



HAL
open science

Report on an Imperial Mission to Bohemia, 1451, by Enea Silvio Piccolomini . Edited and translated by Michael von Cotta-Schönberg. 3rd preliminary version. (Reports on Five Diplomatic Missions by Enea Silvio Piccolomini; 3)

Michael Von Cotta-Schönberg

► **To cite this version:**

Michael Von Cotta-Schönberg. Report on an Imperial Mission to Bohemia, 1451, by Enea Silvio Piccolomini . Edited and translated by Michael von Cotta-Schönberg. 3rd preliminary version. (Reports on Five Diplomatic Missions by Enea Silvio Piccolomini; 3). 2020. <hal-02907943v3>

HAL Id: hal-02907943

<https://hal.science/hal-02907943v3>

Submitted on 11 Feb 2021 (v3), last revised 3 Sep 2025 (v4)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire HAL, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

**(Reports on Five Diplomatic Missions by Enea Silvio Piccolomini;
3)**

Report on an Imperial Mission to Bohemia, 1451, by Enea Silvio Piccolomini. Edited and translated by Michael von Cotta-Schönberg

3rd version

2021

Abstract

In 1451, Enea Silvio Piccolomini, Bishop of Siena and senior imperial diplomat, went on a mission for Emperor Friedrich III to Bohemia. The purpose of the mission was to communicate to the Bohemian estates the emperor's refusal to end his wardship over the Bohemian boy king, Ladislaus, then 11 years old. Piccolomini took the opportunity to have an important political conversation with the Bohemian governor, Georg Podiebrad, investigating the possibilities for a modus vivendi between the Papacy and the Bohemian Hussites. He also visited the city of Tabor, home of radical Hussites, and had a debate with them concerning the Hussite claims for communion under both species (Utraquism).

Keywords

Enea Silvio Piccolomini; Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini; Æneas Silvius Piccolomini; Pope Pius II; Papa Pio II; Emperor Frederick III (Habsburg); Kaiser Friedrich III (Habsburg); Renaissance diplomacy; 15th century; 1451; Georg Podiebrad; George Podiebrad; Jiri Podiebrad; Cardinal Juan de Carvajal; King Ladislaus Posthumus (Habsburg); Bohemia; Hussites; Hussitism; Tabor; Ulrich von Rosenberg; Heinrich von Rosenberg; Prokop von Rabstein; Utraquism; Communion under both species; Communion under both kinds; Bohemian Compacts; Hussite Compacts

Editor and translator

Michael von Cotta-Schönberg

Mag. Art. (University of Copenhagen)

Bachelier en Philosophie (Université de Louvain)

Emeritus Deputy Director / The Royal Library, Copenhagen

Emeritus University Librarian / University of Copenhagen

ORCID identity: 000-0001-8499-4142

e-mail: typsita@gmail.com

Foreword to the present volume

Piccolomini's report on his mission to Bohemia in 1451, often called his Dialogue with Taborites, Hussites or something similar, was published by Wolkan more than 100 years ago as part of his edition of Piccolomini's letters. The present edition is based on seven manuscripts collated directly for the purpose and on Wolkan's edition.

A translation of the text seems not to have been published previously.

A note of caution: the present text only provides a brief introduction and notes to make the text more immediately comprehensible to a modern reader. It is not a study as such of Piccolomini's report nor of his views of and dealings with Hussitism and Bohemia.

Michael Cotta-Schönberg
28 July 2020

Table of volumes in *Reports on Five Diplomatic Missions by Enea Silvio Piccolomini*

1. Report on an Imperial Mission to Rome, 1447
2. Report on a Imperial Mission to Milan, 1447
3. Report on a Imperial Mission to Bohemia, 1451
4. Report on an Imperial Mission to the Diet of Regensburg, 1454 (Historia de Ratisponensi Dieta)
5. Report on a Imperial Mission to Rome, 1455

Table of contents

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Context
2. Themes
 - 2.1. Politics
 - 2.2. Communion under both species
 - 2.2.1. Ritual
 - 2.2.2. Faith
 - 2.2.3. Authority
 - 2.3. Church properties
 - 2.4. Jan Rokycana
3. Conduct of diplomacy
4. Date, addressee and format
5. Text
 - 5.1. Manuscripts
 - 5.2. Editions
 - 5.3. Present edition
6. Sources
7. Sigla and abbreviations

II. TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1. Introduction [1]
2. Visit to Tabor [2-15]
 - 2.1. Reception [2-3]
 - 2.2. Zizka [4]
 - 2.3. Taborite sect [5-7]
 - 2.4. City of Tabor [8-11]
 - 2.5. Piccolomini's host [12]
 - 2.6. Departure [13]
 - 2.7. Pest in Prague [14]
 - 2.8. Death of Empress Barbara [15]
3. Assembly at Benesov [16-17]

4. Dialogue with Georg Podiebrad [18-34]
 - 4.1. Introduction [18-19]
 - 4.2. Hussite rejection of the Catholic Church [20-21]
 - 4.3. Hussite claim of communion under both species as necessary for salvation [22-26]
 - 4.4. Church properties [27]
 - 4.5. Jan Rokycana [28-33]
 - 4.6. Conclusion [34]

5. Travel back to Tabor [35]

6. Debate with the Taborites [36-73]
 - 6.1. Introduction [36-37]
 - 6.2. Supreme religious authority established by God [38-41]
 - 6.2.1. The Old Testament [38]
 - 6.2.2. The New Testament [39]
 - 6.2.3. Exhortation to the Taborites to obey the Roman Church [40-41]
 - 6.3. Hussite objection: the teachings of the popes are false [42-46]
 - 6.3.1. The papess [43]
 - 6.3.2. Criminal popes [44]
 - 6.3.3. Popes change church laws [45]
 - 6.3.4. Roman communion practice erroneous [46]
 - 6.4. Discussion of communion under both species [47-73]
 - 6.4.1. Hussite arguments [47]
 - 6.4.1.1. Bible [47-48]
 - 6.4.1.2. The Primitive Church [48]
 - 6.4.1.3. The Greek Church [48]
 - 6.4.1.4. Doctors and popes [48]
 - 6.4.2. Piccolomini's refutation [49-73]
 - 6.4.2.1. Gospel of John [51-52]
 - 6.4.2.2. Synoptic evangelists and Saint Paul [53-55]
 - 6.4.2.3. The Primitive Church [56]
 - 6.4.2.4. The Greek Church [57-59]
 - 6.4.2.5. Doctors [60-61]
 - 6.4.2.6. Popes and councils [62-73]

7. End of visit to Tabor [74-76]

8. Conclusion [77-78]

Appendix: Conciliar decree *Cum in nonnullis* of 15 June 1415 (Council of Konstanz, XIII Session)

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Context^{1 2}

Piccolomini wrote extensively about Bohemia and the Hussites.³ If anybody in Europe was a specialist on Hussitism, it was he, even if he was somewhat prejudiced in his general understanding of the Hussite phenomenon. Moreover, he may not have fully comprehended the differences between the various Hussite factions.⁴ He was in Basel during the discussions with the Hussites, being close to Cardinal Cesarini who, by then, favoured a peaceful solution to the Hussite problem. At the imperial chancellery, he had many occasions to deal with Bohemian matters, and he apparently used his access to the imperial archives to study Bohemian history. He travelled in Bohemia, even visiting the Hussite city of Tabor, having direct contacts with persons knowledgeable about Hussitism, and debating with Taborite theologians. He had extensive discussions with Bohemian nobles and especially the Hussite governor of Bohemia, Georg Podiebrad. And he wrote a book on Bohemian history, including the Hussite period. His letters frequently touched upon Bohemian matters, and several of his orations concerned Bohemia, including the two very important orations “*Res Bohemicas*” from 1456 and “*Superioribus diebus*” from 1462.

In his *Revised History of the Council of Basel* from 1450, the year before his mission to Bohemia, Piccolomini wrote about the process against Jan Hus and Jerome of Prague at the Council of Constanz,⁵ the development of Hussitism and the Hussite wars, including the failed crusade against the Hussites led by Cardinal Cesarini in 1431,⁶ and the debates and negotiations at the Council of Basel with a Hussite delegation.⁷ In this account, Piccolomini stated as follows concerning the communion under both species: *It pleased the council to indulge the Bohemians so that the laity, too, could receive the sacrament of the Eucharist under the species of bread and wine, but with the added condition that they should preach in public sermons that it was not a necessity but a privilege to receive both species.*⁸ In the *Revised History*, Piccolomini also wrote about the battle of Lipany (1434), opposing various Hussite factions and ending with the defeat of the Taborites and the Orphans.⁹

So when in Summer 1451, Piccolomini went on an imperial mission to Bohemia, he was reasonably informed about the general and political situation in Bohemia and especially the Hussite question. The object of the mission was to communicate the emperor’s refusal of yet another Bohemian request to end his wardship over the then 11 year old boy king, Ladislaus the Posthumous. He was also to persuade the Bohemian estates to accept that this issue should be deferred until the emperor returned from his coronation voyage to Rome, on which he would be accompanied by Ladislaus. Apparently, Piccolomini was successful in this regard, and he also had a very important political conversation with the Bohemian governor, Georg Podiebrad. The conversation opened the

¹¹ This section is to a great extent based upon the section on the Hussite heresy in Pius II: *Collected*, sect. 6.3.4.

² CO, I, 21; HB, I, pp. 486-497; Piccolomini’s orations “*Petivistis ex Caesare*” (1451), “*Res Bohemicas*” (1455) and “*Superioribus diebus*” (1462); Boulting, pp. 187-189; Fudge: *Seduced*; Heymann: *George*, pp. 50-53; Kaminsky; Voigt, III, pp. 26-29

³ See HB, I, pp. 101-113

⁴ Kaminsky, p. 302; Fudge: *Seduced*, pp. 94, 99

⁵ Reject, I, p. 323

⁶ Reject, I, p. 325-328

⁷ Reject, I, pp. 337-339

⁸ Reject, I, p. 339

⁹ Reject, I, pp. 344-345

way to a de facto alliance between the governor and the emperor and formal imperial recognition of Podiebrad as governor of Bohemia. On his travel back to Austria, Piccolomini made a second visit to Tabor, where he had his famous discussion with Hussite theologians concerning communion under both species. In this discussion, Piccolomini based himself on the two fundamental tenets of the Council of Basel: firstly, the communion under both species was a matter of rite on which a compromise was possible since rites could be legitimately changed by the Church. And secondly, the assertion of the necessity of this form of communion for salvation was a matter of Faith since it meant that the Catholic Church had for hundreds of years sent its followers directly to Hell by not allowing them communion under both species. Piccolomini was not able to persuade the Hussite theologians of the orthodox view, and he must have come away from Tabor knowing that a compromise on the ritual question would be impossible, as Georg Podiebrad had told him. This whole issue may have had theological interest for Piccolomini, but its political import was more important to the imperial diplomat: pacifying the Hussites was a prerequisite for King Ladislaus' peaceful accession to the Bohemian crown, for his government of Bohemia, and for the development of Habsburg dominance in Central Europe.

In the first version of his *Historia Austriacalis* from late 1453/beginning of 1454,¹ i.e., two or three years later, Piccolomini wrote about the events in Benesov:

In the meantime, the Bohemians, as is their custom when they have to act in common, summoned a meeting in Prague, but when the plague broke out, they moved it to Benesov. It was rumoured that they would petition the emperor to send Ladislaus to their kingdom and that they would elect another king if their request was refused. The emperor sent legates to soften their agitated minds. We ourselves were among the legates. ... There, the imperial legates were heard and with kind words they put an end to all the excitement.^{2 3}

In the second/third version of the *Historia Austriacalis* from 1455-1458⁴ Piccolomini wrote:

In the meantime, the Bohemians, as is their custom when they have to act in common, summoned a meeting in Prague, but when the plague broke out, they convened in Benesov. It was rumoured that they would petition the emperor for their king and that they would elect another king if their request was refused. As this would be an impediment to the emperor's journey to Italy, ambassadors were sent. They were Enea, Bishop of Siena, Prokop,⁵ a Bohemian knight, and two noblemen from Austria. Their task was to soften the agitated minds

¹ HA, I, p. xvii

² *Dum haec aguntur, Bohemi suo more de verbis [rebus] acturi communibus conventum apud Pragam indixere, sed cum ibi pestis crassaretur, ad Villam, quam Benedicti appellant, convenere. Fama erat eos Ladislaum petitorios ad regnum mitti; nisi obtinerent, alium regem quesituros. Eo missi legati a cesare sunt, qui feroces eorum animos lenirent. Nos quoque inter eos fuimus... Ibi legati caesaris auditi benigne omnem turbam amoverunt.*

³ HA, I, pp. 99-100. The editors point out that according to the acts of the diet, the estates were not satisfied with Piccolomini's vague promises on the emperor's behalf, but sent new petitions to the emperor, cf. also Palacky: *Geschichte*, 4, 1, p. 267 ff, 500

⁴ HA, I, p. xx

⁵ Prokop von Rabstein, friend and former colleague of Piccolomini

of the Bohemians so that they would not prematurely ask for the boy who could not at the time be of any profit to the kingdom. There, the imperial legates were heard, and with kind words they put an end to all the excitement. The Bohemians should wait until Ladislaus attained his majority and not doubt that he would come to them first when he was released from the wardship. The mission won the favour of the Bohemians who asked for the king more out of a sense of duty than because they really wanted it.¹

In the *Historia Bohemica*, which he finished in summer 1458, shortly prior to his election as pope,² Piccolomini wrote:

But when Friedrich had decided to travel to Italy to receive the imperial crown, the Bohemians, the Hungarians, and the Austrians again sent embassies to the emperor, putting pressure on him and demanding Ladislaus. All their demands were denied. The Bohemians were to hold an assembly on this question in Prague, and they appeared to be very upset and wanting to elect another king unless their demands were met. The emperor decided to send legates to them, adding us to their number. The representatives from the provinces had been summoned to Prague, but as the plague broke out there, they met in Benesov. Georg Podiebrad presided over their numerous assembly. We addressed them as follows: "You have requested of the emperor ... [here follows the text of the oration³]" The oration inspired confidence and was accepted favourably. Our colleague, Prokop made it even more acceptable as he translated it into their language for the benefit of those who did not understand Latin. Then we were asked to leave the assembly, but shortly afterwards we were called back and given this answer: "Thank the emperor for sending this embassy and for having stated his preference for the Bohemians over the others when the king will be released." They accepted the good counsel received. They would send young noblemen to join and serve the emperor on his journey to

¹ HA, II, pp. 443-444: *Inter haec Bohemi suo more de rebus acturi communibus conventum regni apud Pragam indicunt. Sed cum pestifera lues eo supervenisset, apud Villam quam Benedicti appellant, convenere. Fama fuit eos regem repetituros; nisi obtinerent, alium quesituros. Id caesaris iter in Italiam remorari videbatur. Mittuntur erga ad eos legati Aeneas episcopus Senensis, Procopius eques Bohemus*

et duo ex Austria viri nobiles, qui feroces lenirent animos, ne pupillum ante annos expeterent, dum nullo usui regno esse posset. Expectarent pubertatem neque dubitarent illum, cum dimitteretur, ad eos imprimis venturum. Grata hec legatio Bohemis fuit, quippe qui magis ex debito quam ex animo regem petebant

² HB, I, p. 02

³ Piccolomini's oration "Petivistis ex Caesare" (1451)

Italy. They would await his return peacefully and wished happiness, prosperity, and the favour of Heaven upon him.^{1 2}

Some years later, Piccolomini, now Pope Pius II, wrote in his *Commentarii*:

*Meanwhile the Bohemians, after many vain efforts to get Ladislas for their king, convened a national council at Prague to discuss their affairs. They declared that unless Albert's son, the heir to the kingdom, was sent to them, they would choose another king for themselves. Aeneas was therefore despatched, together with several other noblemen, to meet with them. A terrible plague was then raging through Prague, so the council was transferred to the village of Benesov. There Aeneas addressed a public assembly where he delivered a message from the emperor. He explained that the boy-king needed a guardian; he could be in no better hands than the emperor's; moreover, it would not be long before they saw their wishes fulfilled. This speech soothed their anger, and they promised not to call anyone else to the throne.*³

One of Pius' two contemporary biographers, Campano wrote:

Immediately after his return to Friedrich, he was sent to the Bohemians who would have taken up arms if he did not hurry. Ladislaus, King of Hungary and Bohemia, was still a young boy, being the son of Friedrich's brother.⁴ Fear of plots as well as the fact that the boy was too young to govern and at risk of coming to harm caused Friedrich to keep him at court and to give him guards so that he would not be abducted. However, the Bohemians thought that it was an unworthy treatment of the boy to guard him and keep him away from his paternal kingdom. Therefore they threatened to gather troops and go to war unless they were given a proper explanation why the emperor did as he did. [In his oration Aeneas] especially referred

¹ *At cum Fridericus imperialis coronae suscipiende gratia Italiam petere statuisset, rursus Bohemi, Hungari et Austriales legationibus seorsum missis imperatorem fatigavere Ladislaum reposcentes. Postulata omnibus negata sunt. Ad Bohemos, qui ea de re conventum Prage habituri erant ac ferocius agere videbantur regem alium electuri, nisi mos eis gereretur, legatos mittere placuit, quibus et nos additi sumus. Provinciales, quibus apud Pragam dies statuta fuerat, crassante illic peste, in Beneschavia convenere. Quos in frequenti conventu presidente Georgio Pogiebratio in hunc modum allocuti sumus: "Petivistis ex Caesare [here follows the oration]." Vero similis oratio visa neque sine favore excepta est. Acceptiorem Procopius,*

noster collega, reddidit, qui patrio sermone latine lingue ignaris verba nostra interpretatus est. Iussi sumus ex conventu paululum abire. Mox revocatis responsum datum: Reddite imperatori gratiae, qui eam legationem misisset atque in dimittendo rege Bohemos preferre ceteris. Accipere se bene consulta consilia. Missuros ex nobilitate sua primarios juvenes, qui cesarem Italiam petentem sequantur eique ministrant. Expectaturos quiete reditum, quem felicem faustumque superum benignitate futurum exoptent

² HB, I, pp. 486-496

³ CO, I, 21 (Meserve, I, p. 101)

⁴ He was not the son of Friedrich's brother, but of his cousin, Albrecht II

to the danger of poison which actually, due to a Bohemian plot, killed the boy some years after when he had been sent off by his uncle.^{1 2}

And Platina, the other contemporary biographer, wrote: *When he returned to the emperor, he was immediately sent as ambassador to Bohemia to settle a conflict which had arisen between him and the Bohemians. When the Bohemians had been pacified...*³

It is worth noting that in his other writings Piccolomini did not mention his theological debate with the Hussites in Tabor.

After the voyage to Bohemia in 1451, Piccolomini was – in connection with the imperial coronation in Rome in 1452 – appointed papal legate to a number of countries in Central Europe, including Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia. One of the goals of his legatine mission was to reunite Bohemia with Rome.⁴

Later he had further talks with Bohemian diplomats at the imperial diet in Frankfurt in 1454 and with the governor himself at the imperial diet in Wiener Neustadt in 1455 which apparently convinced him of the necessity of seeking a compromise on the ritual question to ensure Habsburg government in Bohemia.

When he went to Rome in 1456, he was therefore bringing with him the ideas and possibly even a draft of a memorandum in the form of an oration to Pope Calixtus in which he clearly, but modestly and conditionally recommended not only a papal grant of communion under both species to the Bohemians but also made a remarkable declaration to the pope on diversity of rites and religious toleration in general. On the communion issue, he said: *For our part, we only know as much as we understand. But since we have seen the Fathers in Basel grant the Bohemians the right to drink from the chalice – before the council was dissolved by virtue of apostolic authority – we think, rather than believe that it should be granted to them again and for the same reason.*⁵

¹ Zimolo, pp. 19-20: *Extemplo ubi ad Federicum pervenit, ad Boemos mittitur, arma sumpturos nisi properasset. Cum enim Ladislaum Pannoniae ac Boemia regem admodum puerum fratris filium Federicus metu insidiarum et quod regno immaturo adhuc esset atque injuriae obnoxius apud se educaret, adhibitis custodibus ne clam subduceretur, Boemi indignum rati custodiri accersirique a regno patrio regem, coactis copiis bellum, nisi dimitteret, comminabantur. Horum conatus statim compescuit, ratione adhibita cur ita fieri oporteret, maxime iniecto metu veneni, quo paucis post annis dimissus a patruo puer fraude boemica absumptus est*

² The causes of Ladislaus's death in Prague, at the age of 18 are not known except that he died of a sudden illness. Pius certainly thought – and wrote – that he had

died by poisoning, suspecting the regent, Georg Podiebrad, or Hussite clerics of the deed

³ Zimolo, p. 102: *Ad Caesarem tandem reversus, ab eo statim orator in Bohemiam mictitur, ad tollendam omnem controversiam, que inter eum et Bohemos orta erat. Pacata Bohemia ...*

⁴ Kaminsky, p. 295

⁵ Piccolomini's oration "*Res Bohemicas*" (1455), sect. 64. Piccolomini's recommendation, though preceded by conditions and protestations of modesty, was in itself unambiguous and does not support the observation of the editors of the HB: *Trotz seiner humanistischen Gelehrsamkeit trug Enea seine Rede also lediglich als unverbindlichen Entwurf vor, in dem Gründe pro et contra angeführt werden, keineswegs in starrer Form, d.h. lediglich als causa disputationis, nicht etwa als asserendo* (HB, I, p. 095, note 3)

Intriguingly, in his memorandum to the pope, Piccolomini strenuously argues against some positions he had – just as strenuously defended in his discussions in Bohemia five years before, e.g., on the reactions of the Bohemian Catholics, the Germans, and other peoples to a papal grant of communion under both species to the Bohemians.

And - somewhat amusingly in view of his personal experiences in Tabor - Piccolomini told the pope that persuading the Hussites through debate was completely futile:

If you ask the Hussites to arrange a debate, they say that they desire nothing more than a debate, for this is a garrulous people, avid for debate. And when, at the debate, you ask what judge they will follow, they accept neither the Roman Pontiff, nor a General Council, nor any man. They will only submit to the pronouncements of the Old and the New Testament. And when you reach the point where you must use the witness of Holy Scriptures, they will accept none of the interpretations of our teachers, for they have their own interpretations to which they cling. And they insist that only God's judgment between meaning and meaning, between interpretation and interpretation should be heard, and thus they rob the debate of any meaning. When they debate, they require the presence of the ignorant people, they gesture, they clap their hands, they point now here now there, they raise their heads, they roll their eyes, they keep glancing around to see if the audience is impressed by their maxims and arguments, they try to gain the applause of the dullards by raising their voices, and they listen avidly to their own voice as if they were speaking beautifully and pleasantly. When Origen and others demolished errors through debate, they spoke to people who wanted to learn. But never will you bring the Bohemian teachers to become pupils. To them, the name of teacher is the sweetest of all, and to be called "Rabbi" by the crowd, and to rule the chair of pestilence. They think that nothing is worse than to learn. Bohemia cannot be saved by debate, since its teachers are stubborn and the people only believe its own teachers. [Sect. 23-24]

Seven years afterwards, in March 1462, ambassadors of King Georg came to Rome to petition the pope, now Pius II, for papal confirmation of the Bohemians' permission to communion under both species which Pius had himself, as imperial ambassador, Bishop of Siena, recommended to Pope Calixtus III.

On 30 March, the pope – after intense deliberations with his cardinals and advisers - gave his judgment from the throne, in the oration "*Superioribus diebus*" [66]:

... having carefully considered all that must be considered in this matter, We do not see that granting your petition would benefit your king, the kingdom, or the people. The words of the Lord to the sons of Zebedaeus apply to you, too: You know not what you ask. It is Us who are the dispensers of the ministries of God. Ours is the charge to guard the sheep and to lead the flock of the Lord to the road of salvation. We must imitate the supreme family father who never heeds those who ask for harmful things, but directs everything for the best. Not all understand what is truly good, and therefore many people have regretted it when their wishes were fulfilled.

What you request now does not lead to eternal life; what you seek is smoke and the breeze of vainglory.

We desire the salvation of your souls, and therefore We refuse to grant that which militates against it. We exhort you to be satisfied with receiving the Lord's body and blood under the species of bread [alone]. It is sufficient for salvation, as says the Lord in the same text quoted above: I am the living bread which came down from Heaven. He that eateth this bread, shall live forever. Do not wish to be greater than those disciples who, going to Emmaus, recognized the Lord in the breaking of the bread. Do not wish to know more than you should know, and to be more than your fathers who died in Christ having received communion under one species only. This new rite is an affront to their name and fame: comfort their memory, and conform to the rest of Christianity: it is shameful for a part to be in disharmony with the whole. If you abandon your new rite and return to the old custom, your kingdom will be united both internally and with its neighbours, and your former wealth will return together with your former peace and glory. You will be happy in this world, and you will be blessed in the next, as granted by Our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom is the honour and the power through the infinite ages of ages. [Sect. 16-18]

Why did Pope Pius II take the diametrically opposite view of the matter now, denying a petition that he had himself recommended six years before?

In view of the importance of the matter, he must have had very good reasons for doing so. To understand his change of mind it is necessary to look at how the situation relating to the Hussite schism had changed from 1456 to 1462.

In 1456, Pope Calixtus III was quite amenable to a solution to the Bohemian schism and believed that King Ladislaus and his governor, Georg Podiebrad, would be able to contribute effectively to ending the schism.

The conditions for finding some kind of solution to the Bohemian problem were indeed favourable, as George Heymann wrote:

At no time before or after was there so much optimism for a permanent settlement on both sides, in Rome and in Prague, than in the years following the meeting at Wiener-Neustadt¹ and Aeneas' great speech to Calixtus III, and especially in the years 1457-1458.²

However, in November 1457 King Ladislaus of Bohemia died at the age of eighteen. Many, including Piccolomini, believed that he may have been poisoned at the instigation of Georg Podiebrad or Hussite church leaders like Rokycana.

¹ The Imperial Diet of Wiener Neustadt, 1455, February to April

²² Heymann: *George*, p. 165; see also Voigt, IV, p. 424, and Kaminsky, p. 283

This meant that the Kingdom of Bohemia was no longer ruled by a catholic monarch, whose example would conceivably strengthen the position of the catholics in the kingdom and who might be expected to actively support a process of ending the Hussite schism.¹

Ladislav was succeeded as king by the governor of the realm, Georg Podiebrad, who though a Hussite by personal conviction was well thought of in Rome - partly because of the reports of Bishop Piccolomini - as a sensible man who would need the support of the papacy and with whom reasonable deals might be struck.

So Pope Calixtus dealt with him agreeably and trustingly, and even allowed him to be crowned by two catholic bishops from Hungary, but only after he had made an oath, in secret,

- to obey the Roman and Catholic Church and the popes,
- to conform to the true Faith as professed by the Holy Roman Church,
- to defend the Faith,
- and to make his people abandon all errors, heresies, and teachings contrary to the Catholic Faith and bring it to obedience to and conformity and union with the Holy Roman Church and to restore its rites and forms of worship.²

Podiebrad himself may not have interpreted this oath as an abandonment of the practice of communion under both species, but he did promise to obey the popes and to restore catholic rites. There was, indeed, a good reason why he insisted that the oath should not be made public.

¹ Catholic hopes of Ladislav suppressing the Hussite heresy were nourished, among others, by two exemplary episodes from Prague, related by Piccolomini in his *Report on an Imperial Mission to Regensburg 1454* (*Historia de Ratisponensi Dieta*): *Among others, we heard two noteworthy things from the Burgundian ambassadors. They told [of an episode where] Rokycana had gone in a procession with clergy and laypeople, carrying the holy sacrament of the eucharist before the royal palace. The king had been looking at the square through a window and had not bowed his head nor his neck and had shown no sign of reverence. The other young men who were with him had followed his example. When he was asked why he had done so and was rebuked for not honouring the Saviour, he replied that he knew that Lord's body was worthy of every honour, but since it was being carried by Rokycana, an enemy of the true religion, he had feared that if showed honour to the sacrament, the foolish people would think that he had also shown honour to*

the priest and that the king accepted his views which he actually detested. On another occasion shortly afterwards, Ladislav ordered his priest to celebrate mass in a chapel close to the palace. When he wanted to carry out the order, he was prevented from doing so by the priest who was in charge of the chapel, saying that he himself wanted to celebrate mass and that the king could hear and see him celebrate if he wanted to. This would be the same for the king as if he heard his own chaplain. This priest was a follower of Rokycana and adhered to his beliefs. When the king heard it, he ordered his marshal to go immediately and tell the priest to yield to the royal chaplain. If he did not obey, he should throw him from the tall cliff next to the chapel. Terrified at this message, the priest swallowed his anger. These things the ambassadors told about the King of Bohemia, a most noble boy, to the joy and great pleasure of the listeners. [Sect. 138-139]

² Voigt, IV, p. 425, 427 ff.; Heymann: George, p. 181

After the coronation, Georg would not or could not take effective measures in support of Catholic doctrine and ritual practice. He remained or had to remain a defender of Hussitism, and before he died in 1458, Pope Calixtus had lost his illusions concerning his willingness or ability to contain, weaken and end the Hussite schism.¹

In August 1458, Piccolomini then became pope, under the name of Pius II.

As pope, Piccolomini was no longer a diplomat-fixer of thorny political problems like the Bohemian situation. He was the pope and primary guarantor of the purity of the Faith, a role which he took quite seriously. In the Bohemian matter, he might well accept the conditioned and limited continuance of the practice of communion under both species, which was not in itself a doctrinal matter. But in no way could he condone or appear to tolerate a heresy declaring, as the Hussites did, that men could only be saved if they received communion under both species.

So, whereas a compromise on the ritual matter might be possible, a compromise on the doctrinal issue was impossible.

After the solution achieved by the Council of Basel, based on the Bohemian Compacts, experience had shown that the Hussites had continued with communion under both species without really accepting the conditions connected with the Compacts and without accepting the Church's doctrine in the matter.

The pope's acceptance of a compromise on the ritual of communion would therefore be dependent on Rome's perception of a new Bohemian willingness to accept Church doctrine concerning communion and salvation. The position of the Bohemian ruler was rightly considered by Rome to be of paramount importance in this respect.

Though he had his doubts concerning the role of Podiebrad in the death of King Ladislaus, Pius, in the beginning of his pontificate, still believed, though possibly with some misgivings, that Podiebrad would be an able ruler and a dependable ally for the papacy in handling the Hussite schism and in organizing a crusade against the Turks.²

So, when he invited Podiebrad to come to the Congress of Mantua in 1459, it was as a Catholic king – a fact which Podiebrad naturally exploited to legitimate himself vis-a-vis the Bohemian Catholics as a king recognized by the papacy.

Throughout 1459 and 1460 Podiebrad continued to "play" the pope and received his support as ruler of Bohemia.³

¹ Voigt, IV, p. 431-432

² Heymann: *George*, p. 180-181

³ Voigt, IV, pp. 451-2

But no embassy from Bohemia to the pope was forthcoming,¹ and Podiebrad made no offers concerning the Hussite schism and Bohemian participation in the projected crusade against the Turks. On the contrary, the pope received continuous complaints from Catholics in Bohemia and especially from the very important Catholic city of Breslau about the papal support of a proven heretic as King of Bohemia.²

During these years it was becoming clear that Podiebrad was not actively working for a solution of the Hussite schism. Moreover, in 1459-1460 he engaged in a plot with a number of German princes to take over the imperial power by becoming elected King of the Romans, the actual emperor, Friedrich III, continuing in a nominal function. In this context, also the threat of an ecumenical council, so perilous to the papacy, was ventilated. The plot failed, but Podiebrad had now revealed himself to be an adventurous and dangerous player on the European power scene and someone in whom the papacy should not naively place its trust.

The gloves came off.

In January 1462, a papal envoy came to King Podiebrad to let him know that his relations with Rome had now reached a critical state.³

Podiebrad understood that procrastination and subterfuge would no longer serve, and he soon dispatched a Bohemian embassy to the pope. One of the members of the embassy was the pope's old friend, Prokop von Rabstein, who had taken part in the earlier direct meetings between Podiebrad, as the governor of Bohemia, and Piccolomini, as an imperial and papal diplomat. The embassy reached Rome on 10 March 1462, some days before the arrival of a splendid embassy from the King of France, coming to announce the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges of 1438.

