
The phrase « ordinary ways » in the title comes from The Apology of Sir Thomas More (CW9, p. 100) and is not the only way in which the article touches More’s universe. For example, the author thinks it probable that Colet owed to Warham, who was Bishop of London before becoming Primate, his appointment as Dean of St. Paul’s Cathedral. He points out how little is known of Colet’s fifteen years as urban pastor. We possess none of his sermons, except the address to the Synod of his fellow-clergy, and Erasmus’ 1521 account is tendentious.

The De sacramentis, which may have been a London work, as was the Catechyzon (Catechism), tends to reduce the gap between the ordained ministers and their flock. Dr. Kaufman has not convinced me of any new radicalism in the Dean. The Latin passage from Ad Corinthios (p. 9) is badly translated. And how true is it to say (ftn 43) that More prohibited private ownership ? Yet the article makes a few points : Colet « deplored most the contentious spirit that had become associated with the collection of rents and subsidies ... the tangle of litigation in which the spiritual estate was trapped » (pp. 10-11). Less realistic than Reginald Pecock or More, he would have every priest as pure « as the Bride herself, without wrinkle or wem ». On p. 21, ftn 89, we are invited to re-examine two ambiguous sentences in Erasmus’ letter to Ammonio of 5 June 1516 (Allen, ep. 414, 2 p. 246/1 f.) :

Gaudeo N. ereptum e carcere regio ... Amo Coleti tam christianum animum ; nam ejus unius opera liberatum audio ... Cum iam amicus urgeretur episcoporum calumniis, ab illius adversariis steterit.

Is « N. » truly Warham, released from his royal cage, namely the Chancellorship ? Did Warham need Colet to obtain this liberation ? Did the Archbishop betray the Dean by « siding with his enemies » ? This, the obvious meaning of « ab illius adversariis steterit », is retained by the Toronto translation (CWE, II, p. 413), but Marcel Nauwelaerts makes Warham side with the dean: « il l’a mis à l’abri de l’attaque de ses adversaires » (Bruxelles U.P., I, p. 342). Are the two interpretations possible ? One more nut for our Latin scholars to break.
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