affirm a direct connection to the apostolic era. Roman authority and primacy is a product of the New Testament.

Terreni faces a similar set of problems with the sect known as the Apostolic Brethren, whom he labels instead the Pseudoapostles. They were founded around 1260 by Gerard Segarelli of Parma who was later arrested and executed in the year 1300. First of all, says Terreni, this group claims that all the authority which Christ had bestowed upon the Roman Church has been forfeited due to the wickedness of her prelates. Hence the Roman Church is no longer even the Church of God, but is instead the great whore of Babylon, having apostatized from the faith of Christ. For Terreni, however, this is once more a matter of scriptural authority. These presumptuous heretics, he says, are bringing false charges against Holy Scripture itself which testifies to the fact that the authority of the Church will abide forever. The fullness of authority resides in the seat of Peter and his successors. Again, this is because Christ has built his Church upon the solid foundation such that she will withstand all the assaults of the heretics (Matt 16:18-19). This is not to say that Terreni harbors any illusions regarding the sanctity of all those counted in her ranks. He freely admits that the Church at present is a mixed body. But she will nevertheless endure despite the presence of those evil members who will finally be separated out on the judgment day. "The Church, the seat of Peter, which is the Roman Church, will remain the Church of God until the end of the age." Hardly the whore of Babylon, as the heretics slander her, she is the bride of Christ founded upon Peter's steadfast confession of faith (Matt 16:18).<sup>45</sup> Terreni consistently hearkens back to these central passages in the New Testament and thus to the irrevocable promises of Christ himself. He cedes no ground to those who claim the apostolic mantle for themselves. No, indeed, for the Roman Church is herself the Church of the apostles.

In keeping with their basic position outlined above, this sect of the Apostolic Brethren claims that the power which God gave to the primitive Church (*ecclesia primitiva*) has been transferred to them such that they now possess a power equal to that of Peter and the apostles, since they alone maintain the apostolic life of perfection and poverty. In response, Terreni points out that there is really no way that

---

<sup>44</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Valdensium)* ch. 4, f. 82v-83r.

<sup>45</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Pseudoapostolorum)* ch. 1, f. 89r-90r.

these sectarians can prove their claim that this transference has occurred. Actually, their perfect status is belied by the very fact that they refuse obedience to the Roman Church and the successors of Peter. For Christ's true sheep would surely heed the voice of the shepherd (Peter) whom the Lord has set over them. And in a decisive blow to their very *raison d'être*, Terreni contends that merely imitating the apostles' manner of life does not necessarily amount to reproducing their power and authority. Many believers gave up all they had, but they did not thereby succeed to equal authority with the apostles (Acts 4:32).<sup>46</sup> Here again we see that, for Terreni, the very structure of the Roman Church and its allotment of authority had already been set in place during the apostolic epoch—the very epoch that the heretics call their own. And Terreni need look no further than the New Testament to prove his point.

True to their call of apostolic imitation, the Brethren contend that the Roman pontiff cannot absolve anyone unless he himself is as holy as Saint Peter, and thus as poor and humble. Such claims, Terreni observes, resemble those of the Waldensians. Yet they only serve to denigrate the power of Christ who bestowed this power upon the successors of Peter. With lack of worldliness as their touchstone, this sect has rejected the legitimacy of the papacy since the time when Sylvester accepted the Donation of Constantine. They only make an exception for the poor hermit Pietro del Morrone who briefly held the papal office in 1294 as Pope Celestine V. Yet Terreni finds a fundamental inconsistency in their position. The Brethren still call Celestine a poor man despite the fact that when he was pope he lived among the riches that he possessed in the name of the Church. If they can allow for this, says Terreni, then there is no reason to dismiss the other holy popes who also loved Christ even as they did not relinquish the riches that the Church holds in common. In fact, these popes had worthily administered the Church's common wealth. Like Celestine, therefore, they do not fall from sanctity or perfection, since they too are poor men in spirit to whom belongs the kingdom of God (Matt 5:3).<sup>47</sup> In the end, Terreni chalks up the Apostolic Brethren's many heresies and errors to the affection they feel for Joachim of Fiore and Peter John Olivi, whom he will then deal with at length in the following book.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Pseudoapostolorum)* ch. 2, f. 90r-90v.