In the ensuing weeks, the pope conducted two extremely important negotiations, one with the French and one with the Bohemians. The negotiation with the French took priority and was highlighted by the papal oration "*Per me reges regnant*" [65], celebrating a great diplomatic victory for the Papacy. Although that victory proved to be rather short-lived, it undoubtedly influenced the negotiations with the Bohemians, since – for the time being – it seemed to assure the pope of peaceful relations with the French and to remove the threat of an ecumenical council.^{4 5}

The Bohemian ambassadors were received in two consistory meetings. In the first, Prokop von Rabstein presented the king's obedience to the pope. Afterwards, another member of the embassy, a Hussite priest, ill-advisedly argued for benefits of the communion under both species as divinely

¹ Voigt, IV, p. 452-453

² Heymann: *George*, ch. 10

³ Voigt, IV, p. 458; see also Heymann: *George*, pp. 232-365 and ch. 12

⁴ Voigt, IV, p. 459; Heymann: *George*, p. 262

⁵ See Heymann: *John Rokycana*, p. 255

revealed and – indirectly - as necessary for salvation, an argument which the Holy See must consider as heretical.¹

The following negotiations with the Bohemians did not, and probably could not, establish the basis for a compromise in the matter of the Bohemian schism. The Hussite priests in the Bohemian embassy staunchly upheld Hussite teachings, and King Podiebrad could not afford, had he been willing, to alienate his Hussite subjects *en bloc*. On his part, the pope would not and could not compromise on the doctrinal issue.

So, without some, even a minimal commitment from Podiebrad to uphold his coronation oath (as understood by Rome) and to affirm catholic doctrine and thereby recognize that the Roman Church had not been sending generations of believers and countless souls to Hell by denying them the communion under both species, Rome could not budge on the question of rite, though this was not in itself the stumbling block of the matter. There were also other considerations than the doctrinal one, especially political considerations. But the basic issue for the Catholic Church was and had to be doctrinal: it could only grant communion of the chalice to the Bohemians if the Bohemians acknowledged that this form of communion was not necessary for salvation. In the circumstances, confirming or granting the communion under both species to the Bohemians would be taken by the Hussites as an admission by the Church that the Hussite teachings on the Eucharist were right and the Church's teachings wrong.

The momentous papal decision concerning the communion under both species was the starting point for a process leading, shortly before Pius' death, to the summoning of King Podiebrad to Rome to defend himself against accusations of heresy, to the king's excommunication by Pius' successor, and to later wars so detrimental to all parties, and first of all to Bohemia itself. It may also reasonably be believed that it contributed to a weakening of Podiebrad's position to the extent that it would be impossible for him to establish his own family as a continuing royal dynasty.

2. Themes

2.1. Politics

Piccolomini's travel to Bohemia was an imperial diplomatic mission with clear political aims.² These were the subject of his negotiations with the various parties represented at the assembly in Benesov and with governor Georg Podiebrad. Only the issue of pacification of the Bohemian lands for its future Habsburg king is mentioned directly by Piccolomini in the present text, but the other issues,

¹ See Pius' own description of this event in CO, VII, 15 (Gragg, pp. 512-514). See also the report in Rainaldus, Ad ann. 1462. Also Heymann: *George*, p. 270-275

² In writing and sending his report to Cardinal Carvajal and through him to the curia and the pope,

Piccolomini, quite probably also had other, personal aims, e.g. promoting his own ecclesiastical career, with his eyes firmly fixed on the cardinal's hat, see Kaminsky, p. 287-288

known from other texts,¹ he undoubtedly refers to in the passage: *Thus we ended our conversation and took leave of each other. We actually spoke about much more [than related here], but this is the gist of our discussion on the ecclesiastical issues. And though the words may not have been the same, I have rendered their substance without distortions and changes.* [Sect. 34]

Piccolomini's first political aim was to communicate to the Bohemian estates the emperor's refusal to end his wardship over his royal nephew, Ladislaus the Posthumous, and to send him to Bohemia to be brought up there, under Bohemian governors. The important thing was, however, not just to communicate this decision but to make the Bohemians accept it and not join Austrian and Hungarian protests against the emperor's bringing Ladislaus on his coronation journey to Rome. Piccolomini does not comment on this issue in the present text, but it is otherwise known that in this regard the mission was a success though there may have been some Bohemian protest – more as a matter of form.

The second aim was to induce governor Georg Podiebrad to work for a *modus vivendi* with the Catholic Church concerning the Hussite schism. This would clear the path for King Ladislaus' peaceful accession to the throne and thus facilitate the extension of the Habsburg power sphere into Central and Eastern Europe. This theme is mentioned directly by Piccolomini:

But you, who lead the peoples of the kingdom where you wish, make a great name for yourself, make the Apostolic See love you, give her back the sons whom Satan abducted. Let the river draw its waters from the source so that it will not dry out as it is cut off. If it is your wish, all will return and venerate the Roman Church. The Roman Pontiff and the Emperor will love you above all, and when Ladislaus comes to the kingdom, he will call you his guide and father and thank you fervently for giving him back a pacified province, cleansed of errors, at peace, distinguished by its morals, fervent in the Faith. [Sect. 20]

Podiebrad was not unwilling, but he clearly informed Piccolomini that the condition *sine qua non* for reunification of Bohemia with the Roman Church was the confirmation of the Compacts made with the Council of Basel, granting the Bohemians the practice of communion under both species. He said:

... I tell you that if the treaty is not kept, there will no place for peace and no word of agreement. If we go to war again and you offer us the old pacts, we shall not accept them. We are not few, though you appear to think so. Many in the neighbouring lands agree with us and are only waiting for us to lead out an army. You know what happened in former years. If the pope is wise, he will not discuss whether we have lost our privileges, or we shall take a great revenge by arms. Anyone who refuses just [requests], gives all to the one who holds the weapons. Maybe there are some who make extravagant promises, who pledge large armies, and who boast that they will force their way to us. But we know the ways and strengths of our neighbours. If I should give the pope an advice, it would be to keep the Compacts. [Sect. 25]

¹ See oration "Petivistis ex Caesare" (1451)

On this and later occasions, Podiebrad managed to persuade Piccolomini that the grant of communion under both species was necessary for a reunification of the Bohemians with Rome.

The third aim was to create the basis for an alliance between the emperor and Georg Podiebrad, that would generally strengthen the emperor's position vis-à-vis his enemies and rivals and, not the least, his own Austrian subjects. Also in this matter, the mission proved to be a success.

2.2. Communion under both species

This very complicated matter had three different components: ritual, Faith, and authority. It was further complicated by the fact that without access to relevant historical records, neither the Hussites nor the representatives of the Church of that age had a clear knowledge of the historical process which had, only some centuries before, gradually led to the abolition of the communion of the chalice for laypeople.

2.2.1. Ritual

Historically, the Church was quite familiar with diversity of rites between the various patriarchates and had even accepted it within single dioceses as witnessed by a decree of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, saying:

Quoniam in plerisque partibus intra eandem civitatem atque diocesim permixti sunt populi diversarum linguarum, habentes sub una fide varios ritus et mores, districte praecipimus, ut pontifices hujusmodi civitatum sive diocesum, provideant viros idoneas, qui secundum diversitates rituum et linguarum divina officia illis celebrent et ecclesiastica sacramenta ministrent, instruendo eos verbo pariter et exemplo.¹

And in the Latin Church, the Ambrosian rite of Milan as well as the Mozarabic rite of Toledo have survived to the present age.

In 1455, Piccolomini himself told the pope, in the memorandum/oration "*Res Bohemicas*", that

ceremonies and solemn holy rites are found to be different in different peoples, and the Divine Piety has not told us which rites please him most, though it may be assumed that those which are more common are more pleasing to God. For only with divine approval do ritual ceremonies grow and spread to all the world and are accepted by it. It is not for us to oppose those forms of devotion that are not contrary to divine law. [Sect. 63]

¹ Constitutio 9. COD, p. 215

As for the communion under both species, the Roman Church knew perfectly well that it had been the practice of the Early Church, and it accepted without reservation that it had been kept by the Eastern churches [see sect. 56-57].

So, the ritual matter in itself was not the great stumbling block for a settlement between the Bohemians and the Roman Church, as had been shown when the Council of Basel made the Compacts with the Hussites in 1436.

Piccolomini himself said that in abolishing the communion of the chalice for laypeople,

the Church does not corrupt the sacrament but changes the rite. That which belongs to the essence of the sacrament continues unchangeably. That which belongs to the rite, the Church can change, for its power is not smaller today than it was under the apostles. But as the doctors teach, the power and administration of the Church comprises three things: the orders of the various prelates, the administration of the sacraments, and the various rules for its subjects. This is why the excellent doctor, Aquinas, justly considered that the Church had the competence to create various ranks of prelates and to remove them because of different conditions and times.

Thus we ordain subdeacons though they were unknown in the Primitive Church. Thus bishops were set above priests, though – as Jerome states – they once had equal power. And thus was established the holy senate of cardinals, a great ornament and stable foundation of the Church. In the administration of the sacraments, the Church can also abolish previous rites and introduce new rites and ceremonies. Therefore, though the Lord gave communion to his disciples after they had eaten dinner, the Church does not, except under urgent circumstances, permit brothers who have eaten breakfast or the noon meal to receive this great sacrament. And though Christ instituted this sacrament girded with a towel and only said a few words, the Church out of reverence for the sacrament gave ornamental vestments to the priests and adorned the solemnity of the mass with readings from the prophets and the apostles as well as with pious prayers. In the Old Law, the skins dyed red and the primitive tabernacle were followed by the holy glory of the high temple, and similarly, the simple ways of the Primitive Church in the New testament were gradually followed by splendour in the divine worship and a lustrous ritual for the sacraments and a greater majesty of the priesthood. [Sect. 67-69]

Asked by the Hussites for papal and conciliar pronouncements forbidding the communion under both species, Piccolomini could only refer to the declarations of the two recent councils of Konstanz and Basel. At the time he may not have known that no pope except Pope Martin V had ever forbidden this form of communion and neither had any previous council except the Council of Konstanz, but some years later, again in the “*Res Bohemicas*” he said to the pope that

The Latins, however, treated the sacraments of Christ with greater reverence, understanding how much we should honour and revere the body and blood of Our Saviour, the son of God supreme, who thunders from on high. They also understood that the divine flesh and heavenly

blood must be treated with awe. Fearing that the Holy blood would sometimes be treated uncautiously and spilt on the earth when distributed to the masses, they gradually abolished the communion of the chalice for the people. And thus, with the passing of time, it became the normal practice in the Latin [Church] that no layman might presume to demand the chalice of the Lord. For the Latin Church knows that the whole and complete body of Christ is contained in the sacrament administered under one species and that laymen do not need to take communion under both species to be saved. But I have never read nor heard who initiated this custom and when the prohibition of the chalice for the people was introduced.¹ It is clear, however, that before the Council of Konstanz neither the Roman Pontiffs nor the Universal Synods² are found to have authorised this prohibition. And from older times many decrees are extant that appear to mandate the communion of the chalice. [Sect. 41]

2.2.2. Faith

The problem concerning communion under both species was not a matter of ritual, but a matter of Faith. On the basis of the description of the last supper by the evangelists and Saint Paul, the Hussites believed that Jesus Christ himself had commanded that all should receive the sacrament under both species. Those who only received it under one species, therefore, disobeyed a divine command and were not saved but condemned to Hell. The Hussites furthermore pointed to a number of declarations of Fathers, doctors and even a pope to prove that communion under both species was part of Church tradition:

When Paul and the evangelists show the command of eating together with the command of drinking, who does not see that the Roman Church is in violation of this command and closes the way of salvation by forbidding the people [to drink] the blood of Christ. To this should be added the praxis of the holy apostles and other disciples, who learnt the meaning of the new law not from a man but from the mouth of the Lord. Their action is our instruction for it is sinful to think they were in error. Also Greece, the mother of letters and the teacher of all disciplines, has until now kept unchanged the tradition of Paul, who was the author of [the practice of] eating the bread and drinking from the chalice, as his own letter to the Corinthians attests. Moreover, several of the doctors interpret the text of John in our sense, and Pope Leo is said to have declared that those who take the sacrament under one species should not abstain from the chalice. So, when the Roman Church so clearly gainsays the divine precepts, how can we respect it and heed its words and keep its law? Must we obey men rather than God, the pope rather than Christ, and the decretals rather than the Gospel? [Sect. 48]

¹ Communion under both species was the normal practice in the Church for more than 1.000 years. In the High Middle Ages it gradually gave way to the communion under the species of bread alone. Piccolomini was correct in maintaining that no

ecumenical council and no pope had forbidden the communion under both species before the Council of Konstanz, see Smend, p. 29 ff.

² i.e. General Council

On his part, Piccolomini did his best to refute – point for point and at some length - the Hussite interpretation of the Gospel and to prove that Christ’s command for communion under both species only applied to priests performing the sacrament. He, too, of course, could point to doctors and theologians.

Whatever the truth of this matter, the Hussite view that communion under both species also for laymen is a divine command, had the unfortunate consequence firstly that Christians – including their own forefathers - who only communicated under one species, were not saved but condemned to Hell, and secondly that this was the fault of the Church which had forbidden them the communion under both species.

Such a view was, of course, completely unacceptable to the Church, which rejected it as heretical, as declared by the councils of Konstanz and Basel, and as Piccolomini told Podiebrad:

When the council spoke about communion under both species, it rejected your opinions, declaring that it is not necessary for salvation nor commanded by Christ that the people should receive communion under both species. [Sect. 22]

Thus the Church could never accept a settlement with the Bohemians which did not explicitly reject the heretical view of communion under both species also for laymen as a divine command and therefore as necessary for salvation.

2.2.3. Authority

In the light of the Lutheran reformation some generations later, owing much to Hussitism,¹ the Hussite challenge to Church authority was possibly even more serious for the Catholic Church than the heresy concerning communion under both species as a divine command. It had, of course, not originated in Bohemia, but rather with Wycliff in England, but it really continued a current of defiance against established religious authority represented by a number of teachings and movements in the Middle Ages condemned by the Church as heretical.

Church history, with its many heresies and schisms, had abundantly proven that scriptural passages could be interpreted differently. God had foreseen this would happen and had therefore set up a tribunal on Earth to make the final judgment concerning the true meaning of Scripture. As Piccolomini told the Hussites:

The doubts that afflict you arise from Holy Scripture, for it was never so straightforward and clear that it could not be bent towards different meanings. From the time of the Early Church until now, all schisms have their origin in the Holy Books. But God knew what would happen, so after he had given the law to the people of Israel through his servant Moses and listed clearly

¹ Heymann: *John Rokycana*, p. 240

what to pursue and what to avoid, and knowing there would be people who made conflicting interpretations of His law, he safeguarded the future and set up a barrier against heresies by establishing a supreme tribunal on Earth, to which all major causes and all doubts concerning the law should be referred. For in the Deuteronomy the Lord says: If thou perceive that there be among you a hard and doubtful matter in judgment between blood and blood, cause and cause, leprosy and leprosy: and thou see that the words of the judges within thy gates do vary: arise, and go up to the place, which the Lord thy God shall choose. And thou shalt come to the priests of the Levitical race, and to the judge, that shall be at that time: and thou shalt ask of them, and they shall shew thee the truth of the judgment. And thou shalt do whatsoever they shall say, that preside in the place, which the Lord shall choose, and what they shall teach thee, according to his law; and thou shalt follow their sentence: neither shalt thou decline to the right hand nor to the left hand. But he that will be proud, and refuse to obey the commandment of the priest, who ministereth at that time to the Lord thy God, and the decree of the judge, that man shall die, and thou shalt take away the evil from Israel. This was the Lord's command to those who followed the Old Testament, so that nobody, led astray by his own opinions, would divide the people and introduce foreign religions. For evil things will happen to those, who walk in the error of their heart.

And neither did Christ – founder of the new law, teacher of truth and maker of salvation - neglect the refuge of a supreme tribunal. He chose Peter and through Peter the other bishops of the Roman See to be his vicars after his ascension into Heaven and hold the first place in the Church. This he did when he promised Peter the keys to the Kingdom of Heaven and the power to bind and to loosen and when he finally entrusted to him the care of the flock, saying: Feed my sheep. Why did he do that? Why was it needful for Peter to become the shepherd, to keep the keys of the Kingdom, to accept the first place, to act as Christ's vicar, if not to bring the erring back, to instruct the unknowing, to strengthen the fearful, to oust the intractable, to assist the faithful, to oppose the heretics. If we were just and all naturally saw and followed what is true, we would not need the law of a prince. But since destructive characters arise, who sow pestiferous doctrines and pour lethal poison and kill gullible souls, it was necessary to establish a supreme tribunal to judge between leprosy and leprosy. This tribunal is with the Apostolic See. The Lord made the Apostolic See the hinge and head, and it is not dependent on anybody else. And just as the door is ruled by the hinge, thus, as the Lord has ordained it, all the churches are governed by the authority of this Holy See. And – in the words of holy Pope Calixtus - there is no doubt whatsoever that the Apostolic See is the mother of all churches and that nobody should deviate from its norms. [38-39]

Piccolomini summed up:

Many passages in the Holy Book can be given different interpretations. In those cases, we should not seek elsewhere for a different or external meaning, but establish the meaning on the basis of scriptural testimony, and wrest the true meaning from Scripture itself, which only the Church knows and teaches to her sons. [Sect. 49]

When the Hussites insisted that in this case the Church's interpretation of Scripture was wrong and theirs was right, Piccolomini asked who would prevail in the case of doubt and received the answer that *Christ the Lord will be the judge*. [Sect. 62]

Piccolomini, correctly, concluded that the Hussites

do not accept any judge or any superior on Earth who could settle dubious matters. Thus you do not believe that the Roman Pontiff is the head of the Christian people, nor do you accept the general councils, but you disdain Militant Church, though she is the mentor of the faithful, the teacher of truth, the enemy of lies, our mother that gave us rebirth in Christ, and who raises and nourishes us in the Faith. [Sect. 63]

It was a total non-meeting of minds. The established Church, sure of its own supreme religious authority, considered Hussitism to be just another heresy in the long line of heresies encountered over hundreds of years, to be fought with the usual means, while the Hussites, completely rejecting the Church's authority, maintained that they had found an absolute truth and obstinately clung to it. Neither party was aware that they were surfing on a mighty wave of history which would in a few generations lead to a religious revolution and later to a fundamental contestation of divinely established authority.

2.3. Church properties

Another stumbling block to the reunification of Bohemia with the Catholic Church was the takeover of many church properties by laypeople, often important nobles, and even some catholic ones, like Ulrich von Rosenberg.

The Church naturally demanded the restitution of these properties.

In this matter Podiebrad showed himself to be accommodating, perhaps surprisingly so in view of the difficulty in wresting such properties from the great nobles who had appropriated them:

The issue of the church properties I consider to be of lesser importance, since those who occupy them do not claim to have the right to do so, and the kingdom does not favour them. But these properties have been taken over by a number of people, and at a very low mortgage rate. In the kingdom properties with a yearly income of five sexagenae are normally bought at a price of 100 sexagenae. But these people have acquired properties with yearly incomes of 10, 20 or more sexagenae at the [standard] price of 100 sexagenae. Therefore, they can be compelled to immediately restore occupied properties with unusually high incomes. The rest they may keep until they are redeemed. Thus, these properties will soon be restored to the Church, and in a short time they will regain them all, or a better way may be found, if so wished. [Sect. 27]

2.4. Jan Rokycana

Concerning Jan Rokycana,¹ the Hussite cleric whose election as Archbishop of Prague had been recognized by Emperor Sigismund as part of the settlement in Iglau in 1436, Piccolomini frankly told Podiebrad that this appointment was totally unacceptable to Rome. As an archbishop he would systematically promote Hussitism at the cost of the Bohemian Catholics, and his confirmation as archbishop would completely alienate these Catholics who had remained loyal to the Church, even in times of dire persecution by the Hussites. Said Piccolomini to Podiebrad:

The Apostle admonishes us not to take a neophyte as bishop, lest being puffed up with pride, he fall into the judgment of the devil. But your Rokycana is not new in the Faith, no, he is not of the Faith at all. In his sermons he denounces the Apostolic See and declares that the whole Church is in error, claiming that the communion under both species is necessary for all the faithful, and insisting that he holds truths which the Roman Church contradicts. But it is he who is in error, and the truth is not in him. Without divine dispensation, he made himself the leader of the reckless rabble in Prague. Without any legal claim, he appointed himself provost. Despite the refusal of the Vicar of Christ, he assumed the name and office of bishop. His speech slithers along like a snake and pours his mortal poison into the hearts of the listeners. The chair that your Rokycana occupies is not an episcopal chair, but the chair of pestilence. He is a master of error and an outstanding expert on corrupting truth, who has forsaken the fountain of living water and dug for himself hollowed lakes which cannot hold water. I say openly what I think and hold nothing back. How can the Roman Pontiff entrust so important a church to this man? He dismays the Apostolic See, he curses the whole Church, he introduces new rites, he will subject himself to nobody's examination, he disrupts the peace of the Lord with the fury of discord, and though he wants to govern many, he himself wants to be governed by nobody. Should we entrust the sheep to such a wolf? What would the others from the kingdom say who have until now followed the Roman Church with courage and loyalty? If the Supreme Pontiff appointed Rokycana, would they not come him and ask: "Holy Father, who is this to whom you commit us? To whom do you entrust us who have been loyal to you? Do you give our souls to the enemy to be killed? Can you not find someone among us to appoint as leader of our Church? We are in the majority whether you consider the nobility or the people of the kingdom. How does our loyalty help us? Our constancy? You show greater favour to your adversaries [than to us]. Is this how you reward the faithful? Will the others get an archbishop who supports communion under both species? Will we who communicate under one species only be left as orphans?" I do not think, Georg, that what you request can be done. Rokycana's hope is in vain, and so is yours. If you want peace, then abandon him, and you who promised to support him should not be bound by your seals. It is enough that you have tried hard. One cannot be obliged to do what is impossible, and you cannot force the pope. Follow the rite of the Church and conform to the ways of the other Christians. Thus you will win the pope for you,

¹ For a long time, historians neglected Rokycana or had a somewhat negative view of him. For a modern historian's reappraisal of Rokycana, his theological

views, his policies, and his importance, see Heymann: *John Rokycana*

and all others will be kindly disposed. And thus you may peacefully enjoy the benefits of a tranquil and happy kingdom. [Sect. 30-32]

Apparently, Podiebrad accepted Piccolomini's position or at least he made him believe that he had, indicating that he would work for the appointment of another man as Archbishop of Prague, and telling Piccolomini that

I like you, for you do not dissemble or pretend, but say what is in your heart. I trust you, and no longer think that we may hope for Rokycana. We must look to others. However, since he was elected by a vote of the Kingdom, he must be encouraged and enticed to renounce the election. Then we can ask for somebody else from the clemency of the Apostolic See. [Sect. 32]

3. Conduct of diplomacy

Piccolomini's report to Cardinal Carvajal on his diplomatic mission to Bohemia was not a diplomatic report in the sense of a report from an ambassador to his princely master, with an account of the mission and its results. The account of the visit to Benesov does, however, throw some light on Piccolomini's conduct of diplomacy.

Firstly, in Benesov he negotiated with all the parties in presence, both adversaries and opponents of the imperial and royal cause, and both Hussites and Catholics.

Secondly, he correctly identified the principal partner on the opposite side with whom to conduct the essential negotiations. It was, as seen, Georg Podiebrad whom the seasoned imperial diplomat considered to be *a very important man in Bohemia: he has great power in the party that communicates under both species, and many from the other party are allied with him in military matters. If anybody can bring the cities to a union, it is Georg.* [Sect. 34]

Thirdly, his style of negotiation was pleasant, polite, and direct. Here was no haughty imperial courtier dictating the imperial will to a barbarian prince, here was no prelate of the Church bemoaning the wickedness of the lapsed subjects of the Church or threatening them with ecclesiastical censures. No, here was a charming, frank, intelligent, informed and sympathetic interlocutor. That this style, which probably came naturally to Piccolomini, was appreciated is shown by Podiebrad's own words to him: *I like you, for you do not dissemble or pretend, but say what is in your heart. I trust you.* [Sect. 32]

Fourthly, there was a direct approach to determining the main issues of the negotiation, assessing the impediments to a peaceful solution, naming the advantages of a settlement (including for the

interlocutor personally), testing the limits of possible concessions, and identifying the basis for an honourable compromise.

In the case of the four basic issues separating Bohemia from the Church, Podiebrad could not yield in the matter of communion under both species, whereas Piccolomini could not yield in the doctrinal matter (non-necessity for salvation of communion under both species) nor in the matter of the Archbishop of Prague. Concerning the fourth issue, the confiscated church properties, it appeared that a sensible compromise might be found. This would be the basis for Piccolomini's subsequent development of a proposal for the reunification of Bohemia with the Catholic Church: to grant communion under both species to Bohemia, to insist on the non-necessity of communion under both species, to refuse Jan Rokycana as Archbishop of Prague, and to seek a pragmatic settlement on the issue of the Church properties.^{1 2}

Fifthly, sending this report to Cardinal Carvajal was not just an act of friendship, but a calculated diplomatic move in the interest of the emperor and King Ladislaus. It prepared the way for a compromise by informing the Roman curia of the real possibilities of settlement of the Bohemian conflict if only it was willing to deal with Podiebrad as the privileged Bohemian counterpart - and consequently not Ulrich von Rosenberg, the leader of the Catholic party, though Piccolomini, cleverly, did not fail to recommend also this prince to the curia.

Finally, it must not be forgotten that Piccolomini had to speak with Podiebrad through a translator, his friend Prokop von Rabstein, which may have led to some imprecision of communication and possibly to some misunderstanding on Piccolomini's part of Podiebrad's basic convictions and political margin of manoeuvring.³

4. Date, addressee and format

The report is dated 21 September 1451 and would have been written after Piccolomini's return to the imperial court, in August and September.

It was addressed and sent to Cardinal Carvajal, who would undoubtedly forward it to the pope and the curia or at least inform them of it, as intended by Piccolomini.

The format is a letter, but it is rather a *narratio*, even containing two dialogues – as also used by Piccolomini's model, Cicero, as the format for his treatises on various subjects. One dialogue

¹ In the oration "*Res Bohemicas*" (1455)

² Fudge: *Seduced*, p. 91

³ Piccolomini probably overrated Podiebrad's will "to lead, if he but willed, the Bohemian people back to

complete orthodoxy" (Heymann: *John Rokycana*, p. 253)

concerned Piccolomini's negotiation with the Bohemian governor, and the other his theological debate with the Taborite Hussites.

Piccolomini claims that the dialogues were very close to the actual conversation and debate, and they do appear to give a fair representation of the views of his interlocutors. Undoubtedly, however, Piccolomini would to some extent have shaped the account to fit his style and purpose.

5. Text

The manuscripts collated for the present edition appear to represent two versions of the text, the older version (mss. L, N, M) being identical with or close to Piccolomini's original text, and the later version (the other mss., F, O, U, V, WO) having been slightly revised for inclusion in the "official" edition of Piccolomini's correspondence as bishop (*epistolae in episcopatu*).¹ One of the manuscripts of the second group, the O, appears to have been handled directly by Pius II himself, carrying several margin notes in his hand.

¹ The pattern of variants clearly indicates two groups of mss., L/N/M and F/O/U/V/WO. The assessment of L/N/M as the elder group is based on the following errors in transcription common to the Later Version: 1) Sect. 54: triplex est, ut noster Aquinas ait ... hujus excellentissimae rei significatio triaque tempora respicit. Ex *praeterito* significat nobis dominicam passionem vocaturque sacrificium. Ex *praesenti* refert ecclesiasticam unitatem et communio dicitur. Ex *futuro* praesignat Dei fruitionem, quam praestolamur in caelis, et vocatur viaticum, quia viam praebet ad patriam, et secundum hoc etiam eucharistia, id est bona gratia, nuncupatur. Et sacerdotibus quidem sacrificium convenit, ceteris vero communio **atque**¹ viaticum (Early Version: **atque**; Later Version: **ad**. Since Piccolomini here lists the two forms of communion available to the laity, only **atque** gives meaning, and **ad** must be due to a later scribal error). 2) sect. 55: Galechus: ... Hic nodus est, hic vis. Aeneas: Pulchre de nodo locutus es, nam tu nodum in sirpo quaeris. Sed non est hic **nodus**, quem ferunt Alexandrum in curri Gordii reperisse, quem cum solvere manu non posset, ense rescidit. (EV: **nodus**; LV:

modus. From the context (de nodo / hic nodus) it is evident that Galechus talked about a **nodus**, not a **modus**, which must be due to a later scribal error. 3) sect. 56: Mirabile dictu est, si multa fercula et **mixta** cervisiae vina et longissimi somni melius vobis scripturam exponunt quam ceteris abstinentiae atque vigiliae (EV: **mixta**; LV: **mixte**. Grammatically **mixta** is correct, and **mixte** must be due to a later scribal error). 4) sect 56, 57: Galechus: Male nos arguis, non enim nostram sed **apostolorum doctrinam Graecorumque** sequimur. Aeneas: At **illi** non dixerunt damnatos esse populos, qui de calice non acciperent, nec nos ad omnia tenemur, quae in ecclesia primitiva patres egerunt. Sed nec tu tibi de **Graecia** blandiaris. (LV: omits Graecorumque from the EV, though Piccolomini in his reply explicitly mentions both the Early Church (apostolorum) and the Greek); 5) sect. 69: ornamenta vestimentorum **sacerdotibus** dedit (LV: omits **sacerdotibus**, though it clearly belongs to the context); 6) sect. 75: qui **dum** frena superioritatis abjiciunt libertatemque praedicant, necessarium est (LV omits **dum** which governs necessarium est)

5.1. Manuscripts¹

- **Bamberg**
M II 9, ff. 96r-141r
- **Firenze / Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana**
Plut. 54, 19, ff. 122r-137v **(F)**
- **Gotha**
Ch. B, Nr. 61, ff. 233r-261r
- **Göttingen**
Hist. 61, ff. 319r-348r
- **Göttweih**
390, ff. 108v ff.
- **Leipzig / Universitätsbibliothek**
1326, ff. 261r-275r
- **Magdeburg / Domgymnasium**
21, ff. 253r-264r
- **München / Bayerische Staatsbibliothek**
clm 70, ff. 349r-362r² **(L)**
clm 5335, ff. 178r-200r³ **(M)**
clm 16188, ff. 235f-247r
clm 18740, ff. 195r ff.
clm 19608, ff. 124r-136v⁴ **(N)**
clm 24861, ff. 1r-22r
- **Paris / Bibliothèque Nationale**
10343, ff. 73r ff.
- **Quedlinburg / Gymnasium**
189

¹ The following list of mss. is given by WO, but it is not comprehensive

² Bild 698-724 in digital version

³ Bild 361-406 in digital version

⁴ Bild 256-281 in digital version

- **Roma / Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana**
Ott. lat. 347, ff. 218v-242r¹ **(O)**²
Urb. lat. 401, ff. 263r-287r³ **(U)**
Vat. lat. 1787, ff. 261r-299r⁴ **(V)**

- **Salzburg / St. Peter**
a II, ff. 22r ff.

- **Sankt Florian**
XI 108, ff. 356r-366r

- **Wien / Nationalbibliothek**
3338, ff. 13r-25r
3420, ff. 148r-159r
3704, ff. 147r-160r
4498, ff. 65 ff.

- **Wien / Dominikanerkloster**
16

5.2. Editions

- Marquard Freher: *Rerum Bohemicarum Antiqui Scriptorum Aliquot Insignes ...* Hannover, 1602 / pp. 181-193.
[A version closely related to the L/N/M group of manuscripts]
- Pius II: *Opera quae extant omnia*. Basel: Heinrich Petri, 1551, pp. 660-678
- *Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini*. Hrsg. von Rudolf Wolkan. 3 vols. Wien, 1909-1918 // Tom. III, I. Wien 1918, pp. 22-57⁵
[Wolkan often follows the readings of the Firenze manuscript]

The text is also included in a number of early printed editions of Piccolomini's letters, e.g.,

- *Epistolae et varii tractatus Pii secundi pontificis maximi*. Lyon: Etienne Geynard, nr. 130

¹ https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Ott.lat.347

² This manuscript was handled by Pius himself, as shown by several comments in the margin, e.g. "Facete" (Sect. 56)

³ https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Urb.lat.401

⁴ https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.1787

⁵ Singular forms in address to Cardinal Carvajal changed to plural by Wolkan

Excerpts are given in the

- *Annales ecclesiastici ab anno MCXCVIII ubi Card. Baronius desinit.* Auct. Odoricus Raynaldus. Tom. XVIII-XIX. Roma: Varesius, 1659-1663 // ad ann. 1451, nr. 11

5.3. Present edition

The edition is based on the manuscripts listed above with the siglum, with the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana / Plut. 54, 19 as the lead manuscript.

