

Having offered above Derek Pearsall's outline of the story Langland tells in the final version of his work, I set out here with Passus XX. This passus culminates in the powerful and complex oration of Jesus Christ as he liberates enslaved human beings from the prison house of hell. We are given a glimpse of immense divine power:

“A spirit speketh to Helle and bit to vnsperre the yates:

Attolite portas, &c.”

A vois loude in that liht to Lucifer saide,

“*Principes* of this place, prest vndo this gates

For here a cometh with croune, the kyng of all glorie!”

.

“Dukes of this demme place, anoen vndoth this yates

That Crist may come in, the kynges sone of heuene!”

And with that breth helle braek, with alle Belialles barres;

For eny wey or warde, wyde open the yates.

(XX.270–73, 362–65)¹

[“A spirit speaks to hell and bids the gates be opened.”

Lift up your gates.

A loud voice within that light said to Lucifer:

“*Princepes* of this place, quickly undo these gates,

For he comes here with crown, the king of all glory!”

.

“Dukes of this dim place, undo these gates now

That Christ may come in, the son of heaven's king.”

And with that breath hell with all of Belial's bars broke;

Despite all prevention, the gates were wide open.]

The creatures' technologies of war and fortifications disintegrate in the “breth” of the word spoken in Jesus. But the words themselves concentrate not on power but on the divine thirst to save humans, on the ties that bind Jesus to his brethren, the mercy of his kingly power determined to be kind to his kin (XX.403–44).² Unlike so many theologians of the later Middle Ages and the Reformation, Langland constantly disciplined his writing

about divine power by the Christocentric narratives of the New Testament.³ In his theological paradigms it is impossible to entertain many of the speculations about God's power encouraged by the fascination with God's *potentia absoluta* among the *moderni*. For example: that God could order Christians to kill innocent people; that because God creates creatures out of an untrammelled will he can do whatever he likes with them, so that if somebody always loves God and does all the works God demands, God can annihilate such a loving person or damn him eternally without any injustice; that God can deceive the faithful and could have deceived Christ, causing him to deceive his disciples concerning the future.⁴ Langland gestures toward such theological discourses at least twice in *Piers Plowman*. At one point he is considering contemporary discussions of the Trinity at feasts of the wealthy:

Nowe is the manere at the mete when munstrals ben stille
 The lewed ayen the lered the holy lore to dispute,
 And tellen of the trinite how two slowe the thridde
 And brynge forth ballede resonnes, taken Bernard to witenesse
 And putten forth presumpcioun to preue the sothe
 Thus they dreuele at the deyes the deite to know
 And gnawen god with gorge when here gottes fullen.

(XI.33–39)

[Now is the custom at meals, when the minstrels are silent,
 The ignorant take on the learned to debate holy doctrine,
 And talk about the Trinity how two killed the third
 And bring forth flimsy arguments, take Bernard to witness,
 And put forth a presumption to prove the truth.
 Thus they drivel on the dais, the deity to know,
 And chomp on God in their throats when their guts fill up.]

The laicization of theology here involves a parodic imitation of the church's theologians in their Latin academies. Parodic, yes; but also, distinctly, imitation. For what Langland has identified is the way philosophical theology in the modern university produced an immense discourse on the relations and processions of the Trinity which not only sidelined the narratives of scripture but was a committedly antinarrative genre.⁵ True enough, this

genre comprised theologians whose apprenticeship involved both commenting on the *Sentences* and commenting on scripture as conventionally read in the Catholic Church.⁶ But such training legitimated the development of theology (around the *Sentences*) in which the doctrine of God was abstracted from scriptural stories and elaborated in the categories of Aristotelian logic, physics, and metaphysics.⁷ Langland evaluated the outcome in the passage quoted above. Inattention to the disciplines of relevant narratives in scripture sponsored a freewheeling discussion of God's power and nature. He returns to his critical evaluation of modern theology in the critiques of the modern church which fostered this discourse, a critique ascribed to *Liberum Arbitrium*:

Freres fele tymes to the folk ther they prechen
 Mouen motyues, mony tymes insolibles and falaes,
 That both lewed and lered of here beleue douten.
 (XVI.231–33)

[Many times friars when they preach to the people
 Frequently raise fallacious and insoluble questions
 That put both the learned and ignorant in doubt of their belief.]