<sup>47</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Pseudoapostolorum)* ch. 3, f. 90v-91r.

<sup>48</sup> For the Apostolic Brethren and their adaptation of Joachite ideas see MALCOLM LAMBERT, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation* (Oxford: 1992), pp. 202-203.

## VII. THE SPIRITUAL FRANCISCANS

Working as he did during the tumultuous years surrounding the pontificate of John XXII, Terreni considered the refutation of the Spiritual Franciscans to be a mainstay of his mission. Turley believes that his early training at the feet of the secular master Godfrey of Fontaines, in addition to the influence of Dominican thought, had combined to make Terreni deeply suspicious of Franciscan ideas on apostolic poverty, especially given what their ideas of perfection would mean for the rest of the Church.<sup>49</sup> In the first few decades of the fourteenth century, the Spirituals were relying heavily upon Peter John Olivi's Apocalypse commentary in support of their refusal to obey the established Church. And it was around the year 1319 that Terreni, along with the Dominican Pierre de Palu, censured a Catalan writing that was redolent of Olivi's work.<sup>50</sup>

Here in the *Summa de haeresibus*, Terreni begins his attack on the Spiritual Franciscans by pointing out that the Roman Church has repeatedly condemned the many blasphemies and fables told by Joachim of Fiore and Peter John Olivi as heretical and contrary to the true faith, devoid of reason, and—perhaps most importantly—opposed to the authority of Scripture. Terreni ran through Joachim's three *status* and three *ordines*. The third and final order, that of the monks, began with Benedict and started to bear fruit in the time of Joachim. Then, says Terreni, Peter John Olivi established the connection to the Franciscans in his Apocalypse commentary, except that he claimed that the third spiritual state began with Francis of Assisi. Terreni locates many errors within this scheme, starting with the fact that it is simply wrong to say that people of the Old Testament were only living according to flesh; some were indeed spiritual. We will not go over all of his examples, but suffice it to say that Terreni rejects such an historical arrangement as contrary to Scripture (*contra scripturam*) and heretical, since it would thereby condemn all the saints and prophets of the Old Testament. Likewise, the Joachites err in their claim that men of the third state will not live according to the flesh, but only in the spirit. This too is heretical, since there is no state within

---

<sup>49</sup> THOMAS TURLEY, "Ab Apostolorum Temporibus: The Primitive Church in the Ecclesiology of Three Medieval Carmelites," in *Studia in honorem Alphonsi M. Stickler*, ed. Rosalio Castillo Lara (Rome: 1992), pp. 559-80, at pp. 568-74.

<sup>50</sup> DAVID BURR, *The Spiritual Franciscans: From Protest to Persecution in the Century after Saint Francis* (University Park, PA: 2001), pp. 207-09.

this present age that is free from the demands of the flesh. And once more, Terreni marshals a whole host of biblical texts to prove his point.<sup>51</sup> Terreni's analysis may amount to a caricature of Joachim's actual teachings, since the abbot believed that the three *status* overlapped one another; but the point is clear: the whole scheme is opposed to the true biblical witness.

Terreni, the Carmelite friar, was clearly irked by what he regarded as "the presumptuous and heretical" claims put forward by Olivi whereby this band of Franciscans could call themselves the true spiritual men (*virī spirituales*). He accuses them of preferring the life of their own order to that of Christ and the apostles a preference which is itself contrary to the truth of the faith (*contra veritatem fidei*). By claiming that the true spiritual life began with St Francis, by calling themselves the true spiritual men, they are setting themselves above even the apostles. Many passages from the New Testament are thus invoked to demonstrate the spiritual eminence of the apostles who lived in the humility and charity which the Franciscans now claim for themselves.<sup>52</sup> Likewise, their contention that the third state will usher in a law of liberty proves to be heretical, since it denigrates Christ's own gospel by implying that it was not itself a gospel of freedom. This is clearly a heresy that runs contrary to apostolic teaching (*contra doctrinam apostolorum*).<sup>53</sup> Terreni will test all their claims against the exemplar of the apostolic age.