Pagination is from the lead manuscript.

6. Sources

In this oration, 83 direct and indirect quotations from various sources have been identified, most from the Bible (68), some from patristic and medieval sources (11), a few from classical sources (4), and none from contemporary sources.

The quotations from Thomas Aquinas and Augustine have not been identified. Piccolomini had not studied theology, and he may not have read the works cited, but had possibly - during the Hussite discussions at the Council of Basel 1433-1436 – heard and copied the quotations for his file of quotations and exempla for future use.

Biblical: 68

Classical: 4

Patristic and medieval: 11

Contemporary: 0

All: 83

Biblical sources: 68

Old Testament: 20

- Genesis: 1
- Exodus: 1
- Deuteronomy: 1

- Numbers: 1
- Canticle: 1
- Isaiah: 3
- Jeremiah: 3
- Joel: 1
- 2. Kings: 2
- Lamentations: 1
- Proverbs: 1
- Psalms: 4

New Testament: 48

- John: 11
- Luke: 3
- Mark: 12
- Matthew: 5
- Acts: 4
- Apocalypse: 1
- 1. Corinthians: 3
- 2. Corinthians: 3
- Galatians: 3
- Hebrews: 1
- Romans: 1
- 1. Timothy: 1

Classical sources: 4

- Cicero: 1¹
- Horatius: 1²
- Terentius: 1³
- Vergilius: 1⁴

Patristic and medieval sources: 11

- Albertus Magnus: 1⁵

¹ De republica

² Epistolae

³ Phormio

⁴ Aeneis

⁵ Sermones XXXII de Corpore Christi

- Augustinus: 1
- Cyprianus: 3¹
- Decretum Gratiani: 3
- Jacobus de Voragine: 1²
- Thomas Aquinas: 1³
- Zacharias Chysopolitanus: 1⁴

Contemporary sources: 0

7. Sigla and abbreviations

F = Firenze / Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana / Plut. 54, 19

L = München / Bayerische Staatsbibliothek / clm 70

M = München / Bayerische Staatsbibliothek / clm 5335

N = München / Bayerische Staatsbibliothek / clm 19608

O = Roma / Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana / Ott. lat. 347

U = Roma / Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana / Urb. lat. 401

V = Roma / Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana / Vat. lat. 1787

WO = *Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini*. Hrsg. von Rudolf Wolkan. 3 vols. Wien, 1909-1918 // Tom. III, I. Wien 1918, pp. 492-595

¹ De unitate ecclesiae

² Legenda aurea / Petrus

³ Probably the De venerabili Sacramento Altaris

⁴ Unum ex quattuor, sive concordia evangelistarum

Abbreviations

CO = Pius II: *Commentarii rerum memorabilium quae suis temporibus contigerunt* [1464]

HA = Eneas Silvius Piccolomini: *Historia Austriasis*. Teil 1: Einleitung von Martin Wagendorfer. 1. Redaktion ed. von Julia Knödler. Teil 2: 2./3, ed. Martin Wagendorfer. 2 vols. Hannover, 2009. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum. Nova Series; 24)

HB = Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini: *Historia Bohemica*. Herausg. J. Hejnic & H. Rothe. 2 vols. Köln, 2005. (Bausteine zur slavischen Philologie und Kulturgeschichte. Neue Folge. Reihe B; 20)

MPL = Migne, Jacques-Paul: *Patrologia latina*. 217 vols. 1841-1865

OO = Pius II: *Opera quae extant omnia*. Basel: Heinrich Petri, 1551 [2nd ed., 1571; Anastatic reprod. Frankfurt: Minerva 1967]

WO = *Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini*. Hrsg. von Rudolf Wolkan. 3 vols. Wien, 1909-1918

Epistolarium = Eneae Silvii Piccolominei *Epistolarium Seculare*. Ed. A. van Heck. Città del Vaticano, 2007

Rainaldus = *Annales ecclesiastici ab anno MCXCVIII ubi Card. Baronius desinit*. Auct. Odoricus Raynaldus. Tom. XVIII-XIX. Roma: Varesius, 1659-1663

Reject = *Reject Aeneas, accept Pius : Selected letters of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Pope Pius II)*. Intr. and transl. by T.M. Izbicki *et al.* Washington, D.C., 2006

II. TEXT AND TRANSLATION

[1] {122r}¹ Aeneas, episcopus Senesis, Johanni Carvajal, cardinali sancti angeli, salutem plurimam dicit.

Quamvis apud Bohemos apostolicae sedis legationem obieris² et omnes illius gentis³ mores opinionisque noveris, tamen quia perversi quidam homines⁴ novos⁵ in dies⁶ errores cudunt, et ego nuper jussu Caesaris in Bohemia fui cognovique bonos et malos et multa cum eis contuli et audivi multa, quae sedem apostolicam intelligere non est inutile, decrevi, quae⁷ hac in via⁸ mihi⁹ contigerunt, tuae dignationi perscribere¹⁰. Quod si magnam¹¹ papyrum¹² implevero, non erit tamen¹³ arguenda narratio, quia res plurimas non potest brevis epistola comprehendere, et cavendum est, ne fiam obscurus, dum brevis esse laboro¹⁴. Praetermittam nihilominus multa de multis et solos¹⁵ attingam¹⁶ locos¹⁷ illustriores. Adhibeat mihi benignas¹⁸ aures tua modestia bonique¹⁹ consulat, si liberius scripsero quam tuae dignitati par sit²⁰, nam vetus notitia et usura, quae inter nos olim²¹ fuit, me audacem²² facit. Sed incipiam jam narrare, quia nulla est mihi de tua benignitate dubitatio, quae solet omnia in partem recipere meliorem.

¹ Title: Dialogus de fide et sectis Bohemorum **L**; Opus breve atque elegans reverendi patris domini Enee episcopi Senensis ac poete laureati de sectis Bohemorum ad dominum Johannem cardinali Sancti Angeli **M**; Epistola domini Enee episcopi Senensis ad cardinalem dominum Johannem de statu et heresi terre Pragensis **N**; Epistola CLXXVIII disputat per dialogos contra errores Hussitarum **F, O, V**; No title [*due to rubrics not filled in*] **U**

² abieris **L, N**

³ et *add.* **L**

⁴ perversi quidam homines : quidam homines perversi **L**

⁵ novosque **L, M**

⁶ in dies *omit.* **N**

⁷ *omit.* **N**

⁸ hac in via : in hac via **N**

⁹ que *add.* **N**

¹⁰ proscribere **L**; prescribere **M, WO**

¹¹ magnum **WO**

¹² bapirum **L**

¹³ *omit.* **L**

¹⁴ volo **L**; labor **N**

¹⁵ solo **L**

¹⁶ attingo **L**

¹⁷ loco **U**

¹⁸ benignitas **N**

¹⁹ bonumque **N**

²⁰ par sit : prosit **N**

²¹ inter nos olim : olim inter nos **M**

²² me audacem : audacem me **F, O, U**

[1] Aeneas, Bishop of Siena, sends many greetings to Juan de Carvajal, Cardinal of Sant'Angelo.

1. Introduction

[1] You have yourself been on a legatine mission for the Apostolic See to Bohemia¹ and know all the ways and opinions of this people. Still, since some perverted people invent² new errors every day, and I myself have recently been in Bohemia at the command of the emperor and become acquainted with good and bad people and discussed many things with them and heard many things that will be useful for the Apostolic See to know, I have decided to write an account to Your Honour³ of my experiences on this voyage. Even if I fill a great sheet of paper, there is no reason to blame the account that so many things cannot be contained in a short letter and I must take care not to become incomprehensible while I strive to be brief. Nonetheless, I shall omit much about many things and only touch upon the more important.⁴ May Your Modesty lend me benign ears and take it well if I write more freely than your dignity requires, for our old acquaintance and the companionship,⁵ which we once had, give me courage. But now I shall begin my account since I have no doubt concerning your kindness which usually accepts all favourably.

¹ Cardinal Juan Carvajal had been on a mission as papal legate to Prague in May 1448, a little more than three years before Piccolomini's own mission for the emperor. The legate had been met with the Bohemian demands for confirmation of the Bohemian Compacts (communion under both species) and for Rokycana's appointment as archbishop of Prague. The legate, inflexibly defending the position of the Roman Church, refused both demands, and his mission of

reconciliation turned into a complete failure. He even, reportedly, attempted to deprive the Bohemians of the original sealed document containing the Bohemian Compacts. See Heymann: *George*, pp. 334-40, and *John Rokycana*, p. 250. See also sect. 21

² "cudere"

³ "dignatio"

⁴ "illustrior"

⁵ "usura"

[2] Cum ergo per hos dies de Nova Domo versus Pragam iter agerem essentque¹ mihi collegae nobiles Albertus Eberstorffius² baro, Procopius Rabensteinius³ et Haidenricus⁴ Truscers⁵ equestris ordinis milites, ex usu visum nobis⁶ est, quia raptores et insidias⁷ timebamus, ad Thaboritas⁸ potius divertere quam in apertis villis pernoctare ac luporum magis quam leporum sequi fidem⁹. Praemisimus¹⁰ igitur, qui¹¹ Thaboritas accederent¹² atque ab his jus¹³ hospitalitatis¹⁴ expeterent. Acceperunt haec¹⁵ laetis animis Thaboritae dederuntque fidem atque obviam venerunt. Res spectaculo digna fuit rusticanum et incompositum vulgus, quamvis urbani videri velint. Frigus erat et pluviale tempus, nam Bohemia saepe miscet aestati hiemem¹⁶. Ex illis alii¹⁷ nudi erant, solis tecti camisiis, alii¹⁸ pelliceas¹⁹ tunicas induerant²⁰, alii²¹ sella²² carebant, alii freno, alii calcaribus. Alteri²³ crus ocreatum fuit, alteri nudum. Huic oculus defuit, illi manus, et – ut Virgilianis utamur verbis²⁴ – *foedum²⁵ videre fuit populataque²⁶ tempora²⁷ raptis auribus et truncas²⁸ inhonesto vulnere nares²⁹*. Incedendi nullus ordo, loquendi {122v} nulla modestia, barbaro et³⁰ rusticano ritu nos³¹ exceperunt³². Obtulerunt tamen xenia: pisces, vinum³³, cervisiam.

[3] Sic oppidum ingressi locum vidimus, quem nisi haereticorum arcem aut asylum³⁴ vocem nescio, quo appellem nomine, nam quaecumque deteguntur inter Christianos impietatis ac blasphemiarum³⁵ monstra, huc confugiunt tutamentumque habent, ubi³⁶ *tot* sunt haereses *quot capita*, et libertas est, quae velis, credere. In exteriori³⁷ civitatis porta duo fuerunt³⁸ scuta: in altero pictura erat angeli calicem tenentis quasi communionem sub specie vini suaderet populo, in altero Zischa³⁹ pictus fuit, homo senex et utroque lumine cassus.

¹ essent F

² de Ebersdorff L; de Eberstorff M; de Eberstorff N

³ de Rabenstein L, M, N

⁴ Henricus L, N; Ainricus M

⁵ Druchssess L; Druchsass M; Trursess N; Trucksecz V

⁶ visum nobis : nobis visum F, N, V

⁷ terre *add.* M

⁸ Tabar... *et passim* L

⁹ sequi fidem : fidem sequi N

¹⁰ permisimus U

¹¹ que N

¹² incederent WO

¹³ ut N

¹⁴ hospites N

¹⁵ hoc L

¹⁶ aestati hiemem : hyemem estati L

¹⁷ aliqui L, N

¹⁸ aliqui L

¹⁹ pelliciis N

²⁰ induti erant N

²¹ aliqui L

²² sellis N

²³ alii L, N, U

²⁴ *omit.* L

²⁵ fidem N

²⁶ apostolica quidem N

²⁷ *omit.* N

²⁸ truncatas N; tunicas U

²⁹ uares U

³⁰ ac WO

³¹ *omit.* L

³² susceperunt N

³³ pisces vinum : vinum pisces N

³⁴ asilium U

³⁵ blasphemias L

³⁶ *omit.* U

³⁷ in exteriori : interiori L

³⁸ fuerant L

³⁹ Gischa F, O; Zizka N; Gisca U

2. Visit to Tabor

2.1. Reception

[2] When, quite recently, I travelled from Neuhaus¹ to Prague, together with my noble colleagues, Baron Albrecht Ebersdorf² and the knights Prokop von Rabstein³ and Heinrich Truchsess,⁴ we found it expedient, fearing robbers and ambushes, to make a detour to the Taborites⁵ rather than staying overnight in open cities and trust in wolves more than hares. We, therefore, sent people ahead to the Taborites to request rights of hospitality from them. The Taborites accepted gladly, giving their word and coming to meet us. These people were quite a sight, being rustic and rude but wanting to appear civilised. It was cold and rainy, for Bohemia often mixes summer with winter. Some of the Taborites went nude, only wearing a shirt,⁶ while others had put on leather tunics. Some rode without a saddle, others without a bridle, and others again without spurs. Some wore greaves, others were bare-legged. One lacked an eye, another a hand, and – to use Virgil's words – it was terrible to see *ears wrenched from despoiled temples, and nostrils lopped by a shameful wound*⁷. They advanced without order and spoke without restraint. They received us in a barbarous and rustic manner, but they did offer us guest gifts in the form of fish wine, and beer.

[3] Entering the city, we saw a place which I can only call the fortress or asylum of heretics – I know no other name! For whatever monsters of impiety and blasphemy are found among Christians, they flee to this place and seek protection here, where there are as many heresies *as heads*⁸, and freedom is to believe whatever you will. On the exterior city gate hang two shields, one carrying the picture of an angel holding a chalice as if urging the people to [take] communion under the species of wine, and the other a picture of Zizka,⁹ an old man, blind in both eyes.¹⁰

¹ Nova domus: Jindrichuv Hradec. In this city, Piccolomini met the renegade utraquist priest John Papousek, who provided him with valuable materials and (tendentious) information on Hussitism, see Kaminsky, p. 291

² Albrecht IV von Ebersdorf: baron and imperial courtier

³ Prokop von Rabstein (ca. 1420-1472): Member of the Roman Chancellery of Friedrich III, in 1453 chancellor of Bohemia. A close friend of Piccolomini

⁴ Heinrich Truchsess von Staatz: Imperial courtier

⁵ Tábor: town in the present-day Czech Republic, ca. 100 km. South of Prague. A radical wing of the Hussites was named after the city

⁶ Note that the concept of nudity also comprises seminudity

⁷ Vergilius: *Aeneis*, 6, 496-497

⁸ Terentius: *Phormio*, 454: *quot homines, tot sententiae*

⁹ Jan Zizka (ca. 1360-1424): Bohemian Hussite general, leader of the radical Taborite faction

¹⁰ HB, I, pp. 340-341

[4] Hic olim dux Thaboritarum fuerat, et alterum oculum in pueritia perdiderat, alterum hostili sagitta confossus¹ amisit². Ab³ hoc saepe victos fideles ajunt⁴, saepe Christianorum caedes factas, complures⁵ civitates⁶ ⁷ exustas, diruta⁸ monasteria, sacras aedes incensas, prostitutas virgines, sacerdotes occisos⁹, quem¹⁰ Thaboritae non solum monoculum, sed¹¹ caecum quoque¹² secuti sunt ducem¹³, neque absurde, nam tali populo¹⁴, qui nihil divinitatis intelligit, nihil religionis tenet, nil aequi rectique videt, quis ducatum praebere debuit nisi¹⁵ caecus? Impletum est illud salvatoris in eis¹⁶: *Si caecus caeco ducatum praebat*¹⁷, *ambo in foveam cadunt*.¹⁸ Hic dux, cum¹⁹ morti proximus²⁰ esset²¹, consultarentque Thaboritae, quem post²² se principem designaret, “Postquam,” inquit, “animus a me fugerit, excoriate corpus meum et carnes²³ date volucris; ex corio vero tympanum facite atque²⁴ hoc in proelio ducem habete. Nam quovis²⁵ locorum Theutones sonum ejus audierint²⁶, mox terga dabunt, Zischam in tympano formidantes.” Hic postquam obiit, Thaboritarum²⁷ alii Procopium sibi²⁸ ducem legerunt²⁹, alii in³⁰ tantum illius memoriam³¹ dilexerunt, ut neminem dignum existimarent, qui tanto duci succederet, aspernatique principem³² orphanos sese³³ vocabant, quasi patre carentes atque orbatos, ut qui caecitatem non vivam tantum sed mortuam quoque colendam censebant et ad inferos usque³⁴ sequendam. Hunc autem veluti³⁵ numen Thaborenses habent et, quamvis picturas³⁶ omnes abhominantur³⁷, hujus tamen picturam religiose³⁸ colunt³⁹ et honorem, quem⁴⁰ Christo negant, concedunt Zischae⁴¹.

¹ confixus L, M, N

² auulsit U

³ ad N

⁴ agunt N

⁵ compluris F, O, U, V

⁶ civitatis F, O

⁷ complures civitates : civitates plures N

⁸ dirupta N

⁹ omit. L

¹⁰ hunc L

¹¹ et add. L

¹² omit. L

¹³ secuti sunt ducem : ducem secuti sunt N

¹⁴ omit. L

¹⁵ ducem add. N

¹⁶ in eis : omit. L, N; mei U

¹⁷ prebet L

¹⁸ ducatum praebat ... cadunt : etc. N

¹⁹ dux cum : dum L, M, N

²⁰ morti proximus : proximus morti N

²¹ erunt N

²² potius L

²³ meas add. U

²⁴ et L

²⁵ nam quovis : quovis namque L

²⁶ audiuerint V

²⁷ dux add. N

²⁸ Procopium sibi : sibi Procopium M

²⁹ elegerunt L, N

³⁰ omit. N

³¹ illius memoriam : memoriam illius N

³² principemque O, U

³³ se N

³⁴ ut M

³⁵ velud N

³⁶ omit. L

³⁷ abhominantur L, M

³⁸ religiosi N

³⁹ omit. L

⁴⁰ quam L

⁴¹ concedunt Zischae : Zizkae concedunt N

2.2. Zizka

[4] This man was once the leader of the Taborites. One eye he lost as a child, the other when it was pierced by a hostile arrow.¹ They relate that he often defeated the faithful, slaughtered the Christians, burnt many cities, destroyed monasteries, fired holy buildings, raped virgins, and killed priests. Thus they followed a leader who was not just one-eyed but blind, and that was not absurd at all, for who else than a blind man would be willing to lead such a people, which understands nothing of the divine, has no religion, and sees nothing just and right. In them was fulfilled the saying of the Lord: *if the blind lead the blind, both will fall into the pit.*² When this leader was close to death, the Taborites asked him whom he would designate as leader after himself. He replied, "When my soul has left me, then flay my body and give the meat to the birds. From the skin you should make a drum to have as your leader in battle. For wherever the Germans hear its sound, they will flee immediately, fearing Zizka in the drum."³ When he died, some of the Taborites chose Prokop⁴ as their leader, but the others loved his memory so much that they found nobody worthy to succeed so great a leader. Deciding not to have a leader, they called themselves The Orphans,⁵ as if lacking and being deprived of a father, believing that this blindness should be honoured not only alive but also in death and followed into Hell.⁶ This man the Taborites considers as divine, and though they abhor all pictures, they worship his and show Zizka the honour they refuse to give Christ.

¹ See Heymann: *John Zizka*, pp. 18, 255-258; HB, I, pp. 308-309,

² Matthew, 15, 14

³ The story of Zizka and the drum is a legend, reported by Piccolomini but probably not invented by him. See HB, I, 340-341

⁴ Prokop the Bald (ca. 1380-1434)

⁵ Orphans: Radical Taborite faction

⁶ HB, I, pp. 340-343

[5] Horum secta pestifera et abhominabilis est ac summo digna supplicio¹. Romanam² ecclesiam nolunt³ habere primatum aut proprium⁴ clerum habere quicquam⁵. Imagines Christi sanctorumque⁶ delent, ignem⁷ purgatorium⁸ inficiantur⁹, nihil sanctorum preces jam cum Christo regnantium prodesse mortalibus asseverant¹⁰, {123r} festum diem praeter dominicum et paschalem non agunt, jejunia spernunt, horas canonicas abjiciunt, eucharistiam sub specie panis et vini et¹¹ parvulis et dementibus praebent. Conficientes nihil praeter orationem dominicam et verba consecrationis dicunt, neque vestimenta mutant neque ornatus assumunt aliquos. Quidam vero eo usque desipiunt¹², ut¹³ non verum Christi corpus¹⁴ in sacramento altaris, sed representationem quandam esse contendunt¹⁵, errantis Berengarii non conversi sequaces. Ex sacramentis ecclesiae baptismum, eucharistiam, matrimonium ordinemque recipiunt. De poenitentia parum sentiunt¹⁶, de confirmatione et extrema unctione¹⁷ nihil. Monachorum religionibus infestissimi sunt, inventiones¹⁸ diabolicas asserunt esse. Baptisma simplicis undae volunt, nullam aquam benedicunt. Cimiteria non habent consecrata, cadavera mortuorum in campis et¹⁹, ut digni²⁰ sunt, cum bestiis sepeliuntur, vanumque²¹ censent orare pro mortuis. Ecclesiarum consecrationes derident et in omnibus locis passim²² conficiunt sacramentum.

¹ supplicio digna : digna supplicio L

² et *add.* L; Romanamque M

³ volunt N

⁴ propri F, L; propii M, N; proprii O, U, V

⁵ *omit.* N

⁶ sanctorum F, O, U, V

⁷ lignem U

⁸ purgatorium F; purgatorii N

⁹ negant N

¹⁰ asserunt N

¹¹ *omit.* N

¹² decipiunt N

¹³ et N

¹⁴ Christi corpus : corpus Christi L, M, N

¹⁵ errantes *add.* N

¹⁶ *omit.* F

¹⁷ extrema unctione : unctione extrema L

¹⁸ inventionesque L, M, N

¹⁹ *omit.* N

²⁰ digna L, M, N

²¹ vanum L, N

²² passi U

2.3. Taborite sect

[5] Their sect is pestilential and abominable, deserving of the severest punishment. They do not accept the primacy of the Roman Church, nor do they want to have their own clergy. They destroy the images of Christ and his saints; they deny the fire of purgatory; they claim that the prayers of the saints reigning with Christ do not profit mortals; except sundays and Easter, they do not observe any feast days; they spurn fasting; they reject the canonical hours; they offer the eucharist under the species of bread and wine both to babies and to the insane. Those who perform the sacrament only use the Lord's prayer and the words of consecration. They do not change their clothes nor put on vestments. Following the errors of the unrepentant Berengar,¹ some go so far in their madness as to claim it is not the true body of Christ that is present in the sacrament of the altar but only some kind of representation. Of the sacraments of the Church, they only accept baptism, the eucharist, matrimony, and [priestly] ordination.² They think little of penitence and nothing of confirmation and extreme unction. They absolutely hate religious orders, claiming that they are the inventions of the Devil. They want baptism [to be performed] simply, in flowing water, and they do not bless the water. They do not have consecrated cemeteries, burying the corpses of the dead in the fields, together with animals, as they deserve, and they consider it futile to pray for the dead. They scorn the consecration of churches, and they perform the sacrament everywhere.³

¹ Berengar of Tours (ca. 999-1088): French theologian. Though he accepted the real presence of Christ in the eucharist, he rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation, a view he later retracted, only to even later retract the retraction

² Later in the text, sect. 68, Piccolomini states that the Hussites accepted five sacraments, presumably here including confession

³ Here Utraquism entered upon a new development. The priests of Austi, starting from the principle that the Bible contained the whole teaching of Christ, abolished every traditional rite and liturgy. There were to be no

more churches, altars, vestments, sacred vessels, chants, or ceremonies. The Lord's Prayer was the only liturgical prayer; the communion table was a common table with common bread and common appointments, the celebrant wore his everyday clothes and was untounered. Children were baptized with the first water at hand and without any further ceremony they received Communion in both kinds immediately after Baptism. Extreme unction and auricular confession were abolished; mortal sins were to be confessed in public. Purgatory and the worship of saints were suppressed, likewise all feasts and fasts. (Wilhelm)

[6] Nulla major his cura est quam sermonis audiendi. Si quis negligens est domique torpet aut negotio ludove vacat, dum sermo est, virgis caeditur et intrare¹ ad verbum, ut ajunt, Dei² compellitur. Est illis domus quaedam lignea, similis horreo ruris, hanc templum appellant, hic³ populo praedicant, hic legem per omnes dies exponunt, hic altare unicum habent neque consecratum⁴ neque consecrandum^{5 6}, ex quo sacramentum plebibus exhibent. Sacerdotes neque coronas ferunt neque barbas tondent⁷. His Thaboritae frumento, cervisia, lardo, leguminibus⁸, lignis et omni supellectili necessaria publice domum complent et addunt in singula capita singulis mensibus sexagenam, ex qua pisces, carnes recentes et, si velint, vinum emant. In altari⁹ nihil offerunt, decimas omnes damnant, primitiarum neque nomen neque rem tenent. Non tamen concordēs sunt in una fide^{10 11}, sed aliter isti, aliter illi¹² sentiunt. Velle suum cuique est nec voto¹³ vivitur¹⁴ uno.

[7] Hos tamen¹⁵ sacrilegos et¹⁶ sceleratissimos homines¹⁷ Sigismundus caesar civitate¹⁸ donavit¹⁹, et quos exterminare decebat²⁰, aut in ultimas terras ad fodiendos secandosque lapides, humani generis omni commercio privatos, relegare²¹, liberos fecit minimo tributo contentus. Quae res non sibi tantum, sed regno quoque maximo²² dedecori²³ fuit, quia²⁴ sicut²⁵ modicum²⁶ fermenti totam massam corrumpit, sic fex illa hominum totum nomen gentis Bohemicae {123v} foedat.

¹ in terre N

² ut ajunt Dei : Dei ut ajunt L, N

³ illic L

⁴ benedictum L

⁵ consecratum L

⁶ neque consecrandum *omit.* N

⁷ tudent L

⁸ legumini F

⁹ altare N

¹⁰ via M

¹¹ sunt in una fide *omit.* L

¹² isti aliter illi : illi aliter isti N

¹³ voti L

¹⁴ finitur L

¹⁵ tam F, O, U, V

¹⁶ *omit.* N

¹⁷ et sceleratissimos homines : homines et sceleratissimos L

¹⁸ civitati L, M, N

¹⁹ donatus L

²⁰ dicebat L

²¹ religare N

²² quoque maximo : maxime quoque N

²³ dedicioni L

²⁴ nam M

²⁵ *omit.* L

²⁶ modium F, WO

[6] Their greatest concern is the hearing of sermons. If someone is neglectful and stays lazily at home or trades or plays while a sermon is being given, he is whipped and forced – as they say – to enter to [hear] the word of God. They have some kind of wooden building, like a barn, which they call “temple”. Here they preach to the people, here they daily expound on the law, here they have their only altar, which has not been consecrated and will not be so, from where they administer the sacrament to the people. The priests do not have tonsures nor shave their beard. The Taborites as a community¹ provide their homes with grain, beer, bacon, vegetables, wood, and all kinds of furniture and equipment, adding a monthly [allowance] of one *sexagena*² per head in the household, which they can use to buy fish, fresh meat and – if they so want – wine. They make no offerings at the altar, they reject all tithes, and they do not have the practice of firstfruits nor even use that word.³ But they do not agree on matters of Faith, some believing this, and others that. They all want their own, and they disagree on everything.

[7] Nonetheless, these sacrilegious and criminal men were given the city by Emperor Sigismund,⁴ and those whom he ought to destroy or banish to the end of the Earth and set to digging out and cutting stones, deprived of human society, he instead made free, being satisfied with a minimal tax. This thing was a huge disgrace not only for himself, but also for the whole kingdom, for just as little ferment infects the whole lump, that scum of men defiles the entire name of the Bohemian people.

¹ “publice”

² Sexagena: a money unit worth 60 Prague Groschen. Du Cange: Monetæ species, f. quod pretii 60. solidorum esset. Charta Casimiri Polon. Reg. ann. 1335. apud Ludewig. tom. 5. Reliq. MSS. pag. 594: *Recognoscimus..... nos teneri et remanere obligatos.... Regi Boemiæ et suis hæredibus de summa et quantitate viginti millium Sexagenarum grossorum denariorum*

Pragensium, in qua dicto Dom. Regi Boemiæ decem mille Sexagenas dictorum denariorum jam solvimus in una parte.

³ “primitiæ”

⁴ Sigismund (Luxembourg) (1368-1437): King of Hungary and Croatia 1437, King of Germany 1411, King of Bohemia 1419, crowned Holy Roman Emperor 1433

[8] Sed accipe nunc urbis situm, quia fuisti loco proximus, intueri¹ moenia potuisti, quae duplicata cingunt undique² civitatem, munita turribus et propugnaculis³. Collis est in occidentem⁴ extensus, nulla ex⁵ parte vicinis altior campis, sed praeruptis hinc⁶ atque inde rupibus tutus. Hunc uno ex latere fluvius alluit, quem⁷ Lucnisam⁸ accolae vocitant; ex altero rivus est tenuis aquae, sed profundus et⁹ aditu difficilis. Is quasi vellet ante¹⁰ oppidum ingredi majorem fluvium, in angustias viginti passuum collem restrinxit et penetrasset – ut arbitror – montem, nisi saxis durioribus impeditus iter flectere coactus fuisset¹¹. Vertitur ergo ad dexteram rivus et ambiens oppidi¹² magnam partem, tandem fluvio, qui reliquam portionem circumdedit, finito colle miscetur. Sic civitas ex omni parte rupibus et aquis munita uno tantum¹³ loco per planum habet accessum, sed arctum et ingenti fossa et latiori muro defensum. Tres hic portae sunt, priusquam¹⁴ urbem ingrediaris. In priori vero propugnaculum est, cujus muri 20 pedes latitudinis habent¹⁵, altitudinis duplum. Machinas belli plurimas victis hostibus excisisque civitatibus obtinuerunt¹⁶, quas in foro ad terrorem vicinae plebis¹⁷ ostentant¹⁸.

[9] Domorum parietes aut lignei¹⁹ sunt aut lutei²⁰, nullo platearum ordine distincti²¹, sed ad casum positi²². Nam sicut olim tentoria passim locarunt²³, sic postea domos erexerunt. Multa illis et pretiosa suppellex est, et divitiae inter eos plurimae sunt, multarum enim gentium spolia in unum locum²⁴ congessere²⁵. Voluerunt hi quondam²⁶ ecclesiae primitivae moribus vivere²⁷, et in *communi tenebant omnia*. Fratres se invicem appellabant, et quod uni defuit, alter subministravit. Nunc sibi quisque vivit, et alius quidem esurit, alius autem ebrius est. Brevis fervor caritatis²⁸, brevis imitatio fuit²⁹. Sed priores Christi discipuli et qui nascentis ecclesiae fundamenta jecerunt, quae propria prius habebant, fratribus³⁰ communicabant, nihil alieni recipiebant³¹, nisi sponte et amore Christi donatum. Thaboritae vero haereditates alienas expilabant, et, quae violenta manu rapuerant, haec tantum in commune dederunt. Nec sic perseverare potuerunt. Reversi ad ingenium avaritiae³² jam omnes student, et quia rapere ut olim nequeunt, nam languidiores facti vicinos timent, lucris inhiant mercaturae sordidosque sequuntur quaestus.