In shorthand, Langland points toward the institutionalization of theology so richly illustrated by Hester Gelber in her remarkable doctoral thesis and in her more recent studies.⁸ The issues include Langland's suspicion that the church now legitimizes a version of Christian theology in which the narratives and histories through which God is revealed are subordinated to modern forms of Aristotelian logic. Theologians (led by friars) are lured to invent theological truth as suprahistorical or nonhistorical, quite autonomous of the stories on which the church depends and acknowledges in the liturgy. While Langland includes disputations in an academic mode in his own work, they are subjected to the overall dialectic in which they exist, one finally shaped by Christocentric and Pentecostal narratives. For however fragmented and paratactic Langland's work may often feel, Langland has a story to tell, one from which his theology and ecclesiology emerges.

The Christ of *Piers Plowman* is the Christ whom the New Testament describes as being sent to fulfill the promises of the divine covenant with

Abraham and Moses, to save sinners in the manifestation of God's love figured by the father, the shepherd, and the woman of Luke 15. Christ's oration in hell affirms his kindness and kinship with human beings despite their persistent rejection of God. What he says in the context is congruent with an exemplary exchange between Jesus and his disciples when they are rejected by a village of Samaritans: "And when his disciples James and John had seen this, they said: Lord wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them?" (Luke 9:54–56).⁹ The disciples' model of a prophet mediating divine power is Elijah summoning fire from heaven to kill more than a hundred Samaritans in proof that he is "a man of God" (4 Kings 1:1–12). Jesus's response reiterates a common declaration in the evangelical narrative: "the Son of man is come to save that which was lost" (Matt. 18:11; see too Luke 19:10). He is the one whom the Pharisees rebuke for keeping an open table: "This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them" (Luke 15:2). And he is the one who responds to this charge not by denial but by parable upon parable to show that this practice is itself a decisive revelation of the divine will (Luke 15:3–32). Langland himself cites one of these parables in his beautiful and moving depiction of Wille's first conversion in the poem (V.92–101).

How then does Langland return from the emancipating power of God revealed by Christ's acts and words in hell to the place in which he will complete his work for humanity: the present world and the church? The poet chooses to do so by way of the risen Christ's commission to Piers the Plowman, now figuring the apostle Peter, and a representation of Pentecost with an unusual commentary on this event.

Langland ascribes his account of the risen Christ to Conscience, the figure who replaces faith as Wille's guide at the opening of Passus XXI (XXI.9 ff.; cf. XX.6–34). The shift in guide indicates that this Conscience is one informed by faith and reflecting Wille's move toward "scientia" (knowledge) based on faith.¹⁰ Wille begs Conscience "to kenne me the sothe" (XXI.9). What is puzzling him at this point is the relationship between the transformed figuration of "Peres the ploughman," just before the canon of the Mass, and Jesus, whom Wille has seen jousting on the cross against the powers that bind and terrorize humanity (XXI.1–14; cf. XX.6–34a). He is puzzled about the relations between the name of Jesus and the name of Christ (XXI.15–25). Conscience explains this relation to Wille by retelling the life of Jesus with his victory over death and devil: *Christus Resurgens*

(XXI.140–81a). Conscience’s narration also completes Wille’s long quest for Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest, those modes of virtue, by displaying them in Christological form, fulfilled in Christ. So, for example, Dowel becomes the evangelical law in which love of enemy is not a counsel of perfection but a precept of the new law initiated by Jesus Christ who makes law into gospel, a precept for all Christians to follow (XXI.108–23).¹¹

This is the context in which Langland situates Christ’s commission to the apostle Peter. Dobest completes the activity of the risen Christ among his disciples:

And when this dede was doen, do best he thouhte
 And yaf Peres pardoun and power he graunted hym,
 Myhte men to assoyle of alle manere synnes,
 To alle manere men mercy and foryeuenesse
 In couenaut that they come and knoleched to pay
 To Peres pardoun the plouhman *Redde quod debes*.
 Thus hath Peres power, be his pardoun payed,
 To bynde and to vnbynde bothe here and elles
 And assoile men of alle synnes, saue of dette one.