The arrogance of these Franciscans shines through as they contend that the apostles had only preached the gospel according to the literal sense (*secundum literam*) rather than the spiritual understanding (*secundum spiritualem intellectum*) which would arrive with these men of the third state. Such a claim is obviously a further denigration of the apostolic age and one that Terreni believes to be refuted by Scripture. The New Testament texts make it clear that apostolic preaching had been informed by the mysteries revealed in the primitive Church through the Holy Spirit.<sup>54</sup> Echoing the words of

---

<sup>51</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Abbatis Ioachim et Petri Ioannis)* ch. 1, f. 94v-95r.

<sup>52</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Abbatis Ioachim et Petri Ioannis)* ch. 1, f. 95v-96r.

<sup>53</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Abbatis Ioachim et Petri Ioannis)* ch. 1, f. 98r.

<sup>54</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Abbatis Ioachim et Petri Ioannis)* ch. 1, f. 99r-100r.



their nemesis, Pope John XXII, Terreni observes that while these Franciscans claim to follow the apostles, they have shown no such poverty of spirit as exhibited through obedience and humility. The apostles counseled obedience to one's superiors, but Joachim and Olivi have proudly withdrawn their obedience from Holy Mother Church. For Terreni, the very fact that the Spiritual Franciscans refuse obedience to John XXII is direct evidence that they are not truly spiritual men, since obedience is a sign of the genuine spiritual life.<sup>55</sup>

Terreni then goes on to reject as heretical the notion that the clerical order will come to an end in the third state, for that would also mean the end of the sacraments which are the unique province of clerics not monks and friars minor. Once more, Terreni has recourse to the most primitive record: the New Testament itself. We have seen that he traced all the sacraments directly back to Christ, thereby ensuring their absolute and enduring validity. Here, in defense of the present clerical order, Terreni points out that Christ had specifically instituted the episcopacy and priesthood with his commission of apostles and disciples (Matt 28:19). It is for priests to administer the sacraments, not monks, and not even friars except by papal dispensation. The sacramental life depends, therefore, upon the diocesan clerical order. To claim that the sacraments would cease within the Church militant is nothing less than heresy. Christ himself has promised to remain with the priesthood until the end of the age (Matt 28:20); it cannot pass away. What is more, says Terreni, Olivi was simply wrong in his prediction that the order of clerics would cease in 1300, for here we are in 1342 and the priesthood still abides.<sup>56</sup> What we see here is that Terreni, himself a friar, is accusing the Spiritual Franciscans of upsetting the divinely established *status ecclesiae*, the very charge brought against the mendicant orders by their secular opponents.<sup>57</sup>

There is another facet to Terreni's criticism, however, namely the debate between the mendicants over what constitutes evangelical perfection. Terreni is a friar himself, of course, and must defend the

---

<sup>55</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Abbatis Ioachim et Petri Ioannis)* ch. 1, f. 96v-97v. See John XXII's decretal *Quorundam* in *Extravag, Ioann. XXII* T. 14, c. 1; Friedberg 2:1220-1224.

<sup>56</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Abbatis Ioachim et Petri Ioannis)* ch. 1, f. 98r.

<sup>57</sup> The classic study is Yves Congar, 'Aspects ecclésiologiques de la querelle entre mendicants et séculars', *Archives D'Histoire Doctrinale et Littérature du Moyen Age*, 28 (1961), pp. 35-151.