¹ intueri : ni tueri N

² *illeg.* N

³ pugnaculis L

⁴ occidente N

⁵ in F

⁶ huic N

⁷ *omit.* N

⁸ Luznisam F, O, V; *omit.* L; Zhozo M; Luzznicie *illeg.*

N; Luzinsam U

⁹ *omit.* N

¹⁰ cum L; *omit.* N

¹¹ coactus fuisset : cogere L

¹² opidum L; fuisset coactus V

¹³ tamen L, M, N

¹⁴ antequam L

¹⁵ et *add.* N

¹⁶ obtinuerant L

¹⁷ gentis WO

¹⁸ ostendantur N

¹⁹ lignee M, N

²⁰ lutee M, N

²¹ distincte L, M

²² posite L, M, N

²³ locarint F; locaverunt WO

²⁴ latum N

²⁵ congesserunt L

²⁶ quidem N

²⁷ *omit.* L

²⁸ fuit *add.* N

²⁹ *omit.* N

³⁰ sibi L

³¹ rapiebant L

³² *omit.* L

2.4. City of Tabor

[8] Hear now how this city is situated since you have been quite near to the place and able to see the double-wall that surrounds the city on all sides, protected by towers and bulwarks. There is a hill which stretches towards the West, nowhere higher than the neighbouring fields, but safely ensconced among steep cliffs. On one side, a river flows by, which the inhabitants call Luznice. On the other side, there is a stream, narrow but deep and difficult to cross. It seems as if it would join the big river before the city, but then it meets the hill, which narrows it down to 20 passus. If it was not forced by the hard rocks to bend its course, it would – I believe – flow into the hill itself. Instead, it turns to the right and passes around most of the city, until it finally, where the hill ends, joins the river, which passes around the other part. Thus, the city is protected on all sides by cliffs and water. On even ground, it can only be entered in one place, but it is narrow and protected by a huge moat and a massive wall. Three gates must be passed before you enter the city. The first is set in a bastion, whose walls are 20 feet broad and double as high. From defeated enemies and destroyed cities,, they have obtained many war machines that they have put on display in the public square to frighten the neighbouring peoples.¹

[9] The walls of the houses are of wood and clay. They are not arranged by roads, but placed randomly, for they raise their houses, just as they once placed their tents. They have many and costly furnishings, and there is much wealth among them, for they have gathered the spoils from many peoples in one place. Earlier, they wanted to live like the Primitive Church and *had all in common*.² They called each other “brother”, and what one was lacking another provided. Nowadays, everybody lives for himself, and one may be thirsty, while the other is drunk. Brief was the fervour of charity, and brief the imitation [of the old]. But the first disciples of Christ and those who cast the foundations of the Church at its birth shared with their brothers all that each of them had before. They took nothing from others unless it had been given freely and out of love for Christ. The Taborites, however, plundered others’ inheritances and only shared what they had seized violently. But even that they could not continue. They have returned to character, and they are all busy being greedy. And since they can no longer plunder as they could once – for they have grown weak and fear their neighbours – they covet commercial profit and pursue sordid gains.

¹ For another description of Tabor, see HB, I, pp. 286-289

² Acts, 2, 44: *habebant omnia communia*

[10] Sunt in civitate ad quatuor¹ milia virorum, qui possent² educere gladium, sed artifices facti lana ac tela {124r} ex magna parte³ victum quaerentes inutiles bello⁴ creduntur. Praedia nulla his erant, sed nobilium et⁵ monasteriorum villas invaserunt, quas sibi postea Sigismundus - nescio an⁶ divinae legis et humanae perversor idcirco dici possit⁷ – perpetuo jure possidendas ascripsit.

[11] Intellexisti⁸, quae sit haec civitas, qui mores hujus populi, qui situs oppidi, qualis haereticorum senatus, qualis nequitiae synagoga, quale domicilium Sathanae, quod templum Belial, quod regnum Luciferi.

[12] Hic ego, cum pernoctassem et ab hospite meo cuncta⁹, quae¹⁰ jam scripsi¹¹, vera esse¹² didicissem^{13 14}, hortabar hominem¹⁵, tantis ut¹⁶ erroribus renuntiaret. Non erat hic omnino durus¹⁷ neque monitiones aspernabatur, et habebat in¹⁸ penitiori¹⁹ thalamo beatae Mariae virginis et Christi salvatoris imagines, quas occulte colebat. Credo, nisi timeret amissionem bonorum²⁰, nam dives est, publice ab illa insania resiliret²¹, sed malunt animam²² plerique quam opes perdere, et multi propter pecunias periere. Idcirco salvatoris voce *facilius dicitur camelum per foramen acus transire*²³ *quam divites adipisci regna*²⁴ *caelorum*.

¹ ad quatuor : ut dicitur L

² possunt L, N

³ ex magna parte *omit.* L

⁴ ad bella L

⁵ ac L

⁶ aut N

⁷ posset N, WO

⁸ intellexistis L

⁹ certa L

¹⁰ *omit.* L

¹¹ scripta L

¹² *omit.* L

¹³ didicissem N

¹⁴ et ab hospite ... didicissem *omit.* F

¹⁵ homini L

¹⁶ tantis ut : ut tantis N

¹⁷ dicius N

¹⁸ *Here begins a lacuna which ends after the words
cujus corpus in sect. 15 U*

¹⁹ secretiori N

²⁰ nisi timeret ... bonorum : ni bonorum timeret
amissionem L

²¹ illeg. *add.* N

²² animas L

²³ pertransire N

²⁴ regnum L

[10] In the city, there are about 4,000 men capable of fighting, but they have become artisans, who mostly ensure their livelihood from wool and home-spun products and are considered to be useless in war. These people did not possess farms of their own, so they seized the properties¹ of nobles and monasteries to which Sigismund² later gave them permanent rights –if he thus perverted both divine and human law, I do not know.

[11] You have now seen what this city is, what is the character of the people, the site of the city, the senate of heretics, the synagogue of wickedness, the dwelling of Satan, the temple of Belial, and the realm of Lucifer.

2.5. Piccolomini's host

[12] I stayed there overnight, and my host confirmed that all I have written now is true. I exhorted the man to renounce these great errors, and he was neither intractable nor indifferent to my advice. In his inner bedroom, he actually had images of the Blessed Virgin Mary and Christ the Saviour that he worshipped in secret. I do believe that if he had not feared to lose his property – for he is a rich man – he would publicly denounce this folly, but many would rather lose their soul than their wealth, and many have perished because of money. Therefore the Saviour says: *It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.*³

¹ "villa": house or village

² Sigismund

³ Matthew, 19, 24

[13] In crastinum¹ cum venissent^{2 3} ad nos tam sordidae civitatis magistratus et gratias agerent, quia visitassemus eos, et urbani magis verbo quam mente viderentur, dico ego ad collegas meos: “Peccavimus, fratres, genti peccatrici et inimicae Dei communicavimus. Non putavi tantos hic⁴ esse quantos errores invenio⁵. Credebam⁶ solius ritu communionis hunc populum a nobis esse secretum⁷, sed nunc compertum habeo⁸ haeticum⁹ esse populum hunc¹⁰, infidelem, Deo rebellem, nihil pensi¹¹, nihil religionis habentem. Quapropter si volumus conscientiae satisfacere¹², necessarium est his¹³ aliqua dicere, ne sua nobis facta¹⁴ placere putent et¹⁵ apud vicinos¹⁶ glorientur Romani regis sibi legatos communicasse. Assentiebatur mihi Procopius et¹⁷ utile consilium dicebat, sed Australibus¹⁸ terrore plenis et leporino corde praeditis¹⁹, persuaderi sententia mea non potuit, quamvis verba sic²⁰ efferre^{21 22} proposuissem²³, ut nulla irritatio populi timenda esset. Recessimus ergo²⁴, et licet dies dominicus²⁵ esset, divina tamen officia negleximus, ne communicaremus haeticis²⁶.

[14] Erat animus mihi²⁷ Pragam videre, urbem fama celebrem²⁸ regnique caput, sed pestis illic ingens grassabatur²⁹ nec³⁰ minus quam 200 capita per singulos dies auferri³¹ dicebatur. Ob quam rem terrefacti proceres³², qui convenerant, congregationem solvunt et ad villam Benedicti se³³ transferunt, quinque³⁴ et viginti milibus passuum³⁵ a Praga³⁶ distantem³⁷.

[15] Interea et Barbara imperatrix, quae fuit Sigismundi conjunx, Friderici comitis Ciliae soror, diem obiit, cujus³⁸ corpus Pragam delatum in castro³⁹ {124v} sepultum est. Cordata mulier fuit, sed futurae vitae, ut ajunt, parum credula. Nunc, si pie vixit, mercedem habet. Sunt, qui defunctam bene et ut Christianam decuit, supremum spiritum emisisse dicunt.

¹ crastino L, N

² venisset L

³ cum venissent : advenissent N

⁴ tantos hic : hic tantos L

⁵ errores invenio : invenio errores L

⁶ credebatur N

⁷ segregatum L; *illeg.* N

⁸ est L

⁹ et(h)nicum M, V; hennicum F, O

¹⁰ populum hunc : hunc populum N

¹¹ nihil pensi *omit.* N

¹² facere satis V

¹³ iis V

¹⁴ *omit.* L

¹⁵ postea *add.* N

¹⁶ ipsos N

¹⁷ ut L

¹⁸ Australibus L, M

¹⁹ perditis F; preditos L

²⁰ *omit.* L

²¹ afferre L

²² sic efferre : efferre sic N

²³ potuisset N

²⁴ e illo L

²⁵ dominica esset N

²⁶ communicaremus haeticis : hereticis
communicaremus L

²⁷ animus mihi : mihi animus L

²⁸ reserem L; celerem N

²⁹ *em.*; crassabatur codd.

³⁰ ne M

³¹ afferre L

³² terrefacti proceres : proceres terre statim N

³³ sese L, M

³⁴ *omit.* L

³⁵ transferunt quinque ... passuum *omit.* N

³⁶ a Praga : ad Pragam N

³⁷ transferunt *add.* N

³⁸ *Here ends the lacuna which begins after the words
in penitiori in sect. 13 U*

³⁹ crastino L

2.6. Departure

[13] Two days afterwards, the magistrates of this sordid city came to us and thanked us for visiting them, appearing to be more civilized in speech than in mind. Then I said to my colleagues, “We have sinned, brothers, by having contact with a sinful people, enemies of God. I have underestimated the errors I find here. I believed that the communion rite was the only thing that separated this people from us, but now I have learnt it is heretical, faithless, rebellious towards God, without learning¹ and religion. Therefore, if we want to satisfy our conscience, it is necessary to say something to them so that they do not believe we condone their actions and boast to their neighbours of having received the legates of the Roman king. Prokop agreed with me and said my plan was useful, but the Austrians² were fearful and had the heart of a hare, so I could not convince them, even though I proposed to speak in such a way that I would not provoke people. So we left, and though it was Sunday, we omitted the divine offices so as not to be in contact with heretics.³

2.7. Pest in Prague

[14] I did wish to see Prague, that famous city and capital of the kingdom, but a great pest was raging there and reportedly killed more than 200 people per day. Therefore the assembled nobles were terrified and, ending the meeting there, moved to Benesov, about 25,000 passus⁴ from Prague.

2.8. Death of Empress Barbara

[15] In the meantime⁵ Empress Barbara⁶ died. She had been the consort of Sigismund⁷ and the sister of Count Friedrich of Celje⁸. Her body was brought to Prague and buried in the castle. She was a sensible⁹ woman but said to be sceptical concerning the afterlife. If she lived a pious life, she now has her reward. Some say that she had a good death and expired as befits a Christian woman.

¹ “pensum”

² The two other members of the imperial embassy

³ Less likely: “give communion to heretics”

⁴ A Roman passus was ca. 0.75 meter. Benesov is about 40 km. Southeast of Prague. It would appear that Piccolomini underestimated the distance from Prague to Benesov

⁵ 11. July 1451

⁶ Barbara of Celje (1392-1451): Empress. Married Sigismund of Luxembourg in 1405

⁷ Emperor Sigismund

⁸ Friedrich II of Celje (1379-1454): Count of Celje

⁹ “cordata”

[16] Cum venissemus ad villam Benedicti, regni¹ conventum illic offendimus². Barones erant Georgius Pogiebratius³, Henricus Rosensis⁴, Alscio⁵, Zdenko⁶ et Petrus Sterembergii⁷, Sbencho⁸ Lepus, Johannes Zagimachus⁹, Johannes Smiritius^{10 11}, Johannes Chiabelizus¹², Sdencho Coscha^{13 14}, Johannes Malovecius^{15 16}, Johannes Radechus¹⁷, et barones alii¹⁸ complures¹⁹. Civitatum oratores aderant ex Praga, ex Cuthnis²⁰, ex Pilzina²¹, ex Luna, ex Colonia²², ex Glatovia²³, ex Grezia²⁴, ex Litomeritia²⁵, ex Slana²⁶, ex Sacen²⁷, ex Buthovaiza²⁸, ex Thabor, et erant haeretici et catholici²⁹ simul mixti. Vidisses³⁰ illud Isaiae completum³¹ illic³²: *Vitulus³³ et ursus pascentur simul, requiescent catuli eorum*. Proceres regni ex magna parte sequuntur Romanam ecclesiam, civitates ut plurimum aut Thaboritas aut Rochezanam³⁴ sequuntur³⁵.

[17] Venerunt ad nos plurimi ex ambabus partibus et alteri alteros accusabant. Quia vero conventus ille nostri causa tenebatur, ut videret³⁶, quae Caesar ad petitiones³⁷ regni responderet, fuimus tribus diebus in tractatu cum eis quartaque demum die et illi nostram intentionem ad ultimum intellexerunt, et nos illorum propositum cognovimus, dimissumque concilium est. Prius tamen allatae fuerant³⁸ marchionum³⁹ Brandeburgensium⁴⁰ litterae, quae conventum inter regni proceres et legatum apostolicum sancti Petri⁴¹ cardinalem petebant ad res ecclesiae componendas. Placuit id⁴² nobis, et apud ambas partes verba fecimus, quibus conventionem suadebamus. Accepta conditio est, dies ad festum divi Martini, locus conventionis in Lithomeritia dictus⁴³. Mediatores inter cardinalem et regnum marchiones recepti. Faxit⁴⁴ Deus, ut⁴⁵ finis⁴⁶ discordiarum fiet⁴⁷, ut refloreat in Bohemia fides, et errorum⁴⁸ plena⁴⁹ regio veritatis ignara jam tandem ad verae religionis candidam lucem de⁵⁰ profundo tenebrosae⁵¹ superstitionis emergat.

¹ *omit.* N

² *comperimus* M

³ Pogibrat L; de Pogiebrat M; de Bodiebrad N; Pogibratius U

⁴ de Rosis L, M, N

⁵ Alschio L, M; Allso N

⁶ Sdenko F, M, O, V, WO; Schlenko L; Sdencho U

⁷ de Sternberg L; de Sterenberg M, N; Sterenbergii V

⁸ Slencko L; Sbincko N; Sdencho WO

⁹ de Sagimach L; Zagimach M; Zagunachus V

¹⁰ de Zmirius L; de Zmirics M; Smirischius V

¹¹ Johannes Smiritius *omit.* U

¹² de Chiabeliz M

¹³ Cocha M; Coscha V

¹⁴ Johannes Zagimachus ... Costha *omit.* N

¹⁵ de Malovez M; de Malovetz N

¹⁶ Johannes Chiabelizus ... Malovecius *omit.* L

¹⁷ de Radoch L, M; Badoch N

¹⁸ barones alii : alii barones L, M, N

¹⁹ quamplures L, N

²⁰ Cuthinis L; Kuttinis N; Cutnis U

²¹ Pilzna L; Plzna N

²² Calonia L

²³ Glagovia L; Glathonia N; Glatonia U; Glotovia V

²⁴ Grena L; Gretz regine N

²⁵ Littemoricia L; Litomericia M; Lithomietztitz N

²⁶ Zlauh L; Salua N; Glana V

²⁷ Saz L; Zacen M; Jaz N

²⁸ Bothovaiza L; Budweiss N

²⁹ et catholici *omit.* L

³⁰ vidissetis WO

³¹ est *add.* U

³² *omit.* L

³³ vitules WO

³⁴ Rockenzam L; Rokydzianam N

³⁵ *omit.* L

³⁶ audirent L, N

³⁷ petitionem N

³⁸ fuerunt L, WO

³⁹ marchionis L

⁴⁰ Brandeburgensis L

⁴¹ ad vincula *add.* L

⁴² illud L

⁴³ dictos L, N

⁴⁴ sanxit N

⁴⁵ et N

⁴⁶ fines F

⁴⁷ fiat V; fieret N

⁴⁸ erroris N

⁴⁹ *omit.* L

⁵⁰ in L

⁵¹ *omit.* N

3. Assembly at Benesov

[16] When we arrived in Benesov, we met with an assembly of the realm. The barons [present] were Georg Podiebrad,¹ Heinrich von Rosenberg,² Ales,³ Zdenek⁴ and Peter von Sternberg,⁵ Zbynko Has,⁶ Johann Zagimachius,⁷ Jan Smiricky,⁸ Jan Cabelicky,⁹ Zdenko Kostka,¹⁰ Jan of Malenovice,¹¹ and Jan of Nachod,¹² and many other barons. Envoys had come from the cities of Prague, Kutteneberg, Pilsen, Luna, Kolin, Klattau, Königgrätz, Leitomischl, Slana, Sacen, Budweiss, Tabor. Heretics¹³ and Catholics were mixed. You would have seen the saying of Isaiah fulfilled here, *The calf and the bear shall feed: their young ones shall rest together.*¹⁴ The nobles of the kingdom mostly follow the Roman Church, whereas the cities mostly follow either the Taborites or Rokycana.¹⁵

[17] Many men from both parties¹⁶ came to see us and made accusations against those of the other party. But since this assembly was held for our sake so we could inform them of the emperor's reply to the demands of the realm, we negotiated with them for three days, and when the fourth day came, they completely understood our position and we theirs, and the assembly was dissolved.¹⁷ Before that, however, a letter from the margraves of Brandenburg¹⁸ arrived, requesting a meeting between the nobles of the kingdom and the apostolic legate, the Cardinal of Sant Pietro,¹⁹ to settle the affairs of the Church.²⁰ We²¹ agreed with this request and spoke to both parties urging them to accept the meeting. The proposed meeting was accepted, to be held on the Feast of Saint Martin²² in Leitomischl.²³ The margraves were accepted as mediators between the cardinal and the kingdom. May God give that there be an end to conflict, that Faith come to flourish again in Bohemia, and that this region, now full of errors and ignorant of truth, finally emerge from the depths of dark superstition and [attain] the shining light of true religion.

¹Georg Podiebrad (1420-1471): Governor of Bohemia 1451 to 1457 when he became King of Bohemia

²Jindrich ze Rozmberka (ca. 1430-1457): Son of Ulrich von Rosenberg, a leader of the catholic noble party, enemy of Georg Podiebrad

³Ales Holicky ze Sternberka (-1455): Bohemian noble of the Sternberg family, allies of Georg Podiebrad

⁴Zdenek Sternberg (1410-1476): Bohemian noble of the Sternberg family

⁵Petr ze Sternberka: Bohemian noble of the Sternberg family

⁶Bohemian noble of the Zajic von Hasenburg family

⁷Johann Zagimachius: Bohemian noble. One of the leaders of the catholic party

⁸Jan Smiricky ze Zmiric (-1453): Bohemian noble, one of the leaders of the Utraquist party

⁹Jan Cabelicky ze Soutic (-1457/58): Bohemian noble. Mint master of Kutna Hora. Prominent member of the Utraquist gentry

¹⁰Zdenek Kostka ze Postupic (1425?-1468): Bohemian noble, one of the leaders of the Utraquist party. A close ally of Georg Podiebrad

¹¹Unidentified

¹²Unidentified

¹³I.e. Hussites

¹⁴Isaiah, 11, 7

¹⁵Jan Rokycana (ca. 1396-1471): Bohemian Hussite theologian. Promised the archbishopric of Prague by the Bohemian estates but never appointed as such by a pope

¹⁶I.e. from the catholic party and the Hussite party

¹⁷Piccolomini does not mention the oration he held, formally delivering the emperor's reply that the young King Ladislaus would not be sent to Bohemia for now, the "*Petivistis ex Caesare*" (1451)

¹⁸Friedrich II and Albrecht III Achilles of Brandenburg

¹⁹Nikolaus of Kues (1401-1464): Cardinal 1448. Prince-bishop of Brixen 1450

²⁰The planned meeting never took place, since the cardinal demanded a prior declaration from the Bohemian estates that they would obey his final decisions which the estates refused to do (Heymann: *George*, p. 69)

²¹As ambassadors of the emperor

²²11 November

²³Litomysl: Bohemian city ca. 136 km. east of Prague

[18] Ad quam rem, ut nos¹ quoque pro virili nostra juvamen adjeceremus², rogavi Procopium inter me atque³ Georgium fidelis ut interpres esset⁴, nam magnum illum et potentem virum, quem regni pars maxima sequitur⁵, si concordiae cupidum invenissem⁶, adduci⁷ ceteros facile posse credebam⁸. Fuimus diu⁹ simul. Quae locuti sumus¹⁰ invicem, nunc referam, utque sim brevior, neque opus sit verbis¹¹ illis “inquam” et “inquit” saepius uti¹², praeponam verbis meis nomen meum et verbis illius nomen suum,¹³ sicut et {125r} Ciceronem et plerosque factitasse reperio, qui collocutores¹⁴ in suis opusculis introducunt. Sic enim - me iudice – brevior et dilucidior oratio redditur¹⁵. Sed audi¹⁶ jam dialogum.

[19] **Aeneas:** Quod te alloqui volui, vir magnifice, neque privata res est neque parva, sed¹⁷ regni¹⁸ 19 hujus²⁰ quietem tuique magnum bonum concernit, quam si vis audire, mox tibi exponam.

Georgius: Cupio audire²¹, dicito, quaecumque libet.

Aeneas: Et²² ego in *caritate non ficta*²³ loqui volo, quae nihil reticet et summa utitur libertate.

Georgius: Hoc expecto²⁴. Loquere.

¹ uos U

² ad(d)iceremus F, L, N, O, U; ad(i)iceremus V

³ et L

⁴ interpres esset : esset interpres L

⁵ consequitur N

⁶ inuenirem U

⁷ educi N

⁸ vacat *add.* M

⁹ adhuc L

¹⁰ simus WO

¹¹ nobis N

¹² ut N

¹³ *These names are omitted [with blank space], possibly intended for later filling in of the names in red] in F and U*

¹⁴ collocuturas res L; collocutores N

¹⁵ oratio redditur : redditur oratio N

¹⁶ audite WO

¹⁷ *omit.* L

¹⁸ *omit.* L

¹⁹ parva sed regni : persuadet. N

²⁰ patrie *add.* L

²¹ te *add.* N

²² at L

²³ victa N

²⁴ expeto M

4. Dialogue with Georg Podiebrad

4.1. Introduction

[18] To do everything in our power to advance this matter, I asked Prokop to serve as a loyal interpreter between me and Georg for I considered that if I found this great and powerful man, whom a large part of the kingdom follows, to want peace, then the others would easily be made to follow suit. We spent much time together. I shall now report what we said to each other, and in order to be brief and not need to use the words “I said” and “he said” incessantly, I shall put my name before my own words and his name before his, just as I find that Cicero and many others did when they used interlocutors in their works¹. In my opinion, this will make the narration shorter and clearer. But hear now the dialogue.

[19] **Enea:** The matter I want to speak with you about, Your Excellency, is neither a private nor a small matter, but concerns the peace of this kingdom and your own great advantage. If you want to hear it, I shall explain it to you right now.

Georg: I do wish to hear it. Say whatever you wish to.

Enea: And I wish to speak *in charity unfeigned*,² which does not hold anything back and has complete freedom.

Georg: This is what I expect. Speak.

¹ I.e. when they use the form of a dialogue

² 2. Corinthians, 6, 6

[20] **Aeneas:** Regnum hoc olim florentissimum fuit et inter¹ occidentalia regna ditissimum. Viguerunt hic religiones et omnium bonarum artium² studia claruerunt. Nunc inops regio est, concussa, lacera. Cur hoc? Sane quia non potest veritas nostra mentiri, dum per³ evangelistam dicit: *Omne regnum in se⁴ divisum⁵ desolabitur et domus supra domum cadet.*⁶ Vos Bohemi non solum invicem divisi estis, verum etiam ab ipsa Christianitatis majori parte secreti, nec⁷ Romanam auditis ecclesiam, quamvis mater est et magistra fidelium, neque⁸ mandata conciliorum recipitis. Quod si unitatem⁹ amplecteremini¹⁰ et *in domo domini¹¹ ambularetis cum consensu*, facile regnum vestrum pristinam dignitatem splendoremque suum resumeret. Tu ergo, qui regni populos quo vis trahis, fac tibi nomen grande, fac¹² te sedes apostolica diligat, redde¹³ sibi¹⁴ filios, quos Sathan abduxit¹⁵. Hauriat ex fonte rivus aquas suas, ne praecisus arescat. Redibunt omnes et Romanam ecclesiam venerabuntur, si volueris. Te Romanus pontifex¹⁶, te Caesar imprimis carum habebit, cumque¹⁷ Ladislaus in regnum venerit, te tutorem, te patrem appellabit, tibi¹⁸ maximas gratias aget, qui sibi pacatam provinciam restitueris, erroribus expurgatam, pace quietam, ornatam moribus, fide ferventem, consequerisque¹⁹ non tu solus gloriam, sed et posteritui et nati natorum, et qui nascentur²⁰ ab illis, ob eam rem semper habebuntur honori, eritque memoria nominis tui sempiterna, et fixus familiae²¹ tuae²² status, qui vera virtute creverit. Transiturus²³ autem ex hac vita ad meliorem migrabis, lucidas sedes²⁴ accipies beatitudinemque perennem immortalitate vestitus. *Omnibus enim, qui patriam ornarint²⁵, auxerint²⁶, juverint²⁷, defenderint²⁸, certum est esse in caelo diffinitum locum, quo beati aevo fruuntur sempiterno.* Quod si viam nosti, qua rectus ad unionem trames ducat, edoctum me redde, nam sedem apostolicam certiore efficiam²⁹. Vos jam legato conventum promisistis et recte {125v} quidem, nam boni cupidus est et industrius pater doctrinaque plenus. Inveniet – nisi³⁰ fallor – convenientes ad unionem modos³¹. Nescio tamen, qua facultate praeditus³² est³³. Quod si scirem, desideria vestra scriberem pontifici maximo, isque³⁴, priusquam dies conventionis adesset, de sua mente legatum commoneret.

¹ et inter : inter et U

² entium M

³ apud/t L, M, N

⁴ ipsum *add.* N

⁵ in se divisum *omit.* U

⁶ et domus ... cadet : etc. L

⁷ secreti nec : nec sequestrati N

⁸ nec L

⁹ ecclesie *add.* L, M, N

¹⁰ complecteremni V

¹¹ dei L

¹² ut *add.* L, N

¹³ reddatur N

¹⁴ tibi U

¹⁵ adduxit N

¹⁶ *omit.* L

¹⁷ cum L

¹⁸ *omit.* L; et N

¹⁹ consequeris F

²⁰ nascuntur N

²¹ fructus *add.* N

²² familiae tuae : tue familie L, M

²³ transitus U

²⁴ *omit.* U

²⁵ ornarunt N

²⁶ auxerunt N

²⁷ iuuerunt N

²⁸ defenderunt N

²⁹ reddam L, M, N

³⁰ ni L

³¹ moris N

³² predictus N

³³ *omit.* N

³⁴ is L

4.2. Hussite rejection of the Catholic Church

[20] **Enea:** This kingdom was once quite prosperous and the richest among the Western kingdoms. Here religious orders flourished, and the studies of the good arts¹ were famous. Now it is an impoverished region, weak and miserable. Why is that? It is because as He, who is our Truth and cannot lie, says through the evangelist, *Every kingdom divided against itself, shall be brought to desolation, and house upon house shall fall.*² But not only do you Bohemians have your internal divisions, you are also separated from the greater part of Christianity, and you do not follow the Roman Church, though she is the mother and teacher of the faithful. Nor do you accept the decrees of the councils. If you would embrace unity and *walk in the house of the Lord with consent*,³ then your kingdom would easily regain its former dignity and splendour. But you, who lead the peoples of the kingdom where you wish, do make a great name for yourself, make the Apostolic See love you, give her back the sons whom Satan abducted. Let the river draw its waters from the source so that it will not dry out, cut off as it is.⁴ If it is your wish, all will return and venerate the Roman Church. The Roman Pontiff⁵ and the Emperor⁶ will love you above all, and when Ladislaus⁷ comes to the kingdom, he will call you his guide and father and thank you fervently for giving him back a pacified province, cleansed of errors, at peace, distinguished by its morals, fervent in faith. And not only will you gain glory for yourself, but your descendants and the sons of your sons and those who are born from them will always be honoured, and the memory of your name will be eternal, and the status of your family will remain firm since it grew great by true virtue. And when you pass from this life to the better one, you will find shining seats and eternal happiness, and you will be clothed in immortality. *For all those who have preserved, aided, or enlarged their fatherland have a special place prepared for them in the heavens, where they may enjoy an eternal life of happiness.*⁸ If you know a way which leads straight to union, please tell me about it, and then I shall inform the Apostolic See. You have already promised to meet with the legate,⁹ and justly so, for he is desirous of that which is good, a diligent Father, full of learning. He will – if I am not mistaken – find ways that lead to union. But I do not know the extent of his powers. If I knew them, I would write what it is you desire to the Supreme Pontiff, and he would, before the date of the meeting, inform the legate of his intentions.

¹ The liberal arts

² Luke, 11, 17

³ Psalms, 54, 15: *in domo Dei ambulavimus cum consensu*

⁴ Piccolomini had this image from Cyprianus: *De Unitate ecclesiae*, 5: *A fonte praecide rivum, praecisus arescet.* He would reuse it the next year in his oration “*Sentio*” (1452) against the Austrian rebels against the emperor

⁵ Nicolaus V [Tommaso Parentucelli] (1397-1455): Pope from 1447 to his death

⁶ Friedrich III (Habsburg) (1415-1493): Duke of Styria, Carinthia and Carniola, 1424. Duke of Austria, 1439. King of Germany, 1440. Crowned as Holy Roman Emperor in Rome, 1452

⁷ Ladislaus the Posthumous (Habsburg) (1440-1457): Duke of Austria and King of Hungary and Bohemia

⁸ Cicero: *De republica*, 6.9.13: *omnibus, qui patriam conservaverint, adiuverint, auxerint, certum esse in caelo definitum locum, ubi beati aevo sempiterno fruuntur*

⁹ Cardinal Nikolaus von Kues

[21] **Georgius:** Ago tibi gratias, pater, quia nostri regni curam geris. Regnum – ut ais – quassatum compilatumque est. Novit Deus, quorum¹ culpa est². Nos cupidi pacis sumus neque bellamus, ut bellemus, sed ut pacem habeamus. Coacti gerimus arma, coacti versamur in proeliis. Misimus olim legatos nostros³ ad Basiliense concilium⁴, nonnullaque cum patribus, qui tunc ibi praesidebant, pacta percussimus, quae, si servata fuissent, et⁵ cum sede apostolica et cum⁶ ceteris Christianis pacem haberemus, et in regno nulla divisio esset. Sed violantur foedera nobis, haeretici et schismatici vocitatur. Si qui ex nostris apud vos^{7 8} moriuntur, cum asinis sepulturam accipiunt. Clerici nostri⁹, quamvis docti modestique sint, nusquam consecrari possunt. Deridentur, qui de calice bibunt. Fuit apud nos cardinalis sancti angeli legatus. Adiverunt¹⁰ eum nostri sacerdotes¹¹. Fui et ego cum eo. Petivimus innovari firmarique¹² priscum¹³ foedus. Si¹⁴ nobis auscultasset¹⁵, non secuta fuissent^{16 17} scandala¹⁸, quae postea emergerunt. Obaudivit preces nostras. De compactatis sic loquebatur, quasi nihil umquam¹⁹ de illis accepisset. Nos tamen illa valida scimus et authentica, quae generale nobis concilium²⁰ admisit, priusquam dissolveretur ab Eugenio. Quod si Nicolaus pontifex maximus nostri memor est nosque sibi obsequentes cupit, jubeat servari²¹ conventa et venerabimur eum. Haec brevis²² et unica via pacis unionisque via. Hac²³ gradiendum est, hoc²⁴ iter ad concordiam patet.

Aeneas: Mos hominum est, ut paria paribus referant. Cur violari foedus querimini²⁵, quod priores rupistis?