(XXI.182–90)

[And when this deed was done, he thought about Do-best
 And gave Piers the power and pardon he granted
 To all manner of men, mercy and forgiveness;
 Gave him might to absolve men of all manner of sins
 Provided they come and acknowledge they must pay
 To Piers the plowman’s pardon *Redde quod debes*.
 Thus Piers has the power, if his pardon is paid for,
 To bind and unbind both here and elsewhere
 And absolve men of all sins, except for their debts.]

This is Langland’s final account of what the papacy claimed as its origins. What Langland finally does with this claim is a major part of the story he will tell. At the moment, however, the apostle Peter is merged with Piers the poem’s plowman as the risen Christ gives him the power to mediate Christ’s mercy and forgiveness to “alle manere men” who fulfill the law of the gospel, the new covenant.¹² Christ’s gift also resolves Wille’s puzzles

about indulgences and the purchase of masses so eloquently expressed much earlier in the poem, at the end of Passus IX. To appreciate the implications of this resolution we should recall the treatment of pardon and papacy in that passus.

There, Wille had woken from his vision of an encounter between “Peres the plouhman” and a priest who “impugned” the pardon allegedly received from Treuthe as “no pardoun” (IX. 293–352a; 289; see IX.1–292 passim). Ruminating on the issues raised in this dramatic clash, Wille interprets the priest’s judgment as congruent with his own suspicions about indulgences in the late medieval church together with the papal power they assume and papal authority.¹³ He suspects that virtuous practice (Dowel) far surpasses any salvific role of indulgences, or of masses purchased for the souls of the dead to ease their path through purgatory, or of pilgrimages (IX.321–24).¹⁴ But Wille wants to remain an orthodox member of the contemporary church and checks the direction of such thoughts by affirming papal power:

Yut hath the pope power pardoun to graunte
 To peple withouten penaunce to passe into ioye.
 (IX.325–26)

[Yet the pope has power to grant pardon
 To people to pass without penance into joy.]

This is a strikingly unqualified affirmation of papal authority and power in the economy of salvation. It smacks of just the kind of undifferentiated claims to plenitude of papal power so extensively criticized, in different ways and to different ends, by Marsilius of Padua and William of Ockham earlier in the century.¹⁵ Langland emphasizes this scope by immediately glossing the statement about the pope’s “power” to open the gate of heaven without any penitential reconciliation with God and neighbor: “Quodcumque ligaveris super terram erit ligatum in caelis” (Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven) (Matt. 16:19). This comes from Jesus’s words to Peter after the apostle recognized him as “Christ, the Son of the living God” (16:16). Jesus blesses Peter and promises, “upon this rock (*petram*) I will build my church” (16:18). For Augustine, the rock on which the church stands came to mean Jesus Christ, the

one whom Peter confessed to be “the Christ, the Son of the living God.” In his *Retractions* he observes that Jesus says, “Thou art Peter,” and not “Thou art the rock.” There is no commitment to any exegesis that would make the “rock” represent the Roman papacy.¹⁶ In a sermon apparently “some time between 410 and 412,” Augustine observes that Christ bestowed the name Peter on the apostle Simon to represent the church: “Because Christ, you see, is the *petra* or rock; Peter, or Rocky is so called from rock, not the rock from Rocky; just as Christ is not so called from Christian, but Christian from Christ.” So the rock on which Christ promises to build his church, Augustine states, is the Christological confession uttered by Peter when Christ says that he will build his church; Augustine glosses the promise: “that is, on myself, the Son of the living God . . . I will build you on me, not me on you.”¹⁷ Augustine’s exegesis was well known in the Middle Ages and found a place in Aquinas’s commentary on the Gospels.¹⁸ But papal apologists appropriated the text, set aside Augustine’s reading, and projected onto Matthew’s Gospel their own ideology. To Ockham, such late medieval exegesis was quite unwarranted and led to “many heretical absurdities” in the papalist claims. True enough, Jesus said, “whatsoever thou shall bind upon earth, it shall be bound in heaven” (Matt. 16:19). But if these words are “understood without any exception Christ would have promised blessed Peter power equal to God’s and Christ’s.” Another “heretical absurdity is that the pope could licitly and by right kill innocent people, and universally do all things contrary to divine and natural law.”¹⁹ Ockham goes on to expose the errant theory and practice of exegesis on which such papalist doxology rests.²⁰ Into such waters Langland steps with his quotation from Matthew 16:19, “whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven” (IX.327a). But for the moment he does not explicate or unfold the sharp controversies in his church’s reception of this evangelical text. Nevertheless, he will address the substance of such conflicts toward the end of the poem, and we should not imagine that the quoted text had a consensual interpretation.²¹ Wille’s own position here on papal authority and power is certainly not the poem’s last word on this topic. In fact, even in Passus IX Wille’s affirmation of papal power is followed by warnings about the contemporary norms presided over and encouraged by the modern papacy. Church and pope support the aspiration of wealthy people to “purchase” the pardons and papal bulls, notes Wille, but his support for the system is troubled.²² As he considers Christ’s final