legitimacy of the other mendicant orders against the claim that only Franciscan poverty achieves the Gospel ideal. Hence if the Spirituals believe that the Roman Church is carnal because she possesses wealth and holds her goods in common if this a sign of spiritual imperfection as Olivi claims then that too is heretical. Christ did indeed live a life of supreme perfection and yet he had a purse which he and the apostles used to buy necessities (Jn 13:29). And the Acts of the Apostles speaks of the early community sharing all their goods (Acts 4:32). In other words, property held in common is not an obstacle to spiritual perfection. If Christ and the apostles could live this way, then surely the Church may also hold goods in common. To exclude those who hold goods in common from the state of perfection amounts to nothing less than rendering the whole Church imperfect: from the apostles to the bishops, priests, monks, canons, and other religious orders. In fact, says Terreni, to contend that Christ possessed nothing, whether personally or in common, is a heresy that was recently condemned by Pope John XXII. That this rises to the level of heresy accords perfectly, not only with Terreni's notion of heresy as that which contradicts Scripture, but also with the papal condemnation itself. For in his 1323 bull, *Cum inter nonnullos*, John XXII proclaimed it heretical to deny that Christ and the apostles possessed any common property, since it amounts to a direct contradiction (*contradicit expresse*) of Holy Scripture.<sup>58</sup>

Finally, to accuse the Roman Church—which worships the triune God—of being the synagogue of Satan is heretical and blasphemous for the very fact that it runs against the very article of faith established in the Creed: belief in the Church herself. Despite the presence of evil members in her current state, she remains holy as she abides in the true faith. The very Church whom Christ loves and gave himself for is forever immaculate. Terreni's consistent refrain resounds: this is the Church established by Christ upon the firm foundation; it will never be succeeded by another. To say otherwise is to contradict Christ himself (*contra verba Christi*).<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Abbatis Ioachim et Petri Ioannis)* ch. 1, f. 101v. See John XXII's decretal, *Cum inter nonnullos* in *Extravag. Ioann. XXII*. T. 14, c. 4; Friedberg 2:1229-1230: "...assertionem huiusmodi pertinacem, quum scripturae sacrae, quae in plerisque locis ipsos nonnumma habuisse asserit, contradicat expresse, ipsamque scripturam sacram, per quam utique fidei orthodoxae probantur articuli, quoad praemissa fermentum aperte supponat continere mendacii ..."

<sup>59</sup> *Summa de haeresibus (De haeresibus Abbatis Ioachim et Petri Ioannis)* ch. 1, f. 102r-103r.

## VIII. THE ARGUMENT FOR PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

As we have seen above, Terreni believed that Scripture was the sole source of Christian doctrine, whether these teachings were contained therein implicitly or explicitly. Yet Terreni, an ardent defender of papal infallibility, also maintained that the pope was the final arbiter of the true meaning of Scripture, guided as he was by the Holy Spirit. Whereas Brian Tierney labeled William of Ockham an anti papal infallibilist (and a destructive one at that) he reckons Terreni a champion of pro papal infallibility.<sup>60</sup> Before turning directly to Terreni's treatise on papal infallibility, however, we will look at his comments on three key New Testament passages cited as the basis for papal authority. Commenting on John 21:17 where Christ tells Peter, "Feed my sheep," Terreni finds that this passage condemns Marsilius of Padua who had opposed the plain meaning of the text (*contra apertam sententiam*) by claiming that Christ left behind no vicar or head of the Church. Terreni, for his part, sees Christ establishing Peter as "vicar, prelate, and pastor of the Lord's entire flock." Peter is clearly the head of all the apostles and supreme pontiff over the whole Church. So too, then, is the Roman pontiff the successor of Peter, for he has his authority from Christ through Peter.<sup>61</sup> Turning to Matthew 16:18, Terreni argues that just as Christ is "shepherd of the shepherds," and then after him Peter shepherd of the Church, so Christ is the "foundation of the foundations," followed by Peter the foundation of the Church founded upon Christ.<sup>62</sup> And finally, when commenting on Luke 22:32, Terreni admits that Peter did indeed sin when he denied Christ. Yet he observes that Christ had not prayed that Peter would not deny him, but rather that his faith would not fail. Peter retained the seed of the faith within his heart even as he did not confess it with his mouth. The point is that Christ prayed for the faith of his vicar in order that he might then care for the faith of the whole Church.<sup>63</sup> This verse from the Gospel of Luke became a mainstay in Terreni's defense of papal infallibility and he devoted a considerable amount of space

---

<sup>60</sup> See BRIAN TIERNEY, *Origins of Papal Infallibility: 1150-1350* (Leiden: 1972), 238-72; and TAKASHI SHOGIMEN, "William of Ockham and Guido Terreni," *History of Political Thought* 19 (1998), 517-30.