¹ quod N

² omit. L

³ omit. V, WO

⁴ noti add. U

⁵ omit. L

⁶ omit. L

⁷ vos corr. ex nos F, U; nos WO

⁸ apud vos omit. L

⁹ omit. L

¹⁰ audierunt N

¹¹ nostri sacerdotes ; sacerdotes nostri L

¹² confirmarique L

¹³ pristinum N

¹⁴ a add. N

¹⁵ si add. N

¹⁶ essent N

¹⁷ secuta fuissent : fuissent secuta L

¹⁸ fraudula N

¹⁹ nihil umquam : um/nquam nichil M, N

²⁰ nobis concilium : concilium nobis L, M, N

²¹ observari N

²² est add. L, M, N

²³ ac L; huc N

²⁴ ac M; hac N

²⁵ conquerimini N

[21] **Georg:** I thank you, Father, for being concerned about our kingdom. As you say, the kingdom is dilapidated and battered. God [only] knows whose fault it is. We desire peace, and we do not fight for the sake of fighting but to have peace. We fight because we are forced to, we battle because we are forced to. Once we sent our legates to the Council of Basel¹ and made a number of agreements with the Fathers who presided then.² If they had been kept, we would [now] have peace with the Apostolic See and the other Christians, and there would be no divisions in the kingdom. But the treaties have been violated, and we are being called heretics and schismatics. If one of us dies in your countries, he is buried with the asses. Though our clerics are learned and modest, they can never be consecrated. Those who drink from the chalice are scorned. The Cardinal of Sant'Angelo visited us.³ Our priests went to see him and I with them. We requested that the old treaty be renewed and confirmed. If he had heeded us, the scandals that came later would never have happened. He did listen to our petitions but spoke about the Compacts as if he had never heard about them. We know, however, that they are valid and authentic, for they were accepted by the general council⁴ before it was dissolved⁵ by Eugenius.⁶ But if Pope Nicolaus⁷ cares about us and desires our obedience, let him order the agreements to be upheld, and then we shall honour him. This is the one and only way to peace and union. This is the path that must be trodden, this is the path to peace.

Enea: It is the custom of men to compare things with other, similar things. Why do you complain of the agreement when you were the first to break it?

¹ See Fudge: *Hussites*. The first Hussite delegation to the Council of Basel stayed in Basel from January to April 1433. Piccolomini who had arrived in Basel with Cardinal Capranica in Spring 1432 (Voigt, I, 3, p. 58) may have seen them, and his description of their arrival certainly sounds like that of a direct onlooker (HB, I, p. 370-371; Fudge: *Seduced*, p. 96). He possibly even heard the council fathers debate with them. When he later became close to the council's president, Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini, he may have had first-hand knowledge from him about the Hussite negotiations, and in his oration "*Audivi*" to the council fathers of 16 November 1436 Piccolomini told Cesarini: *Whatever happens, you will always be praised for bringing back the Hussites* [Sect. 82]

² Following the visit of the Hussite delegation in Basel, negotiations between the council and the Hussite -

more moderate – Utraquist majority faction continued, leading to the formal permission for Hussites to continue with communion under both species, sealed in the Compacts of Iglau/ Jihlava (Bohemian Compacts) on 5 July 1436, in the presence of all parties, including the emperor (Fudge: *Hussites*, p. 274). In the meantime, the Utraquist party had destroyed the inflexible Taborites at the Battle of Lipany in 1434

³ Here Podiebrad refers to Cardinal Carvajal's mission to Bohemia in 1448, see sect. 1

⁴ The Council of Basel

⁵ In 1438

⁶ Eugenius IV [Gabriele Condulmer] (1383-1447): Pope from 1431 to his death

⁷ Pope Nicolaus V

[22] Neque enim sufficit vobis sub duplici specie communicare, nisi et si¹ sub una solum² communicantes damnetis³.

Georgius: Ubi damnamus?

Aeneas: Cum dicitis neminem salvari, nisi communicet sub duplici specie, nos⁴ omnes damnatis, haereticos perditosque dicitis. Quid mirum si vitium haeresis in vos retorquemus. Tu conventiones cum concilio factas refers et authenticas dicis, auctoritate concilii probatas. Audio libenter, sed concilium de communione utriusque speciei loquens opinioni vestrae contrarium est, quia neque⁵ ad salutem necessarium⁶ esse dicit neque Christi praeceptum esse sub duplici specie⁷ communicari⁸ populum. {126r}

Georgius: Si non est sub duplici specie mandata communio, neque sub una quidem. Nam qui sub⁹ specie panis communicari¹⁰ plebem iussit, et sub specie vini iussit, et¹¹ in usum deduxit.

Aeneas: Falleris. Nam Christus apostolis, non plebi sacramentum praebuit. Sed non fert¹² tempus¹³ ista discutere. Sine me dicere, quod institui.

Georgius: Perge, ausculto.

¹ *omit.* F, L, M, N

² sola L

³ damnatis N

⁴ uos N, U

⁵ est quia neque : quod L

⁶ necessariam F, M, O, U, V

⁷ *omit.* M

⁸ communicare F, L, N

⁹ una *add.* N

¹⁰ communicare F, L

¹¹ iussit et : et panis L

¹² refert N

¹³ *omit.* L

4.3. Hussite claim of communion under both species as necessary for salvation

[22] And it is not sufficient for you to receive communion under two species, you also condemn those who only receive communion under one.

Georg: When do we condemn you?

Enea: When you claim that nobody may be saved unless he communicates under both species, then you condemn us all and call us heretics and lost souls^{1 2}. Why do you wonder that we return the accusation of heresy against you? You refer to the agreements with the council³ and call them authentic and sanctioned by authority of the council. I hear it willingly, but when the council spoke about communion under both species, it rejected your opinions, declaring that it is not necessary for salvation nor commanded by Christ that the people should receive communion under both species.

Georg: If communion under both species is not commanded [by the Lord], then neither is communion under one species. For he who commanded that the people should receive communion under the species of bread, also commanded that it should receive communion under the species of wine and made that the ordinary practice.

Enea: You are mistaken. Christ did not give the sacrament to the people, but to the apostles. But time does not allow a discussion of this matter. Please allow me to say what I had planned to.

Georg: Go ahead, I am listening.

¹ "perditus"

² According to the Catholic Church, this is the basic heresy of the Hussites. Claiming that men could not be saved unless they took communion under both species meant that for centuries the Church had condemned

the faithful to eternal damnation by only giving them communion under one species. Such a tenet was, of course, completely unacceptable to the Church and must be inflexibly rejected

³ The Council of Basel

[23] **Aeneas:** Si noluit¹ legatus innovare pactiones vestras, quid miri est? Vobis indulta est sub duplici specie communicatio. Jussi tamen sacerdotes vestri² sunt, quotienscumque ministrant populo³ sacramentum, commonere atque instruere omnes, ne sub duplici tantum specie⁴ ⁵, sed sub⁶ qualibet totum et integrum esse Christum intelligant. Nihil faciunt. Prohibiti sunt infantibus atque dementibus eucharistiam porrigere. Porrigunt tamen⁷. Neminem communicare sub duplici specie compellere debent. Compellunt sepulturam negantes, ni communicent. Qui prius non habuit⁸ hujus communionis usum⁹, repelli ab his¹⁰ debet¹¹ ¹². Ipsi autem invitant, provocant, urgent¹³. Debent¹⁴ universalis ecclesiae ritum tenere. Postponunt divinis officiis vulgaria carmina commiscentes. Pulchra oboedientia, pulchra foederis observatio. Quae prohibentur facere, faciunt. Quae jubentur, omnino postponunt. Cum ergo abutamini privilegio et transgrediamini leges patrum praevaricantes leges¹⁵ concilii, haud jure legatum accusatis compactata firmare nolentem¹⁶, quia privilegium amisistis male utentes.

[24] **Georgius:** In conventionibus nostris cautum est, quamvis aliqui ritum, qui generaliter observatur, non statim reciperent, non tamen pacis et unionis impediri¹⁷ foedus.

Aeneas: Vera dicis: non si¹⁸ omnes¹⁹, sed si aliqui, dicunt foedera, ritum²⁰ ecclesiae non reciperent, compactata manere²¹. Quod si omnes²² abicerent²³ ritus, ut²⁴ omnes abicitis, vigor conventionibus aufertur. Rursus quoque de ritu fit mentio, non de fide. Nam si fidem violatis, quae possunt inter nos vosque²⁵ foedera robur habere? At²⁶ vos - quod pace tua sit dictum – fidem nostram abicitis, dum²⁷ necessariam populis²⁸ sub duplici specie communionem astruitis²⁹.

¹ voluit N, U

² nostri F, U

³ ministrant populo : populo ministrent L

⁴ communicaret *add.* U

⁵ tantum specie : specie tantum N

⁶ una *add.* L, M, N

⁷ porrigunt tamen : tamen porrigunt N

⁸ habent L, M

⁹ hujus communionis usum : usum communionis L; usum illius communionis N

¹⁰ aliis L

¹¹ debent L, M

¹² ab his debet : debet ab his N

¹³ provocant urgent : urgent prouocant L

¹⁴ *omit.* N

¹⁵ mandata L, M, N

¹⁶ uolentem U

¹⁷ impedire L, M

¹⁸ non si : sed non N

¹⁹ si omnes : omnes si N

²⁰ rituum N; ritus U

²¹ monere N

²² non reciperent ... omnes *omit.* U

²³ abii.. *et passim* V

²⁴ et N; prout L, N

²⁵ nos vosque : vos nosque M, N, O, U, W, WO

²⁶ vt N

²⁷ *omit.* L

²⁸ *omit.* L

²⁹ construitis N

[23] **Enea:** It is not strange at all that the legate¹ did not renew the agreements. You were, indeed, granted communion under both species. But your priests were given the command that whenever they give communion to the people, they should instruct and admonish all to understand that the whole and complete Christ is present not only under both species together but also under each species separately. They do not do it. They were forbidden to give the eucharist to infants and insane people. They give it to them anyway. They should force no one to receive communion under both species, but they force them anyway by refusing them burial unless they communicate [in this way]. Those who did not previously take communion in this form they should prevent from doing it afterwards. But on the contrary, they invite them, they push them, they urge them to do it. They were required to observe the rites of Universal Church. They fail to do so and have even introduced common hymns into divine worship. That is really a splendid obedience, that is really a splendid way of keeping the treaty! What they are forbidden to do, they do. What they are commanded to do, they do not. So, when you yourselves abuse the privilege and break the laws of the Fathers and the laws of the Council, then it is not just of you to criticize the legate for not wanting to confirm the Compacts, for you have lost the privilege by misusing it.

[24] **Georg:** But in the agreements it is stipulated that even if some do not immediately accept the rite generally observed, the treaty of peace and unity is not therefore annulled.

Enea: Precisely! The treaty says that if "some", not "all", do not accept the rite of the Church, the compacts still stand. But if all reject the rites, as you all do, then the agreements lose their validity. This is a matter of rite, not of Faith. But if you break faith, what force can any treaty between us have? With all respect – you reject our Faith if you claim that communion under both species is necessary for salvation.

¹ Cardinal Carvajal

[25] **Georgius:** Ignota sunt ista mihi, sed hoc dico tibi: nisi pacta serventur, neque paci locus erit neque concordiae mentio. Quod si rursus arma sumpserimus, offeretis ultro pactiones veteres neque recipientur. Non sumus, ut creditis, pauci. Multi sunt in vicinatu, qui nobiscum¹ sapiunt nec aliud expectant, nisi ut exercitum educamus. Scitis, quae superioribus acta sunt annis. Papa, si sapiet, non disputabit, an perdiderimus privilegia, ne vendicemus armis majora. Arma tenenti omnia dat, qui {126v} justa negat. Sunt fortasse, qui magna promittunt, qui² grandes pollicentur exercitus, qui viam ad nos esse facturos se jactitant. Nos vicinorum mores viresque novimus. Ego, si papae consilium dederim³, compactata servaverim.

[26] **Aeneas:** Ut video⁴, spem ponis in armis, et animum tibi priores victoriae congeminant. Sed vincunt saepe mali, ut boni probentur: non semper veritati victoria comes est. Alta nimis et incomprehensibilia sunt judicia Dei⁵. Vicistis diu: quid scitis, si vester⁶ dies adest⁷? *Varius est eventus belli* neque temptanda saepius fortuna est. Non is vobis favor est, qui prius fuit: multi a vobis defecerunt, qui⁸, si exurgat contra vos pugna, et a fronte ferient et a tergo. Nam vestram fidem irritam vident, quam prius evangelicam sanctissimamque⁹ rebantur, et quam tunc favore, nunc odio insequuntur. Sed mittamus haec. Tu pacem sola foederum observantia stare putas. Mihi tribus ex rebus concordia pendere videtur: ex compactatis, ut ais; ex bonis ecclesiasticis, quae occupantur; ex archiepiscopi constitutione¹⁰, quae nec parva sunt nec leviter componenda. Nam compactata postquam violata sunt, rursus innovare magnum est. Qui bona ecclesiarum occupant, inviti restituent. In archiepiscopo vos ipsi vim facitis, qui Rochezanam petitis (nec alium vultis), quem nisi me fallit opinio, numquam sedes apostolica ad id fastigii promovebit.

Georgius: De compactatis dixi tibi, quae sentio. Si durus erit papa, durius regnum inveniet. Nescio, quis vincet. Scripturam sentio, quae dicit: *Si fortis in fortem impegerit, ambo corruent*, neque nobis neque vobis¹¹ utilitati contentio erit.

¹ *omit.* L

² *omit.* L

³ *darem* L

⁴ *uidere* F

⁵ *alta nimis ... dei omit.* L

⁶ *vestra* L

⁷ *aderit* L

⁸ *quod* L

⁹ *evangelicam sanctissimamque : sanctissimam evangelicamque* L

¹⁰ *institutione* F

¹¹ *vobis neque nobis : nobis neque vobis* L

[25] **Georg:** I do not know about this, but I tell you that if the treaty is not kept, then there will no place for peace and no word of agreement. If we go to war again, and you offer us the old pacts, we shall not accept them. We are not a few, though you appear to think so. Many in the neighbouring lands agree with us and are only waiting for us to lead out an army. You know what happened in former years. If the pope is wise, he will not discuss whether we have lost our privileges, or we shall take great revenge by arms. Anyone who refuses just [requests], gives all to the one who holds the weapons. Maybe there are some who make extravagant promises, who pledge large armies, and who boast that they will force their way to us. But we know the ways and strengths of our neighbours. If I should give the pope an advice, it would be to keep the Compacts.

[26] **Enea:** I see that you put your trust in arms and that your former victories give you courage. But often wicked men win so that good men can be tested: victory is not always the companion of truth. God's judgments are deep and incomprehensible. You have been victorious for a long time: who knows if your day [of reckoning] is near? *Various is the event of war,*¹ and the fortune of war should not be tested often. You do not enjoy the same popularity as earlier: many have abandoned you, and if war comes to you, they will hit you from before and from behind, for they see that your faith has failed. Formerly they believed it to be evangelical and holy, and they approved of it, whereas now they hate it. But let that be. You think that peace is only possible if the Compacts are kept. I consider that concord depends on three things: on the Compacts, as you say; on the ecclesiastical properties, which have been seized; and on the appointment of the archbishop. These matters are neither small nor easily settled. For after the Compacts have been violated, it is difficult to renew them. And those who have seized ecclesiastical properties are not willing to give them back. And concerning the archbishop, you yourselves are forcing the issue by demanding only Rokycana, whom – unless I am mistaken – the Apostolic See will never raise to this exalted position.

Georg: Concerning the Compacts I have told you what I feel. If the pope is hard, he will find the kingdom to be even harder. I do not know who will win. But I know Scripture which says that if *the strong stumbleth against the strong, both will fall together.*² A conflict will profit neither us nor you.

¹ 2. Kings, 11, 25

² Jeremiah, 46, 12: *fortis impegit in fortem, et ambo pariter conciderunt*

[27] De bonis ecclesiasticis non est apud me grave pondus: nam, qui occupant, nullo se jure defendunt¹, neque his² regnum favet. Verum quia nonnullis proscripta³ sunt haec bona, et multa pro paucis jacent pignori⁴, cum⁵ regni mos sit, quae bona singulis annis quinque sexagenas⁶ habent census⁷, ea centum sexagenis emi, hi⁸ autem pro centum sexagenis et decem et viginti et amplius impignoratas sexagenas habent, compelli poterunt, quos supra consuetudinem census occupant, hos ut⁹ evestigio restituant¹⁰, reliquos teneant, donec redimantur. Sic¹¹ mox ecclesiae restaurabuntur brevique¹² tempore omnia¹³ vendicabunt¹⁴ vel, si placuerit, melior modus inveniatur¹⁵.

[28] De archiepiscopo vero nescio, cur nobis tantopere¹⁶ papa¹⁷ sit adversus, cur nobis Rochezanam¹⁸ renuat confirmare, quem Sigismundo consentiente delegimus¹⁹ et assistere sibi promisimus omnes.

Aeneas: Saepius ante questus²⁰ es compactata convelli. Nunc tu solus es, qui foedera rumpis.

Georgius: {127r} Quonam pacto?

Aeneas: In compactatis promisistis omnes servare ritus universalis ecclesiae praeterquam in communione calicis. Ritus autem Latinae ecclesiae, cujus vos membrum estis, hoc habet: archiepiscopos aut²¹ eligunt capitula ecclesiarum auctoritate apostolica confirmandos, aut²² vacantibus ecclesiis Romanus pontifex solus praeficit. Vos alium ritum²³ novumque modum²⁴ inducitis: postquam devoluta²⁵ est provisio²⁶, electionem populariter facitis, cumque ritus ecclesiae sit examinari²⁷ electionem electique meritum Romani pontificis iudicio comprobari, vos nisi Rochezanam habueritis, nullum²⁸ vultis. Servare hoc²⁹ est an³⁰ violare pactiones?

¹ defendent V

² eis L

³ scripta L; prescripta N

⁴ pignora N

⁵ cur U

⁶ sexagenis WO

⁷ census L; antedicta *add.* N

⁸ ii V

⁹ *omit.* N

¹⁰ restituerunt N

¹¹ si U

¹² post *add.* M, N

¹³ que *add.* N

¹⁴ brevique tempore ... vendicabunt *omit.* U

¹⁵ inueniretur L

¹⁶ tanto tempore N

¹⁷ tantopere papa : papa tantopere L

¹⁸ Ra/ockeza... *et passim* L; Rokyca... *et passim* N

¹⁹ elegimus N

²⁰ conquestus L, N

²¹ *omit.* M

²² sint N

²³ nonnunquam *add.* U

²⁴ novumque modum : modumque novum N

²⁵ inuoluta L

²⁶ promissio L

²⁷ examinare L

²⁸ alium habere *add.* N

²⁹ autem *add.* L

³⁰ *omit.* L; aut N

4.4. Church properties

[27] The issue of the church properties I consider to be of lesser importance since those who occupy them do not claim to have the right to do so, and the kingdom does not favour them. These properties have been taken over¹ by a number of people, at a very low mortgage rate. In the kingdom, properties with a yearly income² of five *sexagenae* are normally bought at a price of 100 *sexagenae*.³ But these people have - at the [standard] price of 100 *sexagenae* - acquired properties with yearly incomes of 10, 20, or more *sexagenae*.⁴ Therefore, they can be compelled to immediately restore occupied properties with unusually high incomes. The rest they may keep until they are redeemed. Thus, these properties will soon be restored to the Church, and in a short time they will regain them all, or a better way may be found if so wished.⁵

4.5. Jan Rokycana

[28] Concerning the archbishop, I do not know why the pope is so much against us, and why he refuses to confirm Rokycana, whom we elected with the consent of Sigismund, and whom all promised to support.

Enea: Several times before you complained that the Compacts are not observed. Here, you are the only one to break the agreements,

Georg: How?

Eneas: In the Compacts, you promised to follow all the rites of Universal Church except as regards the communion of the chalice. But [on this point], the rite of the Latin Church, to which you belong, is that archbishops are elected by the cathedral chapters of their churches, to be confirmed by apostolic authority, or that the Roman pontiff alone makes the appointment. You have introduced another rite and a new procedure: after the provision reverts [to Rome], you make your own popular election.⁶ Although the rite of the Church prescribes that the election must be examined and the merits of the elected [person] confirmed by a decree from the Roman Pontiff, you will not accept anyone but Rokycana. Is that to respect or to violate the agreements?⁷

¹ "proscripta"

² "census". Another of example of Piccolomini's use of the word census in the sense of income is given in his *Report on the imperial mission to the Diet of Regensburg* (nr. 4 in the present series): *Nicolaus ... clero decimam partem sui census ut ad rem conferret bellicam, indixerat (Nicolaus ... had announced a tithe on the incomes of the clergy)*

³ Meaning that properties were normally bought at a sum twenty times that of the yearly income

⁴ Meaning that the ecclesiastical properties were acquired at the very advantageous sum of only five or

ten times that of the yearly income, thus ensuring relatively higher incomes for the occupant

⁵ The translator is in some doubt about this section on church properties, and would be much obliged to knowledgeable readers for corrections and improvements / MCS

⁶ Rokycana was elected archbishop of Prague by the Bohemian estates, not by the cathedral chapter, and therefore his election was canonically unlawful

⁷ Whether the concept of rite (ritus) covers the procedure of electing bishops is debatable

[29] **Georgius:** Si privilegium regni¹ est² archiepiscopum sibi³ eligere, cur non illud papa⁴ servaverit⁵?

Aeneas: Servaret, si quod esset, sed vobis nulla est hujusmodi facultas.

Georgius: Vetus consuetudo regni est: eligit archiepiscopum rogante rege capitulum, papa confirmat.

Aeneas: Non inficior, sed hunc⁶ neque⁷ capitulum elegit⁸ neque⁹ potestas eligendi fuit. Post diutinam¹⁰ vacationem provisio devoluta¹¹, et persona, quam vocatis electam, gravibus testimoniis infamatur.

Georgius: Me iudice¹², si papa Rochezanam confirmaret¹³, bonum opus efficeret, multum enim hic homo et apostolicae sedi et regno et regi Ladislao sua praedicatione consuleret.

Aeneas: Potest fieri, ut dicis, sed neque mihi neque - ut arbitror - papae suadenda res est: aliud tuum¹⁴, aliud nostrum de hoc¹⁵ homine iudicium.

Georgius: Veracem te iudico, tot enim sunt, qui Rochezanam quamvis injuria criminantur, ut nedum mihi negari fidem arbitror¹⁶, sed neque beatum Petrum audiri Romae putaverim¹⁷ Rochezanae¹⁸ faventem.

¹ regno M, N

² regni est : est regno L

³ omit. L

⁴ non illud papa : illud papa non L; papa id non N

⁵ servaret N

⁶ nunc F, L, M, N, O, U

⁷ omit. M

⁸ eligit L, M, U

⁹ episcopus add. N

¹⁰ diuinam U

¹¹ in papam add. N

¹² indice U

¹³ confirmat O, U, V, WO; infirmaret N

¹⁴ est add. L, M, N

¹⁵ omit. F; isto M, N; istoc M

¹⁶ arbitrer N, WO

¹⁷ putarim L

¹⁸ Rokyzano N

[29] **Georg:** But if the kingdom has the privilege to elect its own archbishop, why should the pope not respect it?

Enea: If there was such a privilege, he would respect it, but you do not have such a prerogative.

Georg: But it is an old custom of the kingdom: the [cathedral] chapter elects the archbishop on the king's proposal, and the pope confirms.

Enea: I do not deny it, but this man was not elected by the chapter, nor did it have the power to do so, for after the long vacancy the provision had reverted [to Rome], and the person you claim to have been elected was tainted by grave testimonies.

Georg: I believe that if the pope confirms Rokycana [as archbishop], he will do a good thing, for this man would profit both the Apostolic See,¹ the kingdom, and King Ladislaus with his preaching.

Enea: It might happen as you say, but I cannot be persuaded of this, and neither – as I believe – can the pope. You have one opinion of the man, and we have another.

Georg: I think you are right: so many people denounce Rokycana as pernicious that I believe that not only I would not be trusted [on this], but that Saint Peter himself would not be heard in Rome if he supported Rokycana!

¹ This claim is quite preposterous: there was no chance that Rokycana would begin to preach in favour

of the Apostolic See and the traditional teachings of the Roman Church

[30] **Aeneas:** Admonet apostolus *neophytum*¹ ne quis episcopum assumat², *ne in superbiam elatus in iudicium incidat*³ *diaboli*. At tuus Rochezana non novus in fide sed nullus est⁴, qui sedem apostolicam suis sermonibus carpit⁵ errareque totam ecclesiam dicit, dum necessariam omnibus⁶ fidelibus utriusque speciei communionem affirmat et aliquas veritates⁷ habere⁸ se contestatur, quibus Romana ecclesia contradicit⁹. Sed fallax est, et *veritas non est cum eo*, qui ultro apud temerarios convenasque Pragenses sine divina dispensatione se praeficit, qui se praepositum sine ulla ordinationis lege constituit, qui negante¹⁰ Christi vicario episcopi¹¹ sibi nomen assumit atque usurpat officium, cuius sermo ut¹² cancer¹³ serpit et auditorum cordibus mortale virus infundit¹⁴. Sed non pontificalis sed *pestilentiae cathedra* est, quam tuus occupat Rochezana, magister erroris et artifex corrumpendae {127v} veritatis egregius, qui *dereliquit fontem aquae vivae et effodit*¹⁵ *sibi*¹⁶ *lacus detritos, qui non possunt aquam portare*. Loquor aperte, quod sentio, nihil¹⁷ reticeo. Quo pacto Romanus pontifex huic tantam ecclesiam commendare potest? Qui confundit apostolicam sedem, qui maledicit toti ecclesiae, qui novos ritus inducit¹⁸, qui¹⁹ nullo²⁰ se subijcere vult examini, qui pacem domini discordiae furore corrumpit, qui, cum velit praeesse quam multis, nulli vult ipse subesse. Siccine lupo commitemus oves?

[31] Quid dicant ceteri de regno²¹, qui²² Romanam ecclesiam²³ forti pectore et immobili corde nunc usque secuti sunt? An non sic aggredi summum²⁴ pontificem possent²⁵, si Rochezanam promoveat²⁶: “Cui nos, pater sancte, committis? Cui nos credis²⁷, qui tibi fideles fuimus²⁸? Hosti animas nostras²⁹ occidendas praebes? Numquid apud nos³⁰ est, quem possis³¹ ecclesiae nostrae³² praeficere? Nos plures sumus, sive nobilitatem sive plebem regni³³ advertis³⁴. Quid juvat nostra fides? Quid constantia? Meliori loco apud te sunt, qui tibi adversi fuerunt. Haecine tuis³⁵ fidelibus praemia reddis³⁶? Archiepiscopum illi habebunt, qui communionem sub duplici specie tueatur³⁷? Nos, qui sub una communicamus, orphani relinquemur?”

¹ ne officium N

² famat L

³ in iudicium incidat : incidat in iudicium N

⁴ in fide sed nullus est : sed nullus est in fide L

⁵ omit. L

⁶ omit. L

⁷ auctoritates U

⁸ habet U

⁹ contraxit U

¹⁰ negauere U

¹¹ Christi U

¹² cum U

¹³ ut cancer : cancer ut N

¹⁴ infudit F, M, O

¹⁵ fodit N

¹⁶ omit. L

¹⁷ nil N

¹⁸ Interducit L

¹⁹ omit. L

²⁰ nulli V, WO

²¹ ceteri de regno : de regno ceteri F

²² omit. U

²³ omit. U

²⁴ Romanum L

²⁵ summum pontificem possent : possent summum pontificem N

²⁶ promoveat : permoueat N

²⁷ tradis N

²⁸ sumus N

²⁹ animas nostras : nostras animas L, M, N

³⁰ apud nos : ex nobis quis N; uos U

³¹ omit. U

³² ecclesiae nostrae : nostrae ecclesiae N

³³ sive plebem regni : regni siue plebem L, M; regni siue plures N

³⁴ aduertat M

³⁵ omit. F, WO

³⁶ praemia reddis : reddis premia N

³⁷ tueantur L

[30] **Enea:** The Apostle admonishes us not to take *a neophyte* as bishop, *lest being puffed up with pride, he fall into the judgment of the devil*.¹ But your Rokycana is not new in the Faith, no, he is not of the Faith at all. In his sermons he denounces the Apostolic See and declares that the whole Church is in error, claiming that the communion under both species is necessary for all the faithful, and insisting that he holds truths which the Roman Church contradicts. But it is he who is in error, and the *truth is not in him*.² Without divine dispensation, he made himself the leader of the reckless rabble in Prague. Without any legal claim, he appointed himself provost. Despite the refusal of the Vicar of Christ, he assumed the name and office of bishop. His speech slithers along like a snake and pours his mortal poison into the hearts of the listeners. The chair that your Rokycana occupies is not an episcopal chair, but the *chair of pestilence*.³ He is a master of error and an outstanding expert on corrupting truth, *who has forsaken the fountain of living water and dug for himself hollowed lakes which cannot hold water*.⁴ I openly say what I think and hold nothing back. How can the Roman Pontiff entrust so important a church to this man? He dismays the Apostolic See, he curses the whole Church, he introduces new rites, he will subject himself to nobody's examination, he disrupts the peace of the Lord with the fury of discord, and though he wants to govern many, he himself wants to be governed by nobody. Should we entrust the sheep to such a wolf?

[31] What would the others from the kingdom say who have until now followed the Roman Church with courage and loyalty? If the Supreme Pontiff appointed Rokycana, would they not come to him and ask, "Holy Father, who is this man to whom you commit us? To whom do you entrust us who have been loyal to you? Do you give our souls to the enemy to be killed? Can you not find someone among us to appoint as the leader of our Church? We are in the majority whether you consider the nobility or the people of the kingdom. How does our loyalty benefit us? Our constancy? You show greater favour to your adversaries [than to us]. Is this how you reward the faithful? Will the others get an archbishop who supports communion under both species? Will we who communicate under one species only be left as orphans?"

¹ 1. Timothy, 3, 6

² John, 8, 44: *non est veritas in eo*

³ Psalms, 1, 1

⁴ Jeremiah, 2, 13, as quoted by Optatus of Milevis: *De schismate Donatistarum*, 4, 9 (MPL, XI, col. 1041)

[32] Non¹ arbitror, Georgi, fieri posse, quod petitis. Vana Rochezanae, vana spes vestra est. Quod si pacem quaeritis, sinite illum, nec sigilla vos teneant, qui² promisistis assistere³. Satis est diligentiam impendisse. Impossibilium nulla est obligatio⁴, nec vestrum est papam⁵ cogere. Sequimini⁶ ritum ecclesiae, et aliorum Christianorum vos moribus coaptate. Sic benignum papam, sic omnes vobis⁷ affectos invenietis, sic tranquilli felicisque regni bonis in pace frui poteritis.

Georgius: Places⁸ mihi, quia⁹ neque fictus neque tectus¹⁰ es, sed, quae corde geris, ore profers¹¹. Ego tibi propemodum habeo fidem neque de Rochezana sperandum esse amplius arbitror¹². In alios cura vertenda est. Quia tamen¹³ regni voto¹⁴ electus est ille, commonendus¹⁵ et inducendus erit¹⁶ electioni renuntiare¹⁷. Tunc alium ex apostolicae sedis clementia postulabimus.

Aeneas: Facite, ut¹⁸ libet, dum¹⁹ Rochezana desistat, qui²⁰, si resipuerit²¹ et humilitatem induerit, gratiam inveniet²² et apostolici culminis benignitatem experietur, quia non est *abbreviata manus* ejus. Et si²³ tu²⁴ rem²⁵ hanc²⁶ ad optatum perduces finem - ut ante dixi - honoribus et praemio cumulaberis. Mea tamen sententia est, ne unum solum, sed papae viros plures²⁷ ²⁸ nominetis, ex quibus unum doctrina et vita probatum possit eligere.

[33] Ceterum, quia de communione duarum specierum deque praecepto domini sermo incidit, neque otium {128r} est tanti sacramenti mysterium nunc exponere, quamvis disputata Basileae declarataque tibi et omni²⁹ Christiano sufficere debeant, quia tamen vestri sacerdotes nondum conversi sunt³⁰ suaque malunt impudenter³¹ ingerere quam nostra patienter audire, consulo tibi adveniente Johanne de Capistrano, docto sanctoque viro, quae sunt apud te dubia, sibi³² exponito et omnia tuae mentis archana patefacito, nam si operam³³ medicantis expectas³⁴, detegenda sunt vulnera. Invenies – si volueris – sanitatem.