judgment, his language about papal dispensations becomes dismissive. He ponders how Christ's concern is with our daily practice and keeping of evangelical law. As for the church's economy of salvation mediated through papal indulgences and pardons:

And how we dede day be day the doem wol reherce.
 A pouheful of pardon there, ne prouinciales lettres,
 Thow we be founden in the fraternite of alle fyue orders
 And haue indulgences doublefold, but Dowel vs helpe
 Y sette nat by pardon a pese ne nat a pye-hele!
 (IX.342–46)

[How we led our lives here and kept his laws
 And how you acted day by day the doom will recount.
 A sackful of pardon there, nor provincials' letters,
 Though we be found in the fraternity of all five orders
 And have doublefold indulgences, unless Do-well help us
 I don't count pardon worth a peascod or piecrust!]

One might argue that Wille's vacillations merely reflect orthodox warnings about the abuse of indulgences. But such an argument overlooks the contested nature of the relevant network of practices, theological legitimizations, and Langland's own intense interest in this contest. Whatever pardon Piers may have received at the opening of Passus IX and however he may have understood or misunderstood it, Langland generated dramatic, irresolvable clashes between the massive gloss on the pardon (a gloss composed by numerous voices, including Piers's) and what turns out to be just two lines of judgment from the Athanasian Creed:

And Peres at his preyre the pardon vnfoldeth
 And Y byhynde hem bothe byheld alle the bulle
 In two lynes as hit lay and nat a lettre more,
 And was ywryte ryhte thus in witesse of Treuthe:
Et qui bona egerunt ibunt in vitam eternam;
Qui vero mala in ignem eternum.
 "Peter!" quod the prest tho, "Y kan no pardoun fynde
 Bote Dowel and haue wel and god shal haue thy soule

And do yuele and haue euele and hope thow non othere
 Bote he that euele lyueth euele shal ende.”

(IX.283–92)

[And Piers at his request unfolds the pardon
 And I behind them both beheld the entire bull
 In two lines as it lay and not a letter more,
 And was written exactly thus in witness of Truth:
They that have done good shall go into everlasting life;
They that have done evil into everlasting fire.
 “Peter,” said the priest then, “I can find no pardon,
 But only ‘Do well and have well and God shall have your soul
 And do evil and have evil and expect nothing other
 But he that lives evilly shall have an evil end.’”]

Disturbed by this clash, this conflict of interpretation, Wille wanders without food and without money on Malvern hills, musing on this dream (IX.293–97).²³ Not until many passages later, and only after participation in the founding narratives of Christian teaching, are Wille’s puzzles over papal power and the keys to the kingdom to be resolved. For now, we are left with Piers unable to answer the priest’s charge that his alleged pardon is “no pardoun” and Wille’s ambivalence over papal claims to the powers of the keys in the economy of salvation.

The resolution will emerge during the passage in which the risen Christ gives Piers power to mediate the forgiveness flowing from Christ’s victorious battle over death and devil. This forgiveness had been manifested in his great oration during the liberation of prisoners held in hell (XXI.182–98; XX.370–475), the passage from which we set out. Conscience now tells Wille that such mediation is a gift given with a determinate condition, a divine gift that belongs to a new covenant in which law and gospel are inseparable. Wille is shown what he had forgotten and what Langland thinks the contemporary church has forgotten. Namely: Ockham was quite right to argue that Christ set clear limits to Petrine power even in its sublime origins, let alone in its modern Roman version. Furthermore, these limits mean that whatever a pope might claim, absolution will not be given by Christ unless the new covenant is fulfilled by the Christian paying back what he owes: “*Redde quod debes*” (Rom. 13:7; Matt.