<sup>61</sup> *Quatuor Euangelistarum quasi in vnum ordinem redactorum concordia*, ed. Johannes Seiner (Cologne: 1631), p. 1038.

<sup>62</sup> *Quatuor Euangelistarum*, p. 560.

<sup>63</sup> *Quatuor Euangelistarum*, p. 895.

to this passage in his commentary.<sup>64</sup> Some of that material can be found in the work to which we will now turn.

In his *Quaestio de magisterio infallibili Romani pontificis*, Terreni begins by asking the question whether a papal successor (with the counsel of his cardinals) can revoke, or even establish the opposite of, what his predecessor had established as a matter of faith, such that it must be firmly believed and its opposite deemed heretical. It would seem that he could, since what has been established by human beings can be erroneous, and error must be always be corrected. Thus the erroneous ruling by a former pope will have to be corrected by his successor. Furthermore, the pope can surely err in matters of faith as Peter did when he denied Christ (Matt 26:69-75) and then later when rebuked by Paul at Antioch (Gal 2:11-14). And there is also the case of Pope Anastasius who had aligned himself with the heretic Photinus. Indeed, canon law even allows for the deposition of an heretical pope (*Si Papa*, D. 40. c. 6).<sup>65</sup>

Terreni responds to these objections first by appealing to Christ's prayer that Peter's faith would not fail (Lk 22:32). He then offers an extensive recounting of Thomas Aquinas's treatment of conciliar decisions issued under papal authority (ST 2.2, q. 1, a. 10). This is noteworthy, because Thomas's objective here was not to exalt papal power so much as to secure the veracity of Church teaching. And that is really what Terreni wants to achieve as well. It is clear that, for Terreni, the notion of papal infallibility was seen as a bulwark established for the security of the Catholic faith. The papal infallibility question is always handled, therefore, within a larger ecclesial context. Indeed, Terreni contends that Christ's prayer in Luke 22:32 was for the faith of the Church. The Church is herself founded upon the solid rock of the true faith from which she will never fall away. The Church does not err with respect to the truth of the faith, or Holy Scripture, when she renders a determination concerning the Catholic faith, precisely because the Church in these instances is guided by the Holy Spirit who teaches all truth and repels all falsehood.<sup>66</sup>

The infallibility of ecclesiastical decrees is most essential when dealing with Catholic doctrines that Scripture does not explicitly address. For even as such doctrines are thoroughly scriptural, they are

---

<sup>64</sup> *Quatuor Euangelistarum*, pp. 895-901.

<sup>65</sup> *Guidonis Terreni Quaestio de magisterio infallibili Romani pontificis*, ed. B.M. Xiberta (Aschendorf: 1926), pp. 9-10.

<sup>66</sup> *Quaestio de magisterio infallibili Romani pontificis*, p. 13.

not immediately evident, and thus stand in need of further explication. And it is to the Church that one looks for such clarification. Hence Terreni insists that the Church cannot err when she renders determinations on those matters of belief which are not evidently (*evidenter*) grasped from Scripture. For if the Church could err that would leave the faithful in a constant state of doubt as to whether the Church has erred in any given instance.<sup>67</sup> Terreni is certainly not setting up the Church as a separate source of revelation divorced from Holy Scripture; rather the Church is simply performing her sacred task as the steadfast interpreter of Scripture. One must be able to depend upon her, therefore, in those instances when the meaning of the sacred text is not immediately apparent. There must be one final arbiter of scriptural truth. It is in this vein that Terreni notes that if such determinations concerning matters of faith which are not evidently (*evidenter*) grasped from Scripture were themselves mutable and revocable, then such determinations would not depend upon the infallible truth, but rather upon fallible human judgment. Yet that would destroy any certain and stable adhesion to articles of faith, since it would leave Catholics in a constant state of doubt. No stability and concord could remain in the Church. For if the first determination could be revoked as contrary to the faith by the next determination, then one could reasonably doubt the following determination and so forth.<sup>68</sup> When the Church determines a matter of faith, therefore, this decision should be believed on her authority, for one cannot have more confidence in what one believes than in the authority on account of which one believes. Yet if the Church could err then it would not seem just to obligate the faithful to believe with a firm and undoubting belief, or to expect that the Church's determination will be held with an unshakeable faith.<sup>69</sup> The Church, therefore, secures the content of the Catholic faith which is itself ultimately grounded in Holy Scripture.