¹ nam L

² quia L, M, N

³ promisistis assistere : assistere promisistis L

⁴ est obligatio : obligatio est L, M, N

⁵ est papam : papam est N

⁶ sequamini L

⁷ *omit.* U

⁸ placet U

⁹ *omit.* L

¹⁰ rectus U

¹¹ profers U

¹² *omit.* F, O, U; *add. in marg.* V

¹³ cum N

¹⁴ voce L

¹⁵ commouendus L, M, N, U

¹⁶ ut *add.* L; est N

¹⁷ renuntiaret L

¹⁸ dum U

¹⁹ ut U

²⁰ quia N

²¹ resipuit L

²² inuenerit L

²³ *omit.* N

²⁴ si tu : tu si L, M; tamen N

²⁵ *omit.* N

²⁶ rem hanc : hanc rem L, M

²⁷ viros plures : plures viros F, L, M, O, U

²⁸ papae plures viros : plures viros pape N

²⁹ populo *add.* N

³⁰ *omit.* U

³¹ pudenter F, O, U, V; prudenter L, M

³² tibi M

³³ opera WO

³⁴ expectes L

[32] I do not think, Georg, that what you request can be done. Rokycana's hope is vain and so is yours. If you want peace, then abandon him. You who promised to support him should not be bound by your seals. It is enough that you have tried hard. One cannot be obliged to do what is impossible, and you cannot force the pope. Follow the rite of the Church and conform to the ways of the other Christians. Thus, you will win the pope for you, and all others will be kindly disposed. And thus, you may peacefully enjoy the benefits of a tranquil and happy kingdom.

Georg: I like you, for you do not dissemble or pretend, but say what is in your heart. I trust you and no longer think that we may hope for Rokycana. We must look to others. But since he was elected by a vote of the Kingdom, he must be encouraged and enticed to renounce the election. Then we can ask for somebody else from the clemency of the Apostolic See.

Aeneas: Do as you wish, if only Rokycana desists. If he comes to his senses and shows humility, he will find favour and experience the kindness of His Apostolic Highness, for his *hand is not shortened*.¹ And if you bring this matter to the desired conclusion, you will – as I said before – be covered with honours and rewards. In my opinion, you should nominate not just one man but several to the pope, from which he may choose one who is of proven learning and life.

[33] We have spoken of communion under both species and the Lord's command, and we do not have leisure, now, to expound the mystery of this great sacrament. The discussions and statements at Basel² ought, however, to be sufficient for you and every Christian. Still, since your priests have not yet been converted and will spread their own [opinions] with impudence rather than listen to ours with patience, I advise you to tell your doubts to Giovanni Capistrano,³ that learned and holy man, when he arrives, and to disclose all the secrets of your mind to him, for if you wish to be treated by a physician, you must bare your wounds to him. Then you will find healing if you want to.

¹ Isaiah, 59, 1: *Ecce non est abbreviata manus Domini*

² At the Council of Basel

³ The mission of Giovanni Capistrano in Bohemia would prove to be a complete failure, see Heymann: *John Rokycana*, pp. 251-252

Georgius: De Rochezana cogitabimus, quae¹ paci² regnoque³ conveniant. De Johanne⁴ Capistrano, quamprimum⁵ ad nos⁶ venit⁷, decrevi, quae nunc dixisti⁸, etsi nullus mones⁹, facere^{10 11 12}. Neque¹³ enim alta sentio et timeo, ne offendam, neque mihi confido neque nostris¹⁴ sacerdotibus omnem¹⁵ habeo¹⁶ fidem. Sed vale, nam¹⁷ tempus est alia in manus recipere.

Aeneas: Et tu vale, nostri sermonis memor.

[34] Sic facto verbis fine disjuncti sumus¹⁸. Complura fuerunt inter nos dicta, sed hic sensus eorum est, quae¹⁹ de rebus ecclesiae disputavimus. Et quamvis verba non eadem fuerint²⁰, sententiam tamen²¹ immutilatam invariataque refero. Intellexisti, quae cum Georgio Pogiebratio²² contuli. Non sunt - ut mea fert opinio - parvi ponderis, nam²³ Georgius apud Bohemos magnum nomen habet et potens est illius partis, quae sub duplici specie communicat, et multi ex alia parte in rebus bellicis juncti sunt ei²⁴. Si quis est²⁵, qui civitates ad unionem trahere possit²⁶, Georgius est²⁷. Sed transeamus nunc ad alia.

¹ *omit.* L

² pacem ... (*illeg.*) L

³ regnique L

⁴ de *add.* W

⁵ quamprimo L

⁶ rumor *add.* L, M, N

⁷ veniet V, WO

⁸ quae nunc dixisti : accedere N

⁹ moues M; ammovetur N

¹⁰ mones facere : monefacere U

¹¹ *omit.* N

¹² decrevi quae ... facere : que moues facere decreui L

¹³ nec N

¹⁴ vestris N

¹⁵ *omit.* N

¹⁶ adhibeo N

¹⁷ iam V

¹⁸ simus U

¹⁹ quibus N

²⁰ fuerunt L, N

²¹ *omit.* F

²² de Pogibrat L, M; de Podiebrat N

²³ hic *add.* L

²⁴ juncti sunt ei : sunt ei iuncti N

²⁵ *omit.* N

²⁶ posset N

²⁷ *omit.* L

Georg: In the matter of Rokycana, we shall consider what is best for peace and for the kingdom. And in the case of Giovanni Capistrano, I have decided to do as you say as soon as he comes to us.¹ For I am not a proud man, I fear to do wrong, I am not overly confident in myself and do not entirely trust our priests. But now, I must say goodbye, for I have to deal with other matters.

Enea: And goodbye to you, too. Remember our conversation.

4.6. Conclusion

[34] Thus we ended our conversation and took leave of each other.

We, actually spoke about much more [than related here], but this is the gist of our discussion on the ecclesiastical issues. And though the words may not have been exactly the same, I have rendered their substance without distortions and changes. So now, you know what I discussed with Georg Podiebrad. I believe that it is not without significance, for Georg is a very important man in Bohemia: he has great power in the party that communicates under both species,² and many from the other party³ are allied with him in military matters. If anybody can bring the cities to union [with the Church],⁴ it is Georg. But let us now move on to other things.

¹ The meaning of the following passage "etsi nullus mones" is unclear

² The Hussite Utraquists

³ The Catholics

⁴ With the Catholic Church

[35] Postquam¹ soluta² congregatio est³, accessit nos Henricus⁴ Rosensis⁵ dixitque se patris scripto monitum, ne⁶ quo pacto domum redeat, nisi⁷ nos secum adducat oneravitque⁸ nos multis precibus extorsitque tandem, ut secum iremus. Cum prope Thabor iter faceremus essetque⁹ hora prandendi, exeuntes Thaboritae Henrico, ut ad se divertat secumque prandeat, preces accumulunt. Is quaerit ex¹⁰ me, iturusne¹¹ sim¹². Dico nolle me amplius apud hostes fidei divertere. Tristatur Henricus, nam et visere civitatem cupiebat, et me solum¹³ relinquere non audebat, et accusabant¹⁴ me¹⁵ omnes durumque¹⁶ dicebant et inurbanum et¹⁷ agrestem, qui nollem nobili domino morem¹⁸ gerere. Tum Procopius: “Quin tu,” inquit¹⁹, “ingrederis civitatem, nunc ea facultas erit dicere, quae prius voluisti. Nunc tuae²⁰ conscientiae satisfacere poteris²¹.” Moverunt me verba Procopii intravique civitatem, sed neque comedi quidquam illic neque bibi. Repetivi tamen²² vetus hospitium ibique mansi, dum ceteri prandebant, vixque curru descenderam²³, cum sacerdotes oppidi ad me venerant²⁴, Nicolaus, quem dicunt episcopum, plenus dierum²⁵ malorum, Johannes Galechus, qui nuper {128v} ex Polonia fugerat²⁶, ignem timens, et Wenceslaus²⁷ Coranda, vetus diaboli mancipium, qui sacramentum altaris solam²⁸ esse figuram significationemque contendit²⁹. Cum his fuerunt scholares³⁰ et cives plurimi, latinum edocti sermonem, nam perfidum genus id³¹ hominum hoc solum boni habet, quia³² litteras amat. Horum consalutatio³³ in³⁴ hunc fere³⁵ modum fuit, qui subscriptus est.

¹ post N

² *omit.* U

³ congregatio est : est congregatio N

⁴ Henricus *et passim* F, O, WO

⁵ de Rosis L, M, N

⁶ *omit.* L

⁷ et *add.* L, M, N

⁸ oneratque N

⁹ atque L

¹⁰ a N

¹¹ utrum iturus N

¹² sum L, N

¹³ *omit.* N

¹⁴ accusabantque L

¹⁵ *omit.* L

¹⁶ duriusque N

¹⁷ ac L

¹⁸ moram N

¹⁹ *omit.* F, O, U, V, WO

²⁰ me U

²¹ satisfacere poteris : poteris satisfacere V

²² repetivi tamen : repetivique N

²³ descenderem N

²⁴ uenerunt L, M, N; veniunt V

²⁵ ducum L

²⁶ fugerit L

²⁷ Wenceslaus F, O, U

²⁸ solum L

²⁹ contendunt N

³⁰ seculares L

³¹ *omit.* L

³² quod L

³³ consolatio U; consultatio WO

³⁴ per L

³⁵ vere L, M, N

5. Travel back to Tabor

[35] After the assembly¹ had been dismissed, Heinrich von Rosenberg came to us and said that his father² had written to him not to come home without bringing us with him, and he urgently requested us to come. In the end, we had to give in and agree to come with him. When, at lunchtime, we approached Tabor, the Taborites came out and begged Heinrich to visit them and have lunch. He asked me if I would come, too. I replied that I would not stay again with enemies of the Faith. This made Heinrich sorry, for he wished to visit the city, but he did not dare to leave me alone. All [the others] blamed me for being hard, impolite, and rude since I would not accommodate the noble lord. But then Prokop³ said, “If you enter the city, you will now have the opportunity to say what you wanted to the first time. Now you can satisfy your own conscience.” Prokop’s words persuaded me, and I entered the city but did not eat or drink anything there. I went to my former lodgings and stayed there while the others had lunch. I had barely descended from the carriage,⁴ when the priests of the city arrived, Mikulas whom they call bishop,⁵ a man full of evil days, Jan⁶ Galka,⁷ who had recently fled from Poland, fearing the fire,⁸ and Vaclav Koranda, an old servant of the Devil,⁹ who claims that the sacrament of the altar is only an image and a symbol. With them were many scholars and citizens, who knew Latin, for the one good thing this race of men possesses is their love of letters. Their greeting went more or less as follows:

¹ The assembly of Bohemian nobles in Benesov to which Piccolomini had been sent as an imperial ambassador

² Ulrich von Rosenberg (1403-1462): Bohemian noble, leader of the Catholic party

³ Prokop von Rabstein

⁴ Note that Piccolomini apparently travelled by carriage, not on horseback

⁵ Mikulas of Pelhrimov (ca. 1385 - ca. 1459): Elected bishop of Tabor 1420 - 1452. Member of the Hussite delegation to the Council of Basel January to April 1433. Piccolomini who was then in Basel may have heard his

interventions in the debates at the council or at least seen him. Fudge, p. 258: *He possessed a keen mind, a sharp tongue, and a sense of history. He remained active in Hussite affairs for forty years.*

⁶ Error for Andreas

⁷ Andrzej Galka of Dobzyna (ca. 1400-ca. 1454): Polish theologian who had to flee Poland because of his unorthodox views

⁸ I.e., being burnt as a heretic

⁹ Václav Koranda (ca. 1390-1453): Radical Hussite clergyman

[36] “Gaudemus, pater, quia civitatem nostram introisti nosque visere dignatus es. Suscipimus te¹ libentibus animis utque nostris bonis utaris cupimus. Cum primus hic fuisti, non te accessimus², quia non eramus praesentes. Nunc cum³ te videmus, precamur, aliquid nobis consolationis⁴ edisseras fructumque⁵ ut⁶ nobis aliquem⁷ tuus adventus pariat.” Tunc ego datam⁸ mihi occasionem loquendi⁹ ¹⁰ laetus arripui dixique illis: “Quod me voluistis accedere¹¹ resque vestras obtulistis, urbana res est et digna¹² ¹³. Suscipiendi sunt enim¹⁴ hospites et omni humanitate fovendi, sicut apostolus ait: *Hospitalitatem*¹⁵ *autem persequentes*, neque sine causa verbum persecutionis adjecit, ut non levi et usitato sermone atque – ut ita loquar – summis labiis hospites invitemus, sed toto mentis ardore teneamus, tamquam auferentes se de¹⁶ lucro nostro atque compendio. At ego hic non facio prandium neque cibum ad noctem usque recipiam. Quia vero consolationem ex me quaeritis¹⁷, loquar vobis, quae¹⁸ mihi consolatoria videbuntur, eritque sermo meus non in sublimibus humanae sapientiae verbis, sed in sinceritate cordis puroque mentis affectu sobrietatis et veritatis sensu¹⁹ depromam. Utinam recipiatis verba mea sicut a me proferentur animo bono.” Quibus dicentibus et²⁰ audire libenter et audiri²¹ velle, jussi eos consedere, cupiens certare fortiter²², sacramenti mei memor et fidei. Cetera, quae sequuntur²³, quia dialogi formam habent²⁴, servabo²⁵ quem supra ordinem²⁶ coepi. Tu, si²⁷ aures adhibueris, et ineptias nostras audies²⁸ et inter audaces senes puerilem pugnam spectabis²⁹:

¹ de N

² suscepimus N

³ dum L, M, N

⁴ vt *add.* N

⁵ fructum M, N

⁶ fructumque ut : ut fructum L

⁷ *omit.* L

⁸ data N

⁹ *omit.* L

¹⁰ occasionem loquendi : loquendi occasionem M;
loquendi occasione N

¹¹ voluistis accedere : accedere uoluistis N

¹² *add.* laude L, M

¹³ digna laude : laude digna N

¹⁴ sunt enim : enim sunt L, N

¹⁵ hospitem N

¹⁶ se de : de se L

¹⁷ requiritis V, WO

¹⁸ qui N

¹⁹ sensus N; sensa F, O, V, WO

²⁰ *omit.* N

²¹ libenter et audiri *omit.* L

²² *omit.* N

²³ dicuntur L

²⁴ habuerunt L; habenti M

²⁵ sermo N

²⁶ modum L

²⁷ tu si : si tu N

²⁸ audias L

²⁹ spectans N; expectabis U

6. Debate with the Taborite¹

6.1. Introduction

[36] “We are happy, Father, that you have entered our city and deign to visit with us. We receive you gladly, and all we have is yours to use. When you were here the first time, we did not come to see you since we were absent. But now that we see you, we ask you to speak words of solace, so that your coming will bring us some benefit.” I gladly seized the opportunity to speak that was given to me and said, “Your coming to visit me and offering me what you have is courteous and honourable. For guests should be received and treated with all courtesy, as the Apostle says: *Pursuing hospitality ...*² Not without reason did he use the word “pursuing”, for he meant that we should not invite guests in superficial and common terms and – so to say – with lips alone³ but treat them with fervent hearts, even though it may cost you. But I shall not have lunch here nor take food before night. However, since you ask me for comfort, I shall say such words to you as I consider to be comforting. I shall not speak in lofty terms of human wisdom but in terms of sobriety and truth, with sincerity of heart and the affection of a pure mind. I speak my words out of kindness. I hope you will receive them in the same way.” They answered that they would both hear and be heard gladly, so I asked them to sit, as, remembering my oath and faith, I desired to fight strenuously. What follows has the form of a dialogue, and I shall use the same format I began with above. If you lend your ears, you will hear our nonsense and see a juvenile fight between brash old men.

¹ Thomas A. Fudge notes that *In his account to Cardinal Carvajal, Aeneas attempts to recount, practically verbatim, his head-to-head debates with the Taborite theologians. It is revealing that Aeneas gets longer speeches, scores more telling points and speaks in a more sophisticated way. ... Since Aeneas is clearly a partisan historian – an unsympathetic enemy of all heresies – he does not simply dismiss the strange*

doctrines, as one might expect, but makes an effort to understand and refute them. (Fudge: *Seduced*, p. 99).

To the present editor it appears that Piccolomini’s account quite fairly reproduces the often perspicacious observations of the Hussite priests / MCS

² Romans, 12, 13: *Hospitalitatem sectantes*

³ “summis labiis”

[37] **Aeneas:** Optatis ex me, viri¹ Thaboritae, consolationem audire. Est igitur aliquid², quod³ vos premit, nam miseros tristesque consolari, non⁴ beatos solemus⁵. At cum video⁶ vos in civitate munita bonis temporalibus abundare, pacem cum vicinis habere fruique sanitate, nescio, cur vobis consolatione sit opus, nisi fortasse in⁷ his, quae fidei sunt, vacillatis⁸, et affligit spiritum vestrum dubitatio, quod mihi satis verisimile fit⁹, namque¹⁰ cum multis in rebus ab universali ecclesia discordetis, necessarium est nutare¹¹ credulitatem¹² vestram et animos tristari¹³ vestros. Quod si consolatoria propterea¹⁴ verba¹⁵ desideratis, obsequar petitioni vestrae certumque solamen ostendam.

¹ fieri M, N

² aliud N

³ quidem N

⁴ nunc N

⁵ sciremus N

⁶ uideam L

⁷ *omit.* N

⁸ fallatis N

⁹ sit L; videtur N

¹⁰ nam N

¹¹ mutari U

¹² incredulitatem N; crudelitatem U

¹³ testari

¹⁴ consolatoria propterea : propterea consolatoria L, M

¹⁵ consolatoria propterea verba : propterea verba consolatoria N

[37] **Enea:** Men of Tabor, you wish to hear [words of] comfort from me. Therefore, there must be something which bothers you, for usually, we do not comfort those who are happy but those who are unhappy and sad. But when I observe you in your fortified city, overflowing with worldly goods, at peace with your neighbours, and being in good health, I do not see why you need to be comforted unless, perhaps, you are unsettled in matters of Faith, and your spirit is plagued by doubt. This seems quite likely to me, for in many areas, you are in conflict with Universal Church. Therefore, your beliefs must be uncertain, and your souls sad. If that is why you wish for words of comfort, I shall fulfil your request and show you solace.

[38] {129r} Dubia, quae vos cruciant, ex sacris litteris oriuntur, neque enim scriptura umquam ulla sic aperta¹ claraque fuit, ut in diversos flecti sensus² nequiret, traxeruntque sacris ex³ codicibus ortum omnia, quae ab initio surgentis ecclesiae⁴ usque nunc fuerunt schismata⁵. Sed norat hoc futurum Deus. Idcirco cum per famulum suum Moysen Israelitico⁶ populo legem dedisset, et quid sectandum quidve fugiendum esset manifesta serie praescripsisset⁷, sciens tamen futuros⁸ esse, qui legi suae dissonos sensus accommodarent, consulturus⁹ futuro saeculo et obicem positurus haeresibus, supremum tribunal in terra constituit, ad quod majores causae et omnes afferri dubitationes de¹⁰ lege¹¹ deberent. Ait enim in Deuteronomio dominus: *Si difficile et ambiguum apud te iudicium esse¹² prospexeris¹³ inter sanguinem et sanguinem, causam et causam, lepram et lepram et iudicium¹⁴ inter portas videris verba variare, surge et ascende ad locum, quem elegerit dominus, Deus tuus, veniesque ad sacerdotes Levitici generis et ad iudicem, qui fuerit illo tempore, et quaeres ab eis, qui iudicabunt tibi iudicii veritatem, et facies, quaecumque dixerint, qui¹⁵ praesunt loco, quem elegerit dominus, et docuerint te juxta legem ejus sequerisque sententiam¹⁶ eorum nec declinabis ad dexteram vel¹⁷ sinistram. Qui autem superbierit nolens oboedire¹⁸ sacerdotis imperio, qui eo tempore ministrat domino, Deo tuo, et decreto iudicis, morietur homo ille et auferes malum de Israel.*¹⁹ Sic veteris testamenti sequacibus dominus imperavit, ne quis²⁰ seductus opinione scindere populum peregrinasque religiones introducere posset. Nam qui *ambulant in errore cordis sui*, venient super eos mala.

¹ aperte WO

² flecti sensus : sensus flecti L, N

³ sacris ex : ex sacris L

⁴ omit. L

⁵ fuerunt schismata : scismata fuere L

⁶ Israelitico F, O, V, WO; Israelico M

⁷ scripsisset L; conscripsisset U

⁸ venturos L, M, N

⁹ consulturos L

¹⁰ hac L

¹¹ de lege : leges N

¹² omit. V, WO

¹³ conspexeris L

¹⁴ omit. N; iudicium F, V, WO

¹⁵ que L

¹⁶ sententiamque N

¹⁷ neque ad U

¹⁸ et audire add. N

¹⁹ Israel F, M, V

²⁰ sua add. L, M, N

6.2. Supreme religious authority established by God¹

6.2.1. The Old Testament

[38] The doubts that afflict you arise from Holy Scripture, for it was never so straightforward and clear that it could not be bent towards different meanings. From the time of the Early Church until now, all schisms have their origin in the Holy Books. But God knew what would happen, so after he had given the law to the people of Israel through his servant Moses and listed clearly what to pursue and what to avoid,² and knowing there would be people who made conflicting interpretations of His law, he safeguarded the future and set up a barrier against heresies by establishing a supreme tribunal on Earth, to which all major causes and all doubts concerning the law should be referred. For in the Deuteronomy the Lord says: *If thou perceive that there be among you a hard and doubtful matter in judgment between blood and blood, cause and cause, leprosy and leprosy: and thou see that the words of the judges within thy gates do vary: arise, and go up to the place, which the Lord thy God shall choose. And thou shalt come to the priests of the Levitical race, and to the judge, that shall be at that time: and thou shalt ask of them, and they shall shew thee the truth of the judgment. And thou shalt do whatsoever they shall say, that preside in the place, which the Lord shall choose, and what they shall teach thee, according to his law; and thou shalt follow their sentence: neither shalt thou decline to the right hand nor to the left hand. But he that will be proud, and refuse to obey the commandment of the priest, who ministereth at that time to the Lord thy God, and the decree of the judge, that man shall die, and thou shalt take away the evil from Israel.*³ This was the Lord's command to those who followed the Old Testament, so that nobody, led astray by his own opinions, would divide the people and introduce foreign religions. For evil things will happen to *those who walk in the error of their heart.*⁴

¹ Eight years later, as pope Pius II, Piccolomini would, in his oration "*Dominatorem caeli*" (1459), return to the theme of God establishing a supreme religious authority in the Old Testament and continued in the

New Testament with Saint Peter and his successors as bishops of Rome

² The Decalogue

³ Deuteronomy, 17, 8-12

⁴ Jeremiah, 13, 10

[39] Sed nec Christus dominus, novae legis conditor, veritatis magister ac salutis¹ inventor, supremi refugium tribunalis omisit. Elegit enim Petrum et in Petro ceteros Romanae sedis antistites, qui post ejus in caelum ascensionem vicariatum tenerent et in ecclesia primum locum, cum claves regni caelorum illi² promisit³ ac⁴ ligandi solvendique potestatem et tandem pasturam gregis commisit⁵ dicens: *Pasce oves meas*. Cur haec⁶? Quid opus erat Petrum fieri pastorem, claves regni tenere, principatum accipere, Christi vicarium gerere⁷, nisi ut errantes reduceret, ignaros instrueret, timidos roboraret, pertinaces eliminaret⁸, fidelibus subveniret, haereticis repugnaret. Si justi essemus ac nostro ingenio verum videremus et⁹ sequeremur omnes, neque lege neque principe opus esset, sed, quia¹⁰ surgunt¹¹ ingenia pernicioosa, quae¹² doctrinas pestiferas seminant funduntque venena¹³ letalia et occidunt credulas animas, necessaria¹⁴ fuit¹⁵ supremi tribunalis erectio, quod inter lepram {129v} et lepram dijudicaret. Hoc autem est apud apostolicam sedem¹⁶, quae *cardo et caput, ut factum est a domino et non ab alio, est constituta fidelium. Et sicut cardine hostium regitur, sic hujus sanctae sedis auctoritate omnes¹⁷ ecclesiae domino disponente reguntur*, atque - ut Calixti¹⁸ papae sanctissimi¹⁹ verbis utamur – *nulli dubium est, quod apostolica sedes mater sit omnium ecclesiarum, a cujus nos²⁰ regulis nullatenus convenit deviare*.

¹ veritatis L

² eis L

³ commisit N

⁴ et L

⁵ *omit.* L

⁶ hoc N

⁷ principatum accipere ... gerere *omit.* F

⁸ illuminaret L, N

⁹ *omit.* N

¹⁰ ni N

¹¹ insurgunt F

¹² etiam L

¹³ uena U

¹⁴ ecclesia N

¹⁵ sunt N

¹⁶ apostolicam sedem : sedem apostolicam N

¹⁷ alie *add.* L

¹⁸ Calisti F, L, U, V

¹⁹ *omit.* L

²⁰ *omit.* U

6.2.2. The New Testament

[39] And neither did Christ – founder of the new law, teacher of truth, and maker of salvation – neglect the refuge of a supreme tribunal. He chose Peter and through Peter the other bishops of the Roman See to be his vicars after his ascension into Heaven and hold the first place in the Church. This he did, when he promised Peter the keys to the Kingdom of Heaven and the power to bind and to loosen,¹ and when he finally entrusted the care of the flock to him with the words: *Feed my sheep.*² Why did he do that? Why was it needful for Peter to become the shepherd, to keep the keys of the Kingdom, to accept the first place, and to act as Christ’s vicar, if not to bring the erring back, to instruct the unknowing, to strengthen the fearful, to oust the intractable, to assist the faithful, to oppose the heretics. If we were just and all naturally saw and followed what is true, we would not need the law of a prince. But since destructive characters arise, who sow pestiferous doctrines and pour lethal poison and kill gullible souls, it was necessary to establish a supreme tribunal to judge between *leprosy and leprosy*. This tribunal is with the Apostolic See. *The Lord made the Apostolic See the hinge and head, and it is not dependent on anybody else. And just as the door is ruled by the hinge, thus, as the Lord has ordained it, all the churches are governed by the authority of this Holy See.*³ And – in the words of holy Pope Calixtus - *there is no doubt whatsoever that the Apostolic See is the mother of all churches, and that nobody should deviate from its norms.*⁴

¹ Matthew, 16, 18-19

² John, 21, 17

³ Decretum, D.22.2. (col. 74). Cf. Pseudo-Isidore: *Letters of Pope Anacletus*, 3, 34 (MPL, 130, col. 78): *Haec vero apostolica sedes caput et cardo, ut praefatum est, a*

domino ... Also used by Piccolomini several times in his orations when arguing for the primacy of the Roman See. Unfortunately, the passage referred to is a late, forged text from the Pseudo-decretals of Isidore

⁴ Decretum, D.12.1. (col. 27). From Pseudo-Isidore

[40] Vos igitur¹, Thaboritae, si qua² vos fidei dubitatio tenet, consulite Romanam ecclesiam, audite vicarium Christi, *facite quaecumque dixerint vobis, qui praesunt loco, quem dominus elegit*. Dicit cum Isaia: *Venite, ascendamus ad montem domini et ad domum³ Dei Jacob et docebit nos vias⁴ et ambulabimus in semitis ejus*. Quis⁵ est mons domini nisi apostolica sedes⁶? Quae domus Dei est⁷ nisi ecclesia? Quis locus electus a domino nisi Roma, quem⁹ beatorum Petri et Pauli martyrium consecravit? Fugiebat Petrus ex urbe mortem timens, *sed cum offendisset¹⁰ in via dominum, dixit ad eum: Domine, quo vadis? Et dominus sibi¹¹: Vado Romam iterum crucifigi¹²*. Sic reversus Petrus ibi¹³ cathedram¹⁴ summi pontificatus¹⁵ erexit, ubi¹⁶ crucis patibulum subiit. Huc ergo recurrendum est, hinc doctrina sumenda est, hinc veritatis hauriendi latices. Hic fons aquae vivae signatus scaturit, hic hortus conclusus¹⁷, hic arca domini, extra quam non est¹⁸ salus, resedit¹⁹ 20.

[41] Non pudeat vos²¹, Thaboritae, quae de fide sentitis apostolicae sedi referre, nam Paulus vocatus, e²² caelo segregatus, in evangelium Christi securitatem non habuit²³ evangelium praedicandi, nisi Petri et ceterorum apostolorum, qui cum eo erant²⁴, fuisset²⁵ sententia roboratum. Eapropter ad Galatas scribens, *Iterum, inquit, ascendi Hierosolymam²⁶ cum Barnaba assumpto Tito. Ascendi autem secundum revelationem et contuli cum illis evangelium, seorsum autem his qui videbantur aliquid esse, ne forte in vacuum currerem aut²⁷ cucurrissem*. Et divus²⁸ Hieronymus²⁹, doctrina plenus et omnem scientiam callens³⁰, cum fidei scripta dictasset, ad Damasum, *Haec est, inquit, fides, papa beatissime, quam didici in ecclesia, quamque semper tenui, in qua si minus perite aut parum caute forte aliquid positum est³¹, emendari³² a te volo, qui fidem Petri³³ tenes et meritum*. Sic et vos facere Thaboritas exhortor. Ostendite vos et doctrinam vestram Romano pontifici. Facite, quae jusserit, neque ad dexteram neque ad sinistram declinantes. Sic consolationem {130r} spiritus, sic animae vestrae quietem assequuntur³⁴ et salutem.

¹ ergo N

² quae N

³ et ad domum *omit.* U

⁴ suas *add.* N

⁵ qui WO

⁶ apostolica sedes : sedes apostolica N

⁷ *omit.* L

⁸ domus Dei est : est domus dei F

⁹ quam L, M, N; quam *corr.* ex quem V

¹⁰ vidisset N

¹¹ respondit N

¹² crucifixi N

¹³ ubi WO

¹⁴ sedem N

¹⁵ pontificis WO

¹⁶ ibi N

¹⁷ hic fons ... conclusus *omit.* L

¹⁸ *omit.* L

¹⁹ residet L; *omit.* N

²⁰ hic hortus ... resedit *omit.* M

²¹ *omit.* L

²² *omit.* M; est de N; est V

²³ Christi securitatem ... habuit *omit.* U

²⁴ fuerant L

²⁵ fuisse L

²⁶ Jerosol... *et passim* L, M, N

²⁷ uel L

²⁸ dominus N

²⁹ Jeron... *et passim* L, M, N

³⁰ tollens N

³¹ sit N

³² cupio *add.* N

³³ fidem Petri : Petri fidem V, WO

³⁴ assequimini L; pariter *add.* N

6.2.3. Exhortation to the Taborites to obey the Roman Church

[40] Therefore, men of Tabor, if you have any doubt concerning the Faith, you should consult the Roman Church, hear the Vicar of Christ, and *do whatsoever they shall say*. Say with Isaiah: *Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us his ways, and we will walk in his paths.*¹ What is *the mountain of the Lord* if not the Apostolic See? And what is *the house of God* if not the Church? Which place did God choose if not Rome, consecrated by the martyrdom of Saints Peter and Paul? Fearing death Peter fled the City, but *when he met the Lord on the way he said to him: Lord, where are you going? And the Lord replied: I go to Rome to be crucified again.*² Then Peter returned to Rome and set up the See of the Supreme Pontificate where he was later crucified. So, there is your recourse, there you must take your doctrine, there you must pour your water, there the *fountain of living water* gushes forth, there is *the closed garden*³ and the ark of the Lord outside which there is no salvation.

[41] Do not be ashamed, men of Tabor, to refer your ideas concerning the Faith to the Apostolic See, for when Paul had received his calling from Heaven⁴ and passed over to the Gospel of Christ, he did not feel qualified to preach the Gospel before he had been strengthened by the doctrine⁵ of Peter and the apostles with him.⁶ Therefore, as he wrote to the Galatians, *I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus also with me. And I went up according to revelation; and communicated to them the gospel, which I preach among the Gentiles, but apart to them who seemed to be some thing: lest perhaps I should run, or had run in vain.*⁷ And Holy Jerome⁸, a man full of learning and knowledge, when he had composed some writings on the Faith, wrote to Damasus: *This is, Most Holy Father, the Faith which I learnt in the Church and which I have always kept. If it contains anything that is less apt and not circumspect enough, I wish it to be corrected by you, who hold the Faith and merit of Peter.*⁹ This is what I urge you to do, too, men of Tabor. Show yourselves and your teachings to the Roman Pontiff. *Do what he commands, and do not deviate to the right or the left.* Thus you will gain consolation of the spirit, peace of mind, and salvation.

¹ Isaiah, 2, 3

² Jacobus de Voragine: *Legenda aurea* / S. Petrus

³ Canticle, 4, 12. Likely quoted from Decretum, D.24.1.20 (col. 973). From Jerome

⁴ Acts, 9, 3

⁵ "sententia"

⁶ Galatians, 1, 18

⁷ Galatians, 2, 2

⁸ Jeronimus, Eusebius Sophronius (ca. 347-420): Theologian. Doctor of the Church. Saint.