18:28). That is to say, evangelical forgiveness is inseparable from evangelical justice. Just as Conscience had argued against Mede, it turns out that God “gyueth nothyng that *si ne* is the glose” (i.e., God’s gifts are always glossed by an *if*, a certain condition, III.329). After invoking the condition, “*Redde quod debes*,” Conscience reiterates that only if the person seeking forgiveness renders what is owed, enacts just restitution, does Piers have the power to pardon, to “bynde and to vnbynde” (XXI.188–90). So emphatic is Conscience about this that he reiterates the conditionality of pardon in his account of Christ’s ascension (XXI.191–98). The theological inflection here is unambiguous: Christ’s minister can declare Christ’s saving forgiveness only to those who fulfill Christ’s conditions. So Ockham was, indeed, correct in discerning determinate limits to Petrine power even if his focus was in a different sphere of conflict.²⁴

From Passus XVIII Langland’s work had converged with the liturgy, and in Passus XXI he moves from the feast of the Ascension to Pentecost.²⁵ As in the celebration of Easter, we see Wille, quite unusually, participating in collective worship, singing *Veni creator spiritus* with “many hundret” (XXI.210–11). His encounters with Abraham (Faith) and with Christ as the Samaritan had included teaching about the Trinity, teaching replete with parable and narrative, a corrective to academic approaches mentioned earlier (XVIII.181–268a; XIX.26–278). He now receives a vision of the Holy Spirit. In this vision time present is joined with time past in a way that is characteristic of the liturgy. The contemporary church, in the feast of Pentecost, remembers and identifies with the apostolic church in which *Spiritus Paraclitus* first appeared “to Peres and to his felawes.” Wille witnesses the presence of the Holy Spirit in the likeness of fire on all the disciples which brings them the knowledge of “alle kyne langages” (XXI.199–206; Acts 2:1–4). This vision terrifies Wille, but Conscience assures him that *Spiritus Paraclitus* is indeed the messenger of Christ who should be welcomed and worshipped (XXI.207–12). The hymn in which Wille joins is a prayer for the illumination of grace and bodily well-being from the “*Creator Spiritus*” who is called “*Paraclitus*.” It also includes a prayer for protection from enemies, for peace, and for knowledge of God the Father, recognition of God the Son, and belief in the Spirit of both.²⁶ After the celebration of Pentecost, Langland gives us his model of apostolic evangelization in the formation of Christ’s church. In following this I shall focus on political and ecclesiastic implications.

11

From the first Pentecost the Holy Spirit, “Grace,” accompanies “Peres plouhman,” still figuring the apostle Peter, to make the church of Christ (XXI.213–335). Grace’s first advice to Piers is also advice to Conscience who is close to Piers: “And conseilede hym [Piers] and Consience the commune to sompne [summon]” (XXI.214). All are to be gathered together so as to receive the gifts of grace. Langland glosses this episode by directing his readers to Paul’s discussion in 1 Corinthians 12, teaching about the diversity of gifts from the one Spirit acting on the community of Christians. The Holy Spirit promises that the gifts he dispenses are sufficient treasures for a lifetime (XXI.215–18, 225–26). He thus returns to the language of Wille’s first teacher:

“When alle tresores ben tried, treuthe is the beste —
 I do hit vppon *Deus caritas* to deme the sothe.
 Hit is as derworthe a druerie as dere god hymseluen.
 For who is trewe of his tonge and of his two handes
 And doth the werkes therwith and wilneth no man ylle,
 He is a god by the gospel and graunte may hele
 And also lykoure lord, by saynt Lukes wordes.”

(I.81–87)

[“When all treasures have been tested, Truth is the best —
 I adduce *Deus caritas*, to deliver this fact.
 It is as precious a prize as dear God himself.
 For he who is true in his tongue and his two hands
 And works that way, wishing no man evil,
 Is a god, says the gospel, and grants health
 And resembles our Lord, in Saint Luke’s words.”]