---

<sup>67</sup> *Quaestio de magisterio infallibili Romani pontificis*, p. 13: "Quia in hiis que ecclesia determinat fide credenda, que evidenter ex scriptura sacra non habentur, si in hiis posset ecclesia errare, fluctuarent fideles, an ecclesia errasset vel non ..."

<sup>68</sup> *Quaestio de magisterio infallibili Romani pontificis*, pp. 13-14: "Per hanc viam fides catholica in hiis per ecclesiam determinarentur credenda que evidenter non haberentur ex scriptura, si talis determinatio mutabilis et revocabilis esset, iam non inniteretur infallibili veritati, sed humano iudicio fallibili, et sic in hiis periret certa et stabilis ac firma adhesio in hiis credendis fide, quia tunc quilibet fluctuaret dubitans, an ecclesia verum determinasset vel non."

<sup>69</sup> *Quaestio de magisterio infallibili Romani pontificis*, pp. 14-15.

There is no other authority by which the faith is confirmed apart from what the prophets and the Holy Gospel have proclaimed, and what the Roman Church teaches, since there is no more certain faith than what is found therein. And it is here, when affirming the authority of the prophets and evangelists, that Terreni draws the careful distinction between the man and the office which will prove essential for his doctrine of papal infallibility. One can rely upon the steadfast faith of the prophets. As human beings it is true that they were liable to error. Yet in matters of faith they spoke under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and thus remained inerrant. And it is by the same authority, says Terreni, that the pope and the Roman Church are also directed by the Holy Spirit to determine the truth infallibly in matters of faith. For the Holy Spirit would never permit the pope, or the Church, to err in these instances. Indeed, Christ the inerrant Truth is present whenever the pope meets with the college of cardinals, or with a general council gathered in the Lord's name for the sake of his faith. At such moments one can be sure that the pope will be directed by the Holy Spirit who will be speaking through him.<sup>70</sup>

For Terreni, as we have seen, the Church's determination of true doctrine will always rest upon Holy Scripture. Thus it is essential that the texts of Scripture itself also be proven infallible. In this vein, Terreni contends that it is by the authority of the Church that the books of the biblical canon are confirmed. It was through the Church that the books of the Bible were admitted into authority, and it is by the authority of the Church that the faithful firmly trust that these books infallibly contain the truth. Here he cites Augustine's famous retort to the Manichees that he would not have believed the authority of Scripture had the authority of the Catholic Church not moved him. Terreni concludes that if, in the selection of the canonical Scripture the Church could not err inasmuch as she is directed by the Holy Spirit so it also stands to reason that the Spirit would not allow the pope to remove anything from the canonical books nor determine against their express truth. Hence one should believe that the pope would not err in the determination of the faith, since it is with him that the authority

---

<sup>70</sup> *Quaestio de magisterio infallibili Romani pontificis*, pp. 15-16: "Ergo eadem auctoritate summus pontifex et ecclesia romana per Spiritum Sanctum directa absque errore docet et determinat veritatem in hiis que ad fidem pertinent, nec in hiis Spiritus Sanctus, qui docet omnem veritatem, permetteret summum pontificem aut ecclesiam errare."

of the Catholic Church abides, as he is all the while directed by the Holy Spirit.<sup>71</sup>