⁹ Not by Jerome. A forgery included in Gregory of Pavia's *Polycarpus*, from where it passed into *Decretum Gratiani*, from where Piccolomni probably had it. (NB: Decretum, D.24.1.14 (col. 970) – note 137: "Non est Hieronymi, Polyc. I, 3, 6")

[42] **Nicolaus:** Oboediremus apostolicae majestati et omni devotione subjecti essemus, nisi legi divinae contraria juberet.

Aeneas: In his, quae sunt fidei¹, numquam reperta est apostolica sedes² errasse aut adulterinis acquievisse dogmatibus

[43] **Galechus:** At³ fuit in Agnete manifestus⁴ error.

Aeneas: Quam⁵ tu mihi Agnetem⁶ commemoras?

Galechus: Quam⁷ Romana sedes feminam pro mare coluit et in apostolatus apice⁸ collocavit.

Aeneas: Istic neque fidei neque juris error, sed ignorantia facti⁹ fuit, neque certa historia est¹⁰.

[44] **Nicolaus:** At plures Romani pontifices criminosi fuerunt, qui nunc dant apud inferos poenam.

Aeneas: Nescio. Si quis tamen peccasse¹¹ compertus est, fragilitate deceptus more hominum lapsus est. Sed hoc ausim¹² dicere: Romanus praesul indubitatus nemo umquam inventus est falsae doctrinae publicus assertor.

[45] **Nicolaus:** Saepe Romanus pontifex legem praecessoris¹³ evertit: aut unus ergo¹⁴ aut alter erravit.

¹ *Here begins a lacuna which ends after the words quod si lex fidem in sect. 45 U*

² apostolica sedes : fides apostolica N

³ et N

⁴ magnus M

⁵ quantum N

⁶ mihi Agnetem : Agnetem michi N

⁷ nam N

⁸ apostolatus apice : apice apostolatus N

⁹ facta U

¹⁰ historia est : est historia L

¹¹ omit. L

¹² ausum L; auserim N

¹³ antecessoris L; predecessoris sui N

¹⁴ omit. F, WO

6.3. Hussite objection: the teachings of the Roman Church are false

[42] **Mikulas:** We would obey His Apostolic Majesty and be his devoted subjects if he did not make commands against the law of God.

Enea: In matters of the Faith, the Apostolic See has never been found to be in error or to have accepted false doctrines.

6.3.1. The papess

[43] **Galka:** But what about Agnete, was there no manifest error there?¹

Enea: What Agnete are you talking about?

Galechus: The woman whom the Roman See honoured as a man and placed on the summit of the apostolate.

Enea: But that was an error neither of Faith nor of law but ignorance of a factual circumstance, and moreover that story is not certain.

6.3.2. Criminal popes

[44] **Mikulas:** But several Roman popes were criminal and are now being punished in Hell.

Enea: I know nothing of that. But if anyone of them is known to have sinned, he fell in the manner of men, deceived by his own fragility. But this I dare say: no undoubted Roman bishop has ever been found to publicly declare a false doctrine.

6.3.3. Popes change church laws

[45] **Mikulaus:** The Roman pontiffs have often overturned one of his predecessor's laws: so, either the one or the other was in error.

¹ Galka is referring to the legend of Papess Joan

Aeneas: Inanis argumentatio tua^{1 2} est. Licet enim vetus decretum novus papa deturbet, non tamen primi conditoris sententiam reprobatur, quoniam secundum tempora leges variantur humanae³, neque enim, quod semel utile fuit decretum, semper utile perseverat. Non erravit⁴ ecclesia primitiva⁵, quae sacerdotibus permisit uxores⁶, nec errat moderna, quae subtrahit. Et vos, quamvis multis in rebus⁷ Romanam⁸ impugnatis ecclesiam, conjugia tamen presbyterorum abjicientes neque primitivam ecclesiam neque Graecam, sed nostram⁹ sequimini. Quia vero mores hominum tempore¹⁰ variantur, decreta, quae super his promulgantur¹¹, perpetua esse non possunt, sed utiliter saepe conscripta lapsu temporis vertuntur ad noxam. Ex quo fit, ut alteruter sit commendandus, et qui prius edidit et qui postea decretum abrogavit. Moysen novimus mandato domini *serpentem aeneum fabricasse*, quem Christi figuram fuisse doctores nostri testantur. Hunc tamen Ezechias longo post tempore¹² sine culpa destruxit. Sic et^{13 14} Romanus praesul¹⁵ legem super moribus editam et absque suo potest¹⁶ et absque illius erratu cassare. Quod si lex fidei¹⁷ respicit et aliquid de¹⁸ fide¹⁹ declarat, immutabilis est²⁰. Nam verum fidei²¹ semper est verum, nec ullo potest vel²² loco vel tempore variari. Ideo decreta, quae sunt de fide a sanctis patribus instituta, summa veneratione recepta sunt et immutata atque inviolata perdurant.

[46] **Galechus:** Pergis Romanam ecclesiam ab errore defendere. Incassum laboras, nam contra evangelium Christi²³ contraque²⁴ praxim²⁵ praedicat²⁶ {130v} agitque²⁷.

Aeneas: Ubinam? Quibus in rebus?

Galechus: Ubique gentium et in altaris sacramento.

Aeneas: Quo pacto? Effare.

Galechus: Porrigi²⁸ calicem populo²⁹ vetat³⁰, Christus jussit.

Aeneas: Ostende, ubi jussit.

¹ omit. L

² argumentatio tua : tue argumentatio N

³ variantur humanae : humanae variantur N

⁴ errat N

⁵ ecclesia primitiva : primitiva ecclesia M

⁶ uxorem N

⁷ in rebus : diebus N

⁸ omit. L

⁹ vestram N

¹⁰ secundum tempora N

¹¹ non multum con...(*illeg.*) add. N

¹² post tempore : tempore post L, N

¹³ omit. M

¹⁴ sic et : sicque N

¹⁵ precessoris add. L; antecessoris add. M, N

¹⁶ omit. V

¹⁷ Here ends a lacuna which began after the words quae sunt fidei in sect. 42 U

¹⁸ de F

¹⁹ de fide : inde N

²⁰ et N

²¹ verum fidei : fidei vere N

²² omit. L

²³ evangelium Christi : Christi evangelium N

²⁴ omit. L

²⁵ proximum L, N

²⁶ dicat L

²⁷ et agit N

²⁸ porrigere L

²⁹ populis L

³⁰ negat L

Enea: Your argument is inane. A new pope may overturn an old decree, but he does not thereby reprove the judgment of the pope who first passed it, for human laws change with times, and a decree that was useful at one time does not remain useful forever. The Primitive Church did not err when it allowed priests to take wives, and the present-day Church does not err when she forbids it. You yourselves, though you criticize the Roman Church in many areas, reject priestly marriage, so in this respect, you are following neither the Primitive Church nor the Greek Church but our Church. Since men's behaviour change with the times, decrees which were passed at one time cannot be permanent: useful [laws] often become harmful with the passage of times. Therefore, both popes are to be commended, both he who first made the decree, and he who later repealed it. We know that on the Lord's command, Moses had a brazen snake made¹ which our doctors say were an image prefiguring Christ. But after a long time, Ezechias had it destroyed without incurring any guilt.² Thus, the Roman bishop can repeal a law regulating men's behaviour without error on his own part or on the part of him who first made it. But a law that concerns the Faith and declares something about the Faith is immutable. For a truth of Faith is always true and cannot vary with time and place. Therefore, decrees concerning the Faith passed by the Holy Fathers must be accepted with complete reverence, and they are forever valid, unchanged and inviolate.

6.3.4. Roman communion practice erroneous

[46] **Galka:** You continue to defend the Roman Church, [claiming that it is not] in error. But you labour in vain, for she preaches and acts against the Gospel of Christ and the praxis [of the Early Church].

Enea: Where? In what matters.

Galka: Everywhere and in the matter of the sacrament of the altar.

Enea: How? Speak.

Galka: She forbids the chalice to be offered to the people, whereas Christ commands it to be.

Enea: Show me where he commanded it.

¹ Numbers, 21: 4-9

² 2. Kings, 18, 4

[47] **Galechus:** Apud Johannem inquit dominus: *Nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis et biberitis ejus sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis*¹. *Qui manducat meam carnem et bibit meum sanguinem, habet vitam aeternam*.² Magna est audacia, ne dicam temeritas apostolicae sedis³, quae potum sanguinis populo⁴ subtrahit, sine⁵ quo negat dominus haberi⁶ vitam aeternam. Sed accipe nunc⁷ in natali⁸ magni⁹ hujus sacramenti, quae fuerunt Christi verba. Matthaeus sic rem gestam exponit: *Cenantibus autem eis*¹⁰ *accepit Jesus panem et benedixit ac*¹¹ *fregit deditque discipulis et*¹² *ait: Accipite et comedite, hoc est corpus meum*¹³. *Et accipiens calicem gratias egit et dedit illis dicens: Bibite ex hoc omnes. Hic est enim sanguis*¹⁴ *novi testamenti, qui pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*. Vides¹⁵, ut imperat omnes bibere. Sed¹⁶ audi Marcum: *Et manducantibus illis, ait, accepit Jesus panem et benedicens fregit et dedit illis*¹⁷ *et ait: Sumite, hoc est corpus meum, et accepto calice gratias agens dedit eis*¹⁸, *et biberunt ex illo omnes et ait illis: Hic est sanguis meus novi testamenti, qui pro multis effundetur*.¹⁹ Lucas vero sic²⁰ ait: *Et accepto pane gratias egit et fregit et dedit eis*²¹ *dicens: Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis datur. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*²². *Similiter et calicem, postquam cenavit, dicens: Hic est calix, novum testamentum in sanguine meo*²³, *qui pro vobis fundetur*.²⁴ ²⁵ Ostendunt evangelistae, ut vides, quia jussit dominus facere, quod ipse fecit, verbo usus imperativo: Facite.

¹ et biberitis ejus ... vobis : et ultra N

² et bibit meum ... aeternam : etc. N

³ apostolicae sedis *omit.* L

⁴ potum sanguinis populo : populo potum sanguinis M

⁵ siue U

⁶ habere N, U

⁷ *omit.* F

⁸ *omit.* N

⁹ *omit.* F, L; magnitudinem N

¹⁰ illis N

¹¹ et M

¹² suis N

¹³ accepit Jesus ... meum : etc. L

¹⁴ meus *add.* M

¹⁵ uidetur M

¹⁶ qui pro multis ... sed *omit.* N

¹⁷ eis M

¹⁸ illis N

¹⁹ gratias egit et dedit illis dicens bibite... effundetur

omit. L

²⁰ *omit.* L

²¹ illis N

²² et fregit et dedit ... commemorationem : etc. L

²³ sanguine meo : meo sanguine F

²⁴ effundetur N

²⁵ postquam cenavit ... fundetur *omit.* L

6.4. Discussion of communion under both species

6.4.1. Hussite arguments

6.4.1.1. *The Bible*

[47] **Galka:** In the Gospel of John the Lord says, *Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life.*¹ Great is the audacity, not to say the temerity, of the Apostolic See, preventing the people from drinking the blood without which the Lord says you cannot have eternal life. But hear now what Christ said at the birth of this great sacrament. This is how Matthew relates it: *And whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke: and gave to his disciples, and said: Take ye, and eat. This is my body. And taking the chalice, he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying: Drink ye all of this. For this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins.*² As you see, he commands all to drink. And Mark: *And whilst they were eating, Jesus took bread; and blessing, broke, and gave to them, and said: Take ye. This is my body. And having taken the chalice, giving thanks, he gave it to them. And they all drank of it. And he said to them: This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many.*³ And this is what Luke says: *And taking bread, he gave thanks, and brake; and gave to them, saying: This is my body, which is given for you. Do this for a commemoration of me. In like manner the chalice also, after he had supped, saying: This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you.*⁴ As you see, the evangelists show that by using the word "do" in the imperative form, the Lord commanded us to do what he himself did.

¹ John, 6, 54-55

² Matthew, 26, 28

³ Mark, 14, 22-24

⁴ Luke, 22, 19-20

[48] Quod si quis existimaret¹ circa priorem dumtaxat speciem stare praeceptum domini, sicut Lucas testari videtur, audiat ad Corinthios Paulum, quid ille *Ego enim accepi a domino*, inquit, *quod et tradidi vobis, quoniam dominus noster³ Jesus⁴, in qua nocte tradebatur⁵, accepit panem et⁶ gratias⁷ agens fregit et dixit: Accipite et manducate. Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem. Similiter et calicem, postquam cenavit, dicens: Hic calix novum testamentum est in meo sanguine. Hoc facite, quotiescumque biberitis, in meam commemorationem⁸ ⁹. Supplet apostolus Paulus, quod evangelistis defuisse videtur, praeceptumque non panis¹⁰ solum¹¹, sed calicis¹² quoque subjungit. Et Matthaeus circa panem, *Comedite*, inquit, et circa calicem *Bibite*, quae sunt verba praeceptionis¹³. Cum ergo Paulus et evangelistae simul juncti manducationis praeceptum et bibitionis ostendant¹⁴, quis Romanam ecclesiam hujus mandati violatricem non videt, quae populo Christi sanguinem interdicit viamque {131r} salutis occludit¹⁵? His¹⁶ accedit sanctorum apostolorum et aliorum observantia discipulorum, qui novae legis sensum non ab homine, sed ab ore domini didicerunt, quorum actio nostra instructio est, quos¹⁷ errasse nefas est opinari. Graecia quoque litterarum mater et omnis disciplinae¹⁸ magistra, traditionem Pauli¹⁹ immutilatam hucusque²⁰ servavit, qui panis edendi bibendique calicis auctor illi fuit, sicut ejus ad Corinthios scripta manifestant. Sunt praeterea²¹ nonnulli doctores, qui Johannis textum ad nostrum²² sensum²³ accipiunt, et Leonem papam statuisse tradunt, ut qui sacramenti suscipit unam speciem a calice non absteineat. Quomodo igitur Romanam ecclesiam consulere²⁴ et vocem ejus audire servareque legem possumus, quae tam²⁵ manifeste divinis²⁶ contradicit oraculis? Numquid Deo magis oboedire oportet quam hominibus, Christo quam papae, evangelio quam²⁷ decretalibus?*

¹ existimat L, M, N

² omit. N

³ omit. N

⁴ Christus add. M, N, V

⁵ tradetur M

⁶ omit. N

⁷ et gratias : graciens M

⁸ inquit quod et tradidi ... commemorationem : etc. L

⁹ similiter et calicem ... commemorationem omit. F

¹⁰ pani M

¹¹ panis solum : solum pane N

¹² calici L, M, N

¹³ receptionis F

¹⁴ ostenderunt L; ostendunt N

¹⁵ concludit N

¹⁶ hic M; is U

¹⁷ omit. L, N

¹⁸ mater et add. N

¹⁹ Paula N

²⁰ immutilatam hucusque : hucusque immutilatam L

²¹ propterea WO

²² omit. L

²³ nostrum sensum : sensum nostrum M

²⁴ omit. L

²⁵ tamen M

²⁶ omit. M

²⁷ plusquam M

[48] If anybody believes that the Lord's command only applies to the first species, as Luke appears to indicate, then let him hear what Paul tells the Corinthians: *For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread. And giving thanks, broke, and said: Take ye, and eat: this is my body, which shall be delivered for you: this do for the commemoration of me. In like manner also the chalice, after he had supped, saying: This chalice is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me.*¹ Here, Paul provides what seems to be missing in the evangelists, giving not only the command of the bread but also the command of the chalice. And concerning the bread, Matthew says, "Eat" and concerning the chalice the word "Drink", both in the command form. When Paul and the evangelists show the command of eating together with the command of drinking, who does not see that the Roman Church is in violation of this command and closes the way of salvation by forbidding the people [to drink] the blood of Christ.

6.4.1.2. *The Primitive Church*

To this should be added the praxis of the holy apostles and other disciples who learnt the meaning of the new law not from a man, but from the mouth of the Lord. Their action is our instruction, for it is sinful to think they were in error.

6.4.1.3. *The Greek Church*

Also Greece, mother of letters and teacher of all disciplines, has until now kept unchanged the tradition of Paul who was the author of [the practice of] eating the bread and drinking from the chalice, as his own letter to the Corinthians attests.

6.4.1.4. *Doctors and popes*

Moreover, several doctors interpret the text of John in our sense, and Pope Leo is said to have declared that those who take the sacrament under one species should not abstain from the chalice. When the Roman Church so clearly gainsays the divine precepts, how can we respect it and heed its words and keep its law? Must we obey men rather than God, the pope rather than Christ, and the decretals² rather than the Gospel?

¹ 1. Corinthians, 11, 23-25

² Decretals: collections of papal decrees

[49] **Aeneas:** Multa et magna sunt, quae dixisti, nam et fucum¹ veritatis habent et multos² decipere possunt, qui sacrae scripturae sonum audientes, sensum negligunt, cujus mysteria non verbo docentur, sed spiritu revelantur. Idcirco, *Revela*, inquit David³, *oculos meos et considerabo mirabilia de lege tua*. Nemo⁴ scripturam nisi spiritu sancto⁵ docente cognoscit. Hinc⁶ Paulus *Ministros* ait⁷, *fecit nos Deus novi testamenti non littera, sed spiritu. Littera enim occidit, spiritus autem⁸ vivificat*. Est ergo⁹ necessarium, si¹⁰ volumus evangelium intelligere, ut spiritu ambulemus, sicut¹¹ ad Galatas doctor gentium scribit. Verum ego, quia *peccator sum et iniquitate circumdatus*, non credo mihi neque me puto sacra eloquia intelligere et altos percipere sensus. Eapropter responsurus tibi nihil de meo, sed quod sancti doctores divino afflati¹² spiritu tradunt, et quod docet ecclesia, dicam, nam sibi assistit¹³ Christus, et¹⁴ suggerit omnia spiritus sanctus, cujus maxima dignitas est, summa potestas¹⁵, immensurabilis auctoritas, quae neque fallit neque fallitur, quam si quis docentem corripientemque contempserit, ut *ethnicus et¹⁶ publicanus* habendus est. Atque – ut Cypriani, clarissimi et doctissimi^{17 18} martyris, sententiae consonemus – *alienus est¹⁹ profanus²⁰ est, hostis est²¹, habere jam non potest Deum patrem, qui ecclesiam non habet matrem*. Plurima²² sunt sacri codicis verba²³, quae diversis accommodari²⁴ sensibus possunt, quapropter non²⁵ alienum²⁶ aut²⁷ extraneum foris²⁸ sensum querere²⁹ debemus, quem scripturae testimonio confirmemus³⁰, sed ab ipsa scriptura rapiendus³¹ est sensus veritatis, quem³² sola novit et suis filiis exponit ecclesia.

¹ votum L; succum N

² multis L

³ *omit.* N

⁴ neque M

⁵ *omit.* L

⁶ hic U

⁷ ministros ait : ait ministros N

⁸ *omit.* L

⁹ enim L, N

¹⁰ sed N

¹¹ sic etiam N

¹² appellatu N

¹³ assit L

¹⁴ ut L

¹⁵ *omit.* F

¹⁶ ut M, N

¹⁷ clarissimi et doctissimi : doctissimi et clarissimi M

¹⁸ et doctissimi *omit.* U

¹⁹ *omit.* M

²⁰ orphanus M

²¹ prophanus est *add.* M

²² plurimi WO

²³ *omit.* L

²⁴ accomodare L

²⁵ *omit.* L

²⁶ non alienum : alienum non U

²⁷ atque L

²⁸ infero N

²⁹ habere L

³⁰ conformemus L; conferemus N

³¹ recipiendus L, M, N

³² que L

6.4.2. Piccolomini's refutation

[49] **Enea:** You have said many and important things that have the appearance of truth and can deceive many men who only hear the literal words (sonum) of Holy Scripture and neglect their meaning (sensus). However, the mysteries of Scripture are not taught in words but revealed in spirit. Therefore David said: *Open thou my eyes: and I will consider the wondrous things of thy law.*¹ Nobody understands Scripture unless taught by the Holy Spirit. Therefore Paul says: God made us *ministers of the new testament, not in the letter, but in the spirit. For the letter killeth, but the spirit quickeneth.*² So, if we want to understand the Gospel, it is necessary for us to walk in the spirit, as the Doctor of the Gentiles³ writes to the Galatians.⁴ But since *I am a sinner and surrounded by iniquity,*⁵ I do not trust myself nor believe that I understand Holy Scripture and its profound meanings. Therefore, in my answer to you I shall not bring forth anything of my own but [only] what the holy doctors, inspired by the Holy Spirit, say, and what the Church teaches, since Christ himself assists her, and the Holy Spirit inspires her in everything. Therefore, the dignity of the Church is immense, her power supreme, and her authority immeasurable, and she neither deceives nor is deceived. If anybody disdains her teachings or censures, he is to be regarded as a *heathen and a publican.*⁶ And, echoing the words of Cyprian,⁷ the noble and learned martyr, *he who does not have the Church as his mother is a stranger, impious, an enemy, who cannot have God as his father.*⁸ Many passages in the Holy Book can be given different interpretations. In those cases, we should not seek elsewhere for a different or external meaning, but establish the meaning on the basis of scriptural testimony and wrest the true meaning from Scripture itself, which only the Church knows and teaches to her sons.

¹ Psalms, 118, 18

² 2. Corinthians, 3, 6: *qui et idoneos nos fecit ministros novi testamenti : non littera, sed Spiritu : littera enim occidit, Spiritus autem vivificat*

³ Saint Paul

⁴ Galatians, 5, 25

⁵ Quotation, origin not traced

⁶ Matthew, 18, 17

⁷ Cyprianus, Thasus Caecilius (ca. 200-258): Bishop of Carthage and eminent Christian writer. Saint

⁸ Cyprianus: *De unitate ecclesiae*, 6 (MPL, IV, col. 503)

[50] Teneo te fortasse¹ {131v} nimis! Perstringo² sermonem, et³ ad rem propero. Accusasti Romanam ecclesiam, quae dum⁴ communionem calicis plebi denegat, evangelium vitiat⁵, Christum negat, salutem adimit⁶. Quattuor sunt – ut video⁷ – quae non te solum, sed omnes movent⁸, quos Hussitarum opinio, ne dicam rabies, ab ecclesia Romana sejunxit⁹: primum est Johannis testimonium; secundum est institutio sacramenti per tres evangelistas relata cum Paulo; tertium est ecclesiae primitivae Graecorumque praxis; quartum est nonnullorum doctorum ac Romanorum pontificum auctoritas. Sunt¹⁰ ad haec omnia nobis¹¹ parata¹² et clara responsa, quae de penu¹³ spiritus sancti recipit et ministrat mater ecclesia.

¹ vis *add.* N

² perstringendo F

³ ut N

⁴ dua L

⁵ cruciat U

⁶ impedit N

⁷ ut video *omit.* L

⁸ uolunt L

⁹ disiunxit N

¹⁰ ut N

¹¹ vobis N

¹² rata N

¹³ parte reparacione L; pena M; vena N

[50] Maybe I am taxing your attention overly, so I shall tighten my exposition and come directly to the issue at hand. You have accused the Roman Church of deforming the Gospel, denying Christ, and removing salvation by forbidding [laymen] the communion of the chalice. As I see it, four things motivate not only you but all whom Hussite beliefs, not to say madness, have separated from the Roman Church. The first is the testimony of John. The second is the institution of the sacrament as related by three evangelists together with Paul. The third is the praxis of the Primitive Church and the Greeks. And the fourth is the authority of several doctors and Roman pontiffs. On all these points, we have ready and clear answers, which Mother Church receives and dispenses from the storehouse of the Holy Spirit.

[51] Negat Johannes – ut ais¹ – immo negat² apud Johannem dominus vitam esse cuiquam, nisi carnem suam comederit et sanguinem ejus biberit, quibus verbis non minus utriusque speciei communionem quam baptismatis undam³ mandatam⁴ censes. Vetus haec Armenorum insania fuit, qui natos, ut in lucem veniebant, mox baptizatos altaris sacramento reficiebant, quod et vos⁵ ajunt facere, qui dementes atque infantes ad eucharistiae libamina⁶ vocatis, inhonorantes divinissimum sacramentum, communionem⁷ Pauli despicientes, qui ad Corinthios scribens ait: *Probet autem seipsum homo, et sic de pane illo edat et de calice bibat*^{8 9}. Quomodo¹⁰ se¹¹ parvuli et amentes¹² probare¹³ possunt, quibus nec certus nec verus rationis est usus? Sed non est¹⁴ evangelio¹⁵ Johannis, quem sibi sensus¹⁶ ascribitis¹⁷: non bibitio¹⁸ sacramentalis illic praecipitur¹⁹ sed spiritualis insinuatur. Nam sanguinis Christi triplicem potum Alberti magni sententia tradit in eo sermone, quem de Christi corpore²⁰ non minus subtiliter quam veraciter edidit. Est enim potus sacramentalis, quem²¹ soli sacerdotes accipiunt, est²² intellectualis, qui plebibus Christianis sub specie panis ministratur, et est²³ spiritualis, quo salvandi omnes utuntur incarnationem passionemque²⁴ domini pia et assidua meditatione recolentes. Et hanc bibitionem dominus apud Johannem praecipit, sicut verborum evangelistae²⁵ series luculenter ostendit. Namque²⁶ cum dixisset dominus: *Caro mea vere est cibus et sanguis meus vere est potus. Qui manducat meam carnem et bibit meum sanguinem, in me manet et ego in eo*²⁷. *Multi audientes ex discipulis ejus dixerunt: 'Durus est hic sermo, quis potest eum audire?' Sciens autem*²⁸ *Jesus apud semetipsum*²⁹, *quia murmurarent de hoc discipuli ejus*³⁰, *dixit eis: 'Hoc vos scandalizat? Si ergo videritis filium hominis ascendentem, ubi erat prius? Spiritus est, qui vivificat, caro non {132r} prodest quidquam. Verba, quae ego locutus sum, vobis*³¹ *spiritus et vita sunt. Sed sunt quidam ex vobis*³², *qui non credunt.'* Declarat dominus his verbis³³ non carnalis esus aut potus illic³⁴, sed spiritualis arcana mysteria contineri, dum ait: *Spiritus est qui vivificat, caro non prodest quidquam*³⁵. Et iterum: *Verba, quae locutus sum, vobis*³⁶ *spiritus et vita sunt.*

¹ ait L, M, N

² Johannes ... negat *omit.* U

³ nudam U

⁴ datam L

⁵ nos U

⁶ libamenta L, M, N

⁷ comunicacionemque L, M, N

⁸ etc. *add.* N

⁹ et sic de pane ... bibat : etc. L

¹⁰ et sic de pane ... quomodo *omit.* U

¹¹ *omit.* L

¹² dementes L, N

¹³ se *add.* L

¹⁴ in *add.* N

¹⁵ evangelii L

¹⁶ sensum N

¹⁷ nam *add.* N

¹⁸ dubito U

¹⁹ *omit.* L, N

²⁰ Christi corpore : corpore Christi L

²¹ sibi *add.* WO

²² et N, V, WO

²³ et est: est et L

²⁴ passionem L

²⁵ evangelistarum L

²⁶ nam L

²⁷ et sanguis meus ... in eo *omit.* L

²⁸ *omit.* L; illud N

²⁹ seipsum L, M

³⁰ de hoc discipuli ejus : discipuli eius de hoc L

³¹ *omit.* L

³² verbis WO

³³ his verbis *omit.* L

³⁴ *omit.* WO

³⁵ caro non ... quidquam *omit.* L

³⁶ *omit.* N

6.4.2.1. Gospel of John

[51] As you say, John, or rather the Lord in John's [Gospel] denies that anybody can have life unless he eats His flesh and drinks His blood. You believe that with these words He not only commands communion under both species but also baptism in flowing water.¹ ² This is the old madness of the Armenians who when their children were born immediately baptized them and gave them the sacrament of the altar. It is said that you do the same, inviting the insane and the infants to the firstfruits of the eucharist, thus showing irreverence for the most holy sacrament and spurning the communion of Paul, who wrote to the Corinthians: *But let a man prove himself: and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice.*³ For how can small children and insane people prove themselves when they do not have sure and true use of reason? The Gospel of John does not have the meaning you ascribe to it, for the passage in question does not command the sacramental drinking, but imply the spiritual. For in Albert the Great's perspicacious and true sermon about Christ's body,⁴ he says that there are three ways to drink the blood of Christ. [Firstly,] the sacramental drinking, which only the priests perform. [Secondly,] the intellectual drinking which is given to the Christian laypeople under the species of bread. And [thirdly,] the spiritual drinking performed by all who piously and assiduously meditate on the Lord's incarnation and passion. The last one is the [form of] drinking which the Lord commands in the Gospel of John, as the splendid passage of the evangelist shows. For when the Lord said: *My flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him.*⁵ *Many therefore of his disciples, hearing it, said: This saying is hard, and who can hear it? But Jesus, knowing in himself, that his disciples murmured at this, said to them: Doth this scandalize you? If then you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken to you, are spirit and life. But there are some of you that believe not.*⁶ In the passages *It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing*, and *The words that I have spoken to you, are spirit and life*, the Lord makes clear that he is not speaking of corporeal eating and drinking but about the hidden mysteries contained in the spiritual drinking.

¹ "baptismatis unda": cf. HB, I, p. 232: *Baptismum fluvialis unde ... recipiendum*, translated as *Die Taufe ist im fliessenden Wasser vorzunehmen*

² In Piccolomini's own summary of Galca's arguments (sect. 44), there is no mention of baptism

³ 1. Corinthians, 11, 28

⁴ Albertus Magnus: *Sermones XXXII de Corpore Christi*. XXIII: *De triplici potu sanguinis Christi*. According to Smend, it is doubtful that Albert the Great ever spoke against communion under both species, see Smend, p. 10-11

⁵ John, 6, 56

⁶ John, 6, 64

[52] Vis aperte cognoscere, quoniam de spirituali manducatione, quae fit per fidem, loquitur evangelista? Adverte, quae dicit dominus: *Qui manducat et bibit*, ait: instantis non futuri temporis verba sunt. Erant igitur¹, dum sic loqueretur dominus, qui manducabant² et qui³ bibebant, cum⁴ nondum⁵ passus dominus⁶ erat⁷, nec adhuc institutum fuerat⁸ sacramentum. Quomodo ergo manducabant aut⁹ bibebant^{10 11} aliqui¹² Christum, nisi spiritualiter per fidem et caritatem, credentes in eum et facientes opera ejus¹³? Nam et prius dixerat: *Ego sum panis vivus*¹⁴. *Qui venit*¹⁵ *ad me*¹⁶, *non esuriet, et qui credit in me, non sitiet umquam*¹⁷. Qui credebant in eum et opera¹⁸ sectabantur ejus¹⁹, hi carnem edebant ejus, hi²⁰ potabant²¹ sanguinem. Atque²² hic verior est evangelii sensus, quia tunc aliter edi caro aut bibi Christi sanguis²³ non poterat. Fuit enim figurata locutio domini²⁴, sicut et Samaritanae et in cruce se sitire²⁵ dixit, quia²⁶ fidem illius et salutem nostram²⁷ sitiebat. Sic glossator intelligit hoc evangelium, sic magnus Augustinus, doctrina et verecundia justa²⁸ nobilis, cujus tanta gloria est, ut nullius laudibus crescat, nullius vituperatione minuat. Quo postposito, si quis Wiclefium²⁹ Rochezanamque sequitur, luci tenebras, veritati mendacium praefert. Quid plura? Nonne³⁰ dominus in³¹ contextu evangelii dicit: *Ego sum panis vitae*³². *Qui venit*³³ *ad me, non esuriet. Et qui*³⁴ *credit in me, non sitiet umquam*. Eccum tibi³⁵ panem³⁶, qui cibus³⁷ et potus est³⁸, qui esurientem³⁹ tollit et sitim. Cui tollit? Quomodo tollit⁴⁰? Credenti tollit, per caritatem tollit⁴¹, nam qui fidem rectam habet et opera facit digna fide, hic est, qui carnem domini digne^{42 43} manducat et sanguinem bibit, et⁴⁴ vitam aeternam assequitur⁴⁵, mundo mortuus, Christo vivens. Sic, quod de Johanne vobis⁴⁶ assumitis, nostrae sententiae, non vestrae confert.