Holy Church, for she is the teacher here, offers an extremely condensed introduction to a Christian language for evoking the commitment of divine love (“*Deus caritas*,” or God is charity, 1 John 4:7–19) to draw humans into the divine life. Constant acts informed by truth create dispositions of the will which transform the human into “a god.” The human creature becomes “lyke our Lord,” becomes “a god” but not God. Holy Church goes

on to associate this teaching with an exquisitely beautiful lyric on how “Treuthe” teaches that “love” is the “salve” (ointment, healing remedy) given to humankind. It is “the plente of pees, most precious of vertues,” brought into human lives through the incarnation of God (I.146–67). As St. Augustine preached to his congregation one Christmas day, “*Today Truth has sprung from the earth* (Ps. 85:11); Christ has been born from the flesh . . . in order to make gods of those who were merely human, one who was God made himself human; without forfeiting what he was, he wished to become what he himself had made. He himself made what he would become, because what he did was add man to God, not lose God in man.”²⁷ Thus Langland’s Holy Church and thus Augustine. But Holy Church’s answers to Wille’s question (“How Y may saue my soule,” I.80), a question so dazzling in its excess of meanings, included a gesture toward “werkes,” toward truthful action with one’s “two handes.” And this raised, but set aside, a question taken up time and again throughout *Piers Plowman* and now at Pentecost. Namely, what kind of community is constituted by the gifts of grace, the gifts that flow from the Incarnation?

In answering this question we should begin by noting how the grace given by the Holy Spirit is both communitarian and individual. It enables each person to be self-guided in a relative autonomy. Grace “yaf vch man a grace to gye with hys suluen” (gave each man a grace to guide himself with) (XXI.227). This unequivocal affirmation of gifts that sustain individual choice and responsibility is combined with a focus on the range of gifts needed to sustain the Pentecostal polity. Langland’s interpretation of St. Paul’s “*divisiones gratiarum*” (diversities of graces) is striking. For he introduces a range of human labor that is both outside Paul’s attention and belongs specifically to Langland’s own world. His aim is to show how the gifts of grace can sustain a social formation in which practices that have been displayed in the poem as inclining their agents to habitual sin can be ordered to virtue. Let us consider some of his examples.

From the Prologue through to the confessions of capital sins (Passus VII) Langland represents contemporary England as a culture in which relations between humans as well as between humans and God are being deformed by commodification, by selling and buying. Law, marriage, the exegesis of scripture, and the sacrament of penance are all assimilated to the kind of production and exchange encouraged by market relations where traditional virtues and their language become unintelligible (Prol.; II–IV;

VI–VII). But in the Pentecostal polity Grace teaches members of the polity trade (“craft”) with the requisite skill in buying and selling to gain their livelihood (XXI.234–35). Earlier in *Piers Plowman* lawyers represented the total subjection of God’s gifts of language, the word, into words spoken only for material profit in a culture where Mede organizes all aspects of the law (Prol. 160–66; III.450–51; III–IV *passim*). At that stage Conscience’s frustration drew him into a fantasia composed in an apocalyptic mode where he envisaged the revolutionary transformation of law into manual labor (III.452). Revolution, distinctly, rather than an ameliorative process of reforms. But in the Pentecostal community Grace bestows “wyt with words” and enables lawyers to earn their livelihood “with Trouthe” (XXI.229–31). Perhaps Langland is imagining the fusion of gospel and law within contemporary divisions of labor. Lawyers formed in Christian virtues earn their livelihood by using their special gifts to facilitate among their neighbors the union of justice and mercy, truth and peace, fulfilling the promise of the new covenant (see XX.459–75). Certainly Grace’s Pentecostal gifts produce a realm of manual labor free from the conflicts around the Statute of Laborers, work disciplines, and the price of labor in the communal pleasures of the pub (XXI.236–39; cf. *Passus VIII*).²⁸ As Langland composes his vision of Pentecostal, liturgical time, he has moved from Acts 2:1–4 to late fourteenth-century England. His development of Paul’s instruction on “spiritual things” (*de spiritualibus*) addresses modes of production and subsistence set aside in 1 Corinthians 12.

One of the most startling gifts of the Holy Spirit is the gift of grace-formed violence directed to remedy the unjust actions of “false men.” Grace enables and guides some people to ride out and recover what had been unjustly seized:

And somme to ryde and rekeuere that vnrihtfulliche was wonne:
 He wissede men wynne hit ayeyn thorw wihtnesse of handes
 And fechen hit fro false men with Foleuiles lawes.

(XXI.245–47)

[And some to ride and recover what was unrightfully gained;
 He showed men strong-armed ways to win it back
 And take it from false men with vigilante law.]