There can be no doubt, therefore, that Terreni sees the papacy as operating within the larger context of the Church which is preserved from error. The pope renders determinations regarding the truth as it is infallibly contained within Holy Scripture. Yet if the pope's word is that final word in such determinations the possibility that he might err would lead to chaos. Terreni explores two scenarios. First, if the pope were to determine on a matter of faith that must be believed, and yet did so with some doubt, then his determination would itself be doubtful. Indeed, the rest of the faithful would also have to believe his determination with doubt, since they cannot be expected to believe in a determination any more so than the one who determined it. The result would be to plunge the whole Church into doubt regarding matters of faith, thereby rendering all the people infidels which is impossible. On the other hand, were the pope to err in rendering a determination and yet believe that error pertinaciously, such that he could not be corrected by his successor, then he would be a heretic. Either possibility, therefore, would cast the faith of the Church into doubt.<sup>72</sup>

Much of this had direct application at the time. For it might seem indeed it did seem to some Franciscans that John XXII had revoked the determination of a previous pope, namely the 1279 bull *Exiit qui seminatur* issued by Nicholas III in support of Franciscan poverty. In light of Terreni's principles outlined above he can hardly allow for such a revocation, since it would imply that the previous pope had erred. In this case Terreni contends that John XXII never really revoked anything in that bull pertinent to the faith, but only clarified some issues concerning use and dominion with regard to consumable goods. Because this was not a question pertaining to faith and morals, therefore, the successor was free to revoke and alter what his predecessor had established if he believed it to be expedient.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> *Quaestio de magisterio infallibili Romani pontificis*, pp. 17-18: "Igitur si ecclesia in electione scripture canonice, ut non erraret, creditur fuisse directa Spiritu Sancto, sic quod non liceret summo pontifici aliquid detrahere de libris canonicis aut contra eorum veritatem expressam determinare ..." See AUGUSTINE, *Contra epistolam Manichaei quam vocant Fundamenti* 5; PL 42:176-77.

<sup>72</sup> *Quaestio de magisterio infallibili Romani pontificis*, pp. 21-22.

<sup>73</sup> *Quaestio de magisterio infallibili Romani pontificis*, pp. 22-24. See p. 24: "... tum quia, ut dominus Papa dicit, illa non pertinent ad fidem specialiter quid et qualiter fratres Minores habeant; istud enim non pertinet ad fidem et in talibus que non sunt de necessitate fidei et bonorum morum generaliter potest successor revocare et mutare

As noted above, Terreni insisted on making a distinction between the man and the office, as he must given the reality of human foibles. The high priest Caiaphas, for instance, was able to prophesy correctly about Christ on account of the dignity of his office, notwithstanding the fact that he was personally heretical (Jn 11:51). Hence even if there were an heretical pope, God would never permit him to determine a heresy, or anything contrary to the faith, since the truth of God must always remain immutable within the Church. God would prohibit such an event in some way, whether through the pope's death, the resistance of the faithful, instruction from others, or internal inspiration. There are many ways that God will provide for the faith of his Church.<sup>74</sup> Here again it is the faith of the whole Church which is always at issue: that is the faith which cannot fail. The pope who personally lapsed into heresy would never be allowed to exercise the powers belonging to the office in such a way that would imperil the faith of the Church. Indeed, the office itself is protected from just such an eventuality, because it always remains under aegis of the Holy Spirit.

The Church's faith is not founded upon the papacy, but ultimately upon Holy Scripture to which all Catholics are subject. Here Terreni plainly confesses that every statement or statute contrary to the faith, or the determined teaching of Holy Scripture no matter who proclaims it must be rejected and revoked. Once again, though, God would never permit the Church to determine against the faith or the truth of Holy Scripture. Terreni will reiterate his earlier point that when the biblical authors human as they may be spoke under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit they could not have erred. Hence the truth of Holy Scripture remains solid and its authority never vacillates.<sup>75</sup> And so too, even as the pope could err in himself (*in se*), the Holy Spirit will not permit him to determine anything contrary to the faith. It is for this very reason that Terreni has no

---

que statuit predecessor, prout sibi visum fuerit expedire, cum in hiis par in parem non habet imperium." See *Exiit qui seminat* in *Sexti Decretal.* L. 5, t. 12, c. 3; Friedberg 2:1109-21; and *Quia nonnunquam* in *Extravag. Ioann. XXII.* T. 14, c. 2; Friedberg 2:1224.

<sup>74</sup> *Quaestio de magisterio infallibili Romani pontificis*, p. 26: "Ergo multo forcus, si esset papa hereticus, propter immutabilem veritatem Dei et fidei datam a Deo benedictionem toti ecclesie et populo christiano non permetteret Deus enim eum determinare heresim aut aliquid contra fidem."

<sup>75</sup> *Quaestio de magisterio infallibili Romani pontificis*, p. 27: "Sic eciam prophete et ceteri scriptores sacre scripture, quamvis ut homines possent errare, tamen quia inspirati et in eis Spiritus Sanctus loquebatur, non poterunt errare, ut veritas scripture firma esset et ne scripturarum sanctarum auctoritas vacillaret nec fides titubaret."



qualms about admitting the genuine failings of St Peter: all of his lapses were strictly personal affairs. When Peter denied Christ he erred as a singular person, not as pope. Investigating this more deeply, though, Terreni proposes that when Peter erred in denying Christ he likely did so out of fear, rather than having erred in his heart, which is to say that he had not erred in the faith. But even if one were to admit that Peter did err in faith, the important point is that he did not determine or establish this error in the Church. So, again, even if the pope is a heretic *in se*, God still does not permit him to determine an error against the faith of the Church.<sup>76</sup>

## IX. CONCLUSION

No matter what modern church historians may make of the doctrine of papal infallibility and we will leave that debate aside it is very clear that in proposing such a doctrine Terreni believed that he was following a very conservative course. Papal infallibility, for Terreni, was a defensive measure against heresy. He could not have imagined himself to have been doing anything new. Quite the opposite: the authority of the papacy was in place to protect the apostolic faith from the novelties of the heretics—from those who would seek to undermine the continuous witness of the Holy Catholic Church. Terreni had one over arching goal: to preserve the ancient faith of the Church that is revealed in Holy Scripture and safeguarded across the ages. For as we saw in his *Summa de haeresibus*, Terreni never ceded the apostolic ground to the heretical sects. Even the papacy at its most exalted was nevertheless the natural expression of the New Testament texts. The Church, with her infallible supreme pontiff, is the very

---

<sup>76</sup> *Quaestio de magisterio infallibili Romani pontificis*, pp. 28-29: “Quod vero dicitur quod summus pontifex potest errare: dicendum quod summus pontifex, etsi ut est persona singularis possit in se errare, tamen propter communitatem fidelium et universalitatem ecclesie, pro cuius fide rogavit Dominus, non permittit eum determinare aliquid contra fidem in ecclesia Spiritus Sanctus, a quo ecclesia in fide regitur: ... Non obstat quod dicitur de Petro: Tum quia Petrus erravit existens singularis persona, licet enim pontificatus sibi esset promissus, ut patet Math. XVI cum loquatur in futuro ... Tum quia Petrus, etsi erravit negando Christum ex timore, tamen non apparet quod erravit corde: et sic non erravit in fide ... Tum quia esto quod Petrus errasset in fide negando Christum, non tamen determinavit aut statuit predictum errorem in ecclesia ... Unde posito quod papa esset hereticus in se, tamen Deus non permetteret eum errorem contra fidem determinare, ut ex predictis patet.”

Church which Christ had established when he set Peter above the rest for the good of the whole body. It is she - not the Greeks or the sectarians - who has remained true to her original commission all the while.<sup>77</sup>

Ian Christopher Levy  
Associate Professor of Historical Theology  
Lexington Theological Seminary  
631 South Limestone Street  
LEXINGTON, KY 40508  
USA  
E-mail: [ilevy@lextheo.edu](mailto:ilevy@lextheo.edu)

---

<sup>77</sup> Much of the research for this article was conducted at Whitefriars Hall in Washington D.C. I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the Carmelites for allowing me full access to their library, and for all their generous hospitality throughout my stay with them in August 2008.