¹ autem L
² qui manducabant *omit.* L
³ *omit.* N
⁴ *em.*; eum *codd.*
⁵ nam dum L
⁶ passus dominus : dominus passus N
⁷ dominus erat : erat dominus L
⁸ erat L
⁹ et L
¹⁰ biberent L
¹¹ aut bibebant : bibebantque M, N
¹² *omit.* L, M, N
¹³ ipsius N
¹⁴ uite L, M, N
¹⁵ uenerit WO
¹⁶ adhuc *add.* U
¹⁷ non sitiet umquam : nunquam sciet N
¹⁸ ejus nam et prius ... opera *omit.* L
¹⁹ sectabantur ejus : eius sectabantur N
²⁰ *omit.* L
²¹ hospitabant L
²² at L
²³ aut bibi ... sanguis : et sanguis eius bibi L
²⁴ locutio domini : domini locutio L

²⁵ se sitire : sitire se M
²⁶ qui L
²⁷ salutem nostram : nostram salutem L, M, N
²⁸ juxta O, U, WO; justa *corr.* ex juxta V
²⁹ Wicleff L; Biclef M; Viklef N; Videsium U; Wiclefium F, V
³⁰ non et N
³¹ *omit.* N
³² uite L, M, N
³³ veniet L
³⁴ *omit.* L
³⁵ dominus *add.* N
³⁶ tibi panem : panem tibi M
³⁷ est *add.* L, N
³⁸ potus est : potum tribuit N
³⁹ tibi *add.* L; esurienti U
⁴⁰ quomodo tollit *omit.* WO
⁴¹ *omit.* N
⁴² *omit.* L, M, N
⁴³ domini digne *omit.* L
⁴⁴ acquirit *add.* L, M, N
⁴⁵ *omit.* L, M, N
⁴⁶ *omit.* L

[52] Do you wish to understand clearly that [here] the evangelist speaks about the spiritual eating done through faith? Then note that when the Lord said *Who eats* and *drinks*, he used the present tense, not the future. So, speaking thus, the Lord [was addressing] those who were eating and drinking [at that moment]. The Lord had not yet had his suffering, and the sacrament had not yet been instituted, so how could the others eat and drink Christ unless spiritually, through faith and love, believing in him and doing his works? And had he not previously said: *I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger: and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.*¹ Those who [at that time] believed in him and followed his works, they were the ones who ate his flesh and drank his blood. So, this is the true meaning of the gospel, for at that time you could not eat the flesh of Christ or drink his blood differently. Thus, the Lord was speaking in the figurative sense, just as when he spoke to the Samaritan and when he said on the cross that he was thirsty,² for what he was thirsting for was the other's faith and our salvation. This is how the glossator³ understands this gospel and also the great Augustine, famed for his learning and just virtue, and whose glory is so great that it cannot be augmented by praise nor diminished by vituperation. Those who ignore them and follow Wycliff and Rokycana, prefer darkness to light and lies to truth. What more? Does not the Lord say in the gospel: *I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger: and he that believeth in me shall never thirst?* So, there is your bread, which is both food and drink, and which satisfies both hunger and thirst. Whom does it satisfy? How does it satisfy? It satisfies the believer, it satisfies through charity, for he who has the right faith and does works worthy of the faith, he it is who worthily eats the flesh of the Lord and drinks His blood, and gains eternal life, being dead to the world and living for Christ. Thus, your quotations from John support our view, not yours.

¹ John, 6, 35

² John, 19, 28

³ The medieval commentator of the gospel text

[53] Nunc ad reliquos evangelistas transeamus hisque Paulum adjungamus. Nam simul omnes integram referunt cenam¹ Christi, et quamvis in uno plus quam in altero sit², nulla tamen discordia, nulla dissonantia est, sed quod unus³ omisit, alter admisit. Et quamvis evangelistarum nullus dicat *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*⁴ nisi solus Lucas, qui post panem benedictum haec verba ponit⁵, nec post calicem geminat, {132v} tamen quia Paulus hoc ad utramque speciem repetit, tenendum est et post panem et post calicem dixisse dominum *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*. Ex quibus verbis praecepta tibi utriusque speciei communicatio videtur, et quia praecepta Christi servanda sunt his, qui salvi esse volunt, quicumque sub specie panis et vini non acceperit⁶ sacramentum, damnationem incidit, et injusta est apostolica sedes, hujus inimica praecepti. Sed audi responsionem. Fateor sic⁷ locutos, ut dicis⁸, evangelistas, neque verbis Pauli quidquam demo⁹. Non tamen idcirco praeceptum esse intelligo sub specie panis et vini communicare¹⁰ plebes, nam verba, quae retulisti, non omnibus fidelibus, sed apostolis¹¹ solum¹² dicta fuerunt¹³, qui – ut est communis sententia doctorum – aut jam sacerdotes erant¹⁴ aut tunc¹⁵ sacerdotium¹⁶ acceperunt. Quod si praeceptum¹⁷ id est *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*, praeceptum hoc sacerdotes, non plebes obligat ecclesiamque simul collectam, non quodlibet ecclesiae membrum¹⁸ respicit. Atque¹⁹ - ut tecum nervosius²⁰ agam et argumentationibus fortioribus utar²¹ - aut sacerdotes erant apostoli, quando mandatum hoc acceperunt, et ad id soli sunt obnoxii sacerdotes, aut erant adhuc laici, et tunc non sumere tantum, sed²² conficere²³ quoque²⁴ sacramentum laicis est praeceptum. Sed hoc tam vobis quam nobis²⁵ ²⁶ absurdum est. Ergo sacerdotes erant apostoli²⁷, et sacerdotes tantum praeceptio²⁸ ligat.

¹ referunt cenam : cenam referunt L

² quam in altero sit : sit quam in altero N

³ omit. M

⁴ meam commemorationem : memoriam L

⁵ postponit L

⁶ accepit N

⁷ si N

⁸ ais L

⁹ devio L, N

¹⁰ communicari L, M, N

¹¹ apostolicis U

¹² apostolis solum : solum apostolis L

¹³ fuere V, WO

¹⁴ fuerant L

¹⁵ nunc F

¹⁶ tunc sacerdotium : sacerdotium tunc N

¹⁷ hoc add. N

¹⁸ ecclesiae membrum : membrum ecclesiae L, M

¹⁹ omit. M

²⁰ ferventius N

²¹ fortioribus utar : utar fortioribus V

²² sederi N

²³ conficitur N

²⁴ quodlibet sacramentum N

²⁵ preceptum add. F

²⁶ vobis quam nobis : nobis quam vobis N

²⁷ apostolici U

²⁸ precepto N

6.4.2.2. *Synoptic evangelists and Saint Paul*

[53] Let us now pass on to the other evangelists and add Paul. They all relate the whole supper of Christ, and though there may be more in one than in another, there is no divergence, no disagreement [between them]: what one omitted, another included. None of the evangelists said, “*Do this for a commemoration*” except Luke who put these words after the blessing of the bread and did not duplicate them after the chalice. Still, Paul repeats these words after each species, so that we must hold that the Lord said, “*Do this for a commemoration*” both after the bread and after the chalice. On the basis of this passage, you believe that [the Lord has] commanded the communion [to be taken] under both species, and since the commands of Christ must be obeyed by those who wish to be saved, anyone who does not receive the sacrament under the species both of bread and wine falls into damnation, and the Apostolic See is in error, rejecting this command. But hear my answer. I admit that the evangelists have spoken as you say, and I do not take away anything from the words of Paul. Still, I do not consider that there is a command for the people to communicate under the species of both bread and wine, for the words you refer to were not said to all the faithful, but only to the apostles, who – as is the general view of the doctors – were already priests or received the priesthood on that occasion. If there is a command to *do this for my commemoration*, then this command obliges the priests, not the [lay]people, and it applies to the Church in general, not to any particular member of the Church. And – to reason more strongly with you and use more forceful arguments – either the apostles were already priests when they received this command, and then only priests are obliged by it, or they were still laymen, in which case laymen were commanded not only to receive the sacrament but also to perform it. But this is absurd both to you and us. Therefore the apostles were priests, and only priests are bound by the command.

[54] **Galechus:** At Paulus¹ ad Corinthios non sacerdotibus solum^{2 3}, sed universae plebi, clericis⁴, laicis, maribus⁵, feminis⁶ scribit.

Aeneas: Non mandat illic Paulus, sed domini⁷ mandatum refert⁸ et rem gestam, et, quomodo sacramentum instituit dominus, exponit. Cumque nullus evangelistarum verba illa *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem* post communionem calicis ponat, notandum est, quomodo Paulus loquatur⁹. Quid ille post panem sacrum inquit? *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*¹⁰. Post calicem autem: *Hoc facite*¹¹, *quotiescumque biberitis in meam commemorationem*. Additur hic: *Quotiescumque biberitis*^{12 13}. Quid sibi hoc vult¹⁴? *Quotiescumque biberitis*¹⁵, inquit, *facite*, hoc est, quando necessarium erit de calice bibere: quando conficietis, quando sacrificium offeretis, *hoc facite in meam commemorationem*, quod solis sacerdotibus convenit. Duobus namque modis hoc divinissimum sacramentum consideramus, ut sacramentum¹⁶ solum, ut sacrificium et sacramentum¹⁷. In sacrificio utraque species exigitur, quia imago est illius sacrificii, in quo *Christus assistens*¹⁸ *pontifex futurorum bonorum per amplius et perfectius tabernaculum non manu factum, id est non hujus creationis*¹⁹, se ipsum pro nobis sacrificium²⁰ {133r} obtulit²¹ Deo patri in ara crucis, ideoque non solum repraesentari debet Christus passus, sed ipsa quoque passio Christi, in qua sanguis fuit²² a corpore separatus, referenda²³ est. In puro autem sacramento, quod ad sanctificationem²⁴ nostram requirimus²⁵, ut²⁶ invisibilis gratia sub visibili specie²⁷ tradatur, sufficit repraesentatio Christi passi, quem panis species abunde refert, quia et ipse dominus grano tritici se comparavit, qui mortuus est, ut multum fructum afferret²⁸. Atque - ut altius de tanto sacramento loquamur - triplex est, ut noster Aquinas ait, sanctus et²⁹ profundissimus doctor³⁰, hujus excellentissimae rei significatio triaque tempora respicit. Ex praeterito significat nobis dominicam passionem vocaturque sacrificium. Ex praesenti refert ecclesiasticam unitatem et communio dicitur. Ex futuro praesignat³¹ Dei fruitionem, quam praestolamur in caelis, et vocatur viaticum, quia viam praebet ad patriam³², et secundum hoc etiam eucharistia, id est bona gratia, nuncupatur. Et sacerdotibus quidem sacrificium convenit, ceteris vero³³ communio atque³⁴ viaticum, in quibus

¹ apostolus *add.* N

² tantum M

³ sacerdotibus solum : solum apostolis N

⁴ et *add.* L

⁵ et *add.* M

⁶ suis N

⁷ divinum N

⁸ *omit.* U

⁹ *omit.* M

¹⁰ post communionem calicis ... commemorationem *omit.* N

¹¹ in meam commemorationem *add.* F

¹² in meam commemorationem additur ... biberitis *omit.* L

¹³ in meam commemorationem post calicem ...

biberitis *omit.* U

¹⁴ hoc vult : vult hoc L, M

¹⁵ quid sibi hoc ... biberitis *omit.* N

¹⁶ consideramus ut sacramentum *omit.* N

¹⁷ et sacramentum : solum L, N

¹⁸ existens L

¹⁹ neque per sanguinem hircorum *add.* N

²⁰ per amplius et perfectius ... sacrificium : assistens etc. usque semetipsum L

²¹ pro nobis sacrificium obtulit : sacrificium obtulit pro nobis N

²² sanguis fuit : fuit sanguis V

²³ reuerenda N

²⁴ sacrificiationem WO

²⁵ requiritur L

²⁶ et L

²⁷ nobis *add.* L, M, N

²⁸ affert N

²⁹ ac L

³⁰ *omit.* L

³¹ designat U

³² *add.* L

³³ quoque N

³⁴ ad F, O, U, V, WO

species panis est sufficiens signum, quia ex multis granis conficitur et pulchre denotat ecclesiasticam unitatem et illum panem angelorum, quo fruemur in caelesti Jerusalem¹.

[54] **Galka:** But in his letter to the Corinthians, Paul addresses not only the priests, but also the whole people, clerics, laypeople, men and women.

Enea: But there, Paul does not make a command, he relates the Lord's command and the event as it occurred, and he explains how the Lord instituted the sacrament. None of the evangelists put the words "*Do this for my commemoration*" after the communion of the chalice, so therefore it should be noted what Paul says. What does he say after the holy bread? "*Do this for my commemoration.*" But after the chalice: "*This do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me.*"² Here he adds "*as often as you shall drink.*" What does this mean? He says "*this do ye, as often as you shall drink,*" which means whenever it is necessary to drink from the chalice. When you perform [the sacrament], when you offer the sacrifice, you should *do this for the commemoration of me*, which only applies to the priests. For this divine sacrament may be understood in two ways: as a sacrament alone, and as a sacrifice and sacrament. In the sacrifice [of the mass] both species are necessary, because it is an image of that sacrifice where *Christ, being come an high priest of the good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hand, that is, not of this creation,*³ gave himself as a sacrifice for us to God the Father on the altar of the cross. Therefore, it is not only Christ who suffered that must be represented but the suffering of Christ itself in which blood was separated from the body. But in the sacrament alone⁴, which we require for our salvation so that the invisible grace may be given [to us] under a visible species, it is enough with the representation of the suffering Christ, who is abundantly signified by the species of bread, for the Lord himself compared himself to a grain of wheat which died in order to bear much fruit.⁵ And - to speak more deeply about this great sacrament – our Aquinas,⁶ the holy and most profound doctor, says that the meaning of this most excellent matter is triple, concerning, as it does, three different times. Concerning the past time, it signifies the Lord's suffering for us and is called sacrifice. Concerning the present, it refers to ecclesiastical unity and is called communion. Concerning the future, it prefigures the fruition in God, which we expect in Heaven, and is called viaticum, because it offers the way (via) to the fatherland. Accordingly, it is also called the eucharist, meaning good grace. The priests have the sacrifice, but the others have the communion and the viaticum, in which the species of bread is an adequate sign since it is made of many grains and beautifully designates ecclesiastical unity and that bread of angels, which we shall enjoy in heavenly Jerusalem.

¹ etc. *add.* N

² 1. Corinthians, 11, 25

³ Hebrews, 9, 11

⁴ Without sacrifice

⁵ John 25-25

⁶ Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274): Dominican Theologian. Doctor of the Church. Piccolomini probably refers to Aquinas' *De venerabili sacramento altaris*, but it is not clear which concrete passages he is referring to

[55] **Galechus:** Multa provolvit et a propositae quaestionis statu longe recedit. *Hoc facite*, inquit¹ dominus, id est, conficite ut ego sacramentum. Sumite vobis, bibite² et aliis date. Hic nodus³ est, hic⁴ vis⁵.

Aeneas: Pulchre de nodo locutus es, nam⁶ tu nodum in sirpo⁷ quaeris⁸. Sed non est hic nodus, quem ferunt Alexandrum in curri Gordii⁹ reperisse, quem cum solvere manu non posset, ense rescidit¹⁰. Facilis est hujus¹¹ solutio¹² nodi. Neque enim, inquit dominus, quomodo ego feci, ita¹³ vos facite¹⁴, sed *hoc*¹⁵ *facite*, id est¹⁶ hoc sacramentum conficite *in meam commemorationem*. Quod si notam praecepti sub illis latere verbis¹⁷ affirmas¹⁸, “*accipite*” et¹⁹ “*comedite*” et “*bibite*”, dico²⁰ prius ad sacerdotes mandata²¹ referri, quia tunc apostoli sacerdotium susceperunt²². Ceterum, sicut mandatum illud²³, *Euntes praedicate evangelium omni creaturae*, sic et²⁴ istud suscepit ecclesia non ab omnibus, sed ab electis ministris ac sacerdotibus exequendum. Sic doctores intelligunt verba²⁵ domini, sic sancta ecclesia docet. Quod si Christus his verbis communionem calicis etiam²⁶ laicis imperasset, non solum Bohemis, sed²⁷ aliis quoque gentibus per tot annorum curricula revelatum fuisset. Sed nulla schola hoc sentit, nulla civitas²⁸ probat, nulla extra Bohemiam collegia tenent. Mirabile dictu²⁹ est, si³⁰ multa fercula³¹ et mixta³² cervisiae vina et longissimi somni melius vobis scripturam exponunt quam ceteris abstinentiae atque vigiliae³³.

¹ facite inquit : inquit facite F

² omit. N

³ modus L; nobis O, U, V, WO

⁴ omit. F, O, U, V, WO

⁵ ius V

⁶ et add. F

⁷ stirpo N

⁸ nam tu ... quaeris omit. L

⁹ Gradii L

¹⁰ recidit M, O, U, V, WO

¹¹ omit. N

¹² talis add. N

¹³ sic M, N

¹⁴ ita vos facite : facite et vos L

¹⁵ omit. N

¹⁶ id est omit. N, U

¹⁷ latere verbis : verbis latere F, L

¹⁸ confirmas V

¹⁹ omit. V

²⁰ quod add. L, M, N

²¹ mandatum N

²² accipiebant L

²³ id N; illud V

²⁴ est M

²⁵ verbum M; etiam N

²⁶ et L

²⁷ etiam add. L

²⁸ hoc add. L

²⁹ dictum L, N

³⁰ *Margin note in Pius II's own late and hardly legible hand: Facete* O

³¹ multa fercula : fercula multa L

³² mixte F, L, O, U, V, WO

³³ deditis add. N

[55] **Galka:** You are really tossing many ideas around and have strayed far from the question at issue. The Lord said: *Do this*, meaning “perform the sacrament as I have done”. Take it, drink of it and give it to others. This is the knot, this is the essence of the matter.

Enea: What you say about the knot is quite appropriate for one seeking the knot in a woven basket. But the knot [we are talking about] here is not [like] that knot which they say Alexander found in the cart at Gordium: since he could not untie it by hand, he sliced through with his sword. But untying our knot is easy. For the Lord did not say “Do as I have done”, but “Do this”, meaning perform this sacrament *in commemoration of me*. If you claim that these words contain a command, I contend that the words “take”, “eat” and “drink” refer to the commands already given to the priests since the apostles had by then received the priesthood. Besides, this command was received by the Church to be performed not by all but by the elected ministers and priests, just like the command: *Go ye and preach the gospel to every creature*.¹ This is how the doctors understand the Lord’s words, and this is what the Church teaches. If Christ had commanded, in these words, that the communion of the chalice be given also to laymen, it would over so many years have been revealed not only to the Bohemians but also to other peoples. But no school teaches this, no city approves it, no community outside Bohemia holds it. It would really be extraordinary if your many courses of food, wine mixed with beer,² and sleeping long would give you better instruction in Scripture than abstinence and vigils do to other people.

¹ Mark, 16, 15: *Et dixit eis : Euntes in mundum universum praedicate Evangelium omni creaturae*

² In the margin of the text, Pius himself noted that he was speaking ironically (facete)

[56] **Galechus:** Male nos {133v} arguis, non enim nostram sed apostolorum doctrinam Graecorumque¹ sequimur.

Aeneas: At illi non dixerunt damnatos esse populos, qui de calice non acciperent, nec nos ad omnia tenemur, quae in ecclesia primitiva patres egerunt. Complurima² illi, quae ad perfectionis³ statum pertinebant, tamquam perfecti observabant, neque enim quidquam proprii⁴ possidebant, sed – ut in Actibus Apostolorum⁵ Lucas ait – *omnes, qui credebant, erant pariter et habebant omnia communia. Possessiones et substantias vendebant, et⁶ dividebant illa omnibus, prout cuique⁷ opus erat.* Nos autem non cogimur omnia vendere, et tamen salvamur. Illi carnem cum sanguine non edebant, nos comedimus et non damnamur. Illis uxores fuerunt, nobis desunt, et magis meremur. Illi populum a communionem calicis non prohibebant, nos arcemus et meritum inde recipimus oboedientes ecclesiae, quae communionem sub specie vini subtrahendum multitudini monente⁸ spiritu sancto decrevit, dicente apud Johannem domino: *Paraclitus autem spiritus sanctus⁹, quem mittet pater in nomine meo, ille vos docebit omnia et suggeret vobis omnia¹⁰ quaecumque dixerit vobis¹¹.* Cum enim ex praecepto Christi non sit communio calicis in¹² populo, quis non videt in hoc sicut in ceteris, quae dominus expresse non iussit, ecclesiae standum esse¹³ iudicio. Cuncta enim, quae sub praecepto divino¹⁴ non cadunt, regentis ecclesiae dispositioni¹⁵ sunt¹⁶ commissa, cuius mandata tamquam divina recipienda sunt et omni devotione complenda, quando¹⁷ praecepto Dei non sunt adversa, vel utrum sint adversa, non est certa cognitio.

¹ *omit.* F, O, U, V, WO

² *quamlurima* N

³ *prefectionis* U

⁴ *quidquam proprii* : *proprii quicquam* N

⁵ *eorum* L, M, N

⁶ *cum* N

⁷ *unicuique* M; *cuiquam* N

⁸ *mediante* L

⁹ *spiritus sanctus omit.* U

¹⁰ *et suggeret ... omnia omit.* U

¹¹ *in nomine meo ... vobis* : etc. usque *quecumque dixerit vobis* L

¹² *omit.* L

¹³ *est* L

¹⁴ *domini* N

¹⁵ *dispositione* L; *dispensationi* N

¹⁶ *dispositioni sunt* : *sunt dispositione* L; *sunt dispositioni* M, N

¹⁷ *que* L

6.4.2.3. The Primitive Church

[56] **Galka:** You blame us unjustly, for we do not follow our own doctrine but that of the apostles and the Greeks.¹

Enea: But they did not claim that people are damned if they do not receive the chalice. Moreover, we are not bound to do all that the fathers in the Primitive Church did. As perfect men they did everything which belongs to the state of perfection, and they possessed nothing individually, but – as Luke says in the Acts of the Apostles - *all they that believed were together, and had all things in common. Their possessions and goods they sold, and divided them to all, according as every one had need.*² But we are not forced to sell all, and still we are saved. They did not eat meat with the blood, we eat it and are not damned. They had wives, we³ do not, and gain greater merit. They did not forbid the people [to receive] the communion of the chalice, we do and in so doing we gain merit by obeying the Church, which under guidance from the Holy Spirit decided to take away communion under the species of wine from the multitude, for in the Gospel of John the Lord said: *But the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you.*⁴ But since the people's communion of the chalice is not a command of Christ, who does not see that in this as in other matters where the Lord did not make an explicit command one must accept the judgment of the Church? For all that falls outside the divine command is left to the disposition of the ruling Church, whose commands must be received as God's own and carried out with complete loyalty, when they are not against God's command or it is uncertain whether they are.

¹ In 1452, the Bohemian Hussites sent an expedition to Constantinople to explore "*the possibilities of a closer tie between Prague and the Greek Church,*" an initiative which was doomed to fail with the fall of

Constantinople to the Turks the next year, 1453. See Heymann: *John Rokycana*, p. 252

² Acts, 2, 44-45

³ I.e. the catholic priests

⁴ John, 14, 26

[57] Sed nec tu tibi de Graecia blandiaris. Quamvis enim non errant¹ Graeci vetustam consuetudinem observantes, non tamen² vobis excusatio est, qui³ sub Latinis⁴ nati educatique moribus honestum, laudatum⁵, securum, purum ecclesiae Romanae ritum auctoritate propria rejecistis, quamvis ordinationem ejus sive consuetudinem longo usu probatam infringere peccatum transgressionis existat. Nec scio, quid⁶ vos hac⁷ in⁸ re Graecam magis⁹ quam Latinam ecclesiam imitari¹⁰ compellat. Latinus certe sanatus¹¹ et mundius et¹² rationabilius et¹³ cautius agit quam¹⁴ Graecus, nam tribus de causis calicis potum plebibus interdixit: prima, ne¹⁵ rudis populus sub duplici solum specie contineri Christum¹⁶ putaret; altera, ne quod est liquidum, multis attractum manibus effunderetur in terram, quemadmodum nuper in Praga factum referunt, ubi puerulus vix anniculus ab ubere matris ad sanguinem domini raptus calicem ex manu minus¹⁷ considerati sacerdotis arripiens sacramentum sparsit in humum; tertia¹⁸, ut impleretur figura¹⁹ veteris legis²⁰, quae licet populo {134r} ministrari de sacrificio²¹ juberet, libamina tamen solis sacerdotibus levitisque²² reservabat.

[58] Quid est, quod Graecam ecclesiam tantopere laudatis? An non Latinam ecclesiam²³ multo florentiorem esse²⁴ quam²⁵ Graecam cernitis, et nostram longe²⁶ lateque dominantem, illam Mahumeti²⁷ cultoribus servientem; hanc uno sub capite gubernatam, illam²⁸ multis schismatibus implicatam; hanc templis sublimioribus exornatam, illam omni splendore nudatam; hanc semper recta dogmata praedicantem, illam saepius errori consentientem? Nolo cum²⁹ Cicerone dicere: *Romanos aut nihil a Graecis suscepisse aut ab eis accepta³⁰ fecisse meliora*. Laudo et magnifico Graecos, ex quorum fontibus nostri majores hausere³¹ doctrinam. Sed consenuit³² Graecia, frigida est et non habet, qui³³ calefaciat³⁴ eam. *Facta est sub tributo domina gentium³⁵*, et quae fuit³⁶ Asianorum magistra, nunc est discipula Latinorum.

¹ erant N

² omit. N

³ si N

⁴ literis L

⁵ honestum laudatum U

⁶ quod M, N; qui F, O, U, V

⁷ ac N

⁸ hac in : in hac L

⁹ Graecam magis : magis Grecam L

¹⁰ ecclesiam imitari : imitari ecclesiam L

¹¹ sanatus L

¹² omit. N

¹³ omit. N

¹⁴ omit. N

¹⁵ omit. U

¹⁶ contineri Christum : Christum contineri L

¹⁷ vnus ni N

¹⁸ tertium M

¹⁹ scriptura M, N

²⁰ testamenti M

²¹ ministrari de sacrificio : de sacrificio ministrari L

²² levitibusque WO

²³ omit. L

²⁴ omit. L

²⁵ quamuis M

²⁶ legem U

²⁷ Machumethi L; Machometi N; Maumethi M, U

²⁸ illis L

²⁹ tamen N

³⁰ suscepta L, M; arrepta U

³¹ hauserant L; aufere U; habuere WO

³² consonuit L; confremuit N

³³ que L

³⁴ calefaciant L; calefaciet M

³⁵ domina gentium : gentium domina N

³⁶ omit. F

6.4.2.4. *The Greek Church*

[57] And do not fool yourself with Greece. The Greeks do not err when they keep their old custom, but that is no excuse for you who, though born and brought up under Latin customs, have on your own authority rejected the honourable, praiseworthy, safe and pure rite of the Roman Church, as if it was not a sin to violate and abandon its old, established practice or custom, sanctioned by long use. And I do not know what it is that compels you to imitate the Greek Church in this matter rather than the Latin. Certainly, the Latin senate¹ acts more purely, reasonably and cautiously than the Greek since it forbade the people to drink from the chalice for three reasons: firstly, so that the uneducated people would not believe that Christ was only contained in both species together; secondly, so that the liquid would not be spilt on the earth when reached for by many hands (as reportedly happened recently in Prague, where a little boy, almost a year old, held by its mother at her breast, reached for the chalice, snatched it from the incautious priest, and spilt the sacrament on the ground); and thirdly, to fulfil what was prefigured in the old law, which commanded the people to be served from the sacrificial [animals], but also commanded the drink offerings to be reserved for the priests and levites only.

[58] But why do you praise the Greek Church so much? Do you not see that the Latin Church is much more flourishing than the Greek: our Church rules far and wide, but their Church serves the followers of Muhammad; our Church is governed by one head, but their Church is embroiled in many schisms; our Church is adorned with lofty temples, but their Church is robbed of all splendour; our Church always preaches right teachings, but their Church often agreed with erroneous teachings. I do not want to say with Cicero: *The Romans took over nothing from the Greeks or if they did they made it better*,² nay, I praise and acclaim the Greeks from whose fountains our ancestors drew their learning. But Greece has grown old and cold and has nobody to warm her: *The mistress of the Gentiles has been made tributary*,³ and she who was once the teacher of the Asians is now the disciple of the Latins.

¹ Piccolomini usually uses the term senate to designate the college of cardinals presided over by the pope. In this context, he may be referring more generally to the church government

² Source not identified

³ Lamentations, 1, 1

[59] Quid¹ vos² Bohemos sub norma Latina nutritos in communione calicis graecari³ compellit? Cur non ceteras quoque⁴ Graecorum observantias amplectimini? Cur non panem fermentatum consecratis? Cur religiones monachorum, quas illi recipiunt, aspernamini? Cur vestis⁵ ornatus ut illi sacrificantes non recipitis? Cur non conjugio copulamini, quod cum Graeca potestis⁶ et cum⁷ primitiva ecclesia facere⁸? Non decet vos partim Graecos, partim Latinos esse: aut calidum⁹ fieri oportet aut frigidum¹⁰. Sed agite, quod in rem vestram est: nolite plus sapere, quam oportet. Audite docentem matrem, amplectimini legem ecclesiae, quae sancta est et honestate condita. Nolite putare semper apostolos aliosque Christi discipulos communionem calicis accepisse, quia post Christi passionem de calice rarus, de pane frequens habetur sermo¹¹, ut est illud: *Et¹² cognoverunt eum¹³ in fractione panis*. Et in¹⁴ Actibus¹⁵ Apostolorum: *Frangentes circa domos panem*, et iterum: *Perseverantes in fractione panis¹⁶*, quibus in locis nullam reperimus de vino mentionem^{17 18}.

¹ est quod *add.* L, M, N

² nos U

³ vos *add.* N

⁴ *omit.* N

⁵ vestrum L; vrbis N

⁶ *omit.* L

⁷ *omit.* L

⁸ potestis *add.* L

⁹ calidos L

¹⁰ frigidus L

¹¹ habetur sermo : sermo habetur L

¹² *omit.* L

¹³ illum N

¹⁴ *omit.* U

¹⁵ actis L

¹⁶ et in actibus ... panis *omit.* F

¹⁷ reperimus de vino mentionem : de vino reperimus mentionem L

¹⁸ quibus in locis ... mentionem *omit.* U

[59] So, what compels you Bohemians, brought up under Latin norms, to imitate the Greeks in having communion of the chalice. Why do you not embrace the other practices of the Greeks? Why is the bread you consecrate not fermented? Why do you reject the orders of monks that those accept? Why do you not use their vestments when you perform the sacrifice of the mass? Why do you¹ not unite in marriage, which you can do if you follow the Greek Church as well as the Primitive Church? It is not right that you are part Greek and part Latin: you must be either warm or cold.² No, do what is best for you: do not wish to know more than you ought to, hear your mother's teachings, accept the law of the Church, holy and based on honesty. Do not believe that the apostles and Christ's other disciples always took the communion of the chalice, for after Christ's passion the chalice is rarely mentioned, but the bread frequently, as for example in: *They knew him in the breaking of the bread,*³ and in the Acts of the Apostles: *Breaking bread from house to house,*⁴ and again: *They were persevering in the breaking of bread.*⁵ In these places, we find no mention of wine.

¹ I.e. the priests

² Apocalypse, 3, 16

³ Luke, 24, 35

⁴ Acts, 2, 46

⁵ Acts, 2, 42

[60] Sed nec moveri debetis, quod nonnulli doctores de communione sacramentali loquentes illamque populo suadentes Johannis verba recipiunt, neque enim propterea illius loci talis verus est et proprius intellectus, sed ex quadam similtudine consonantique ratione trahitur inde¹ sensus magis quam ducitur. Et licet doctoribus oratorio more loquentibus nunc figuris, nunc translationibus uti, ex quo fit, ut saepe de signo loquentes transeat ad signatum. Sed plurimum interest, an² determinando docentes an³ persuadendo componentes⁴ loquantur⁵. Et⁶ advertendum est, quod etsi plerique doctores incidenter⁷ verba Johannis ad sacramentum altaris referant, in continua tamen expositione nullus id⁸ agit, sicut in libro, quem de textura⁹ evangeliorum¹⁰ scripsit, {134v} Zacharias Chrisopolitanus affirmat. Quod autem de Leonis decreto commemorasti¹¹, nihil¹² impedit nostri propositi cursum, namque¹³ cum Manichaei Leone sedente Christum non vero corpore sed¹⁴ ¹⁵ fantastico et sine sanguine vestitum praedicarent neque¹⁶ resurrectionem ejus crederent neque diem dominicum sanctificarent¹⁷ sumentesque Christi corpus sub specie panis, ut suum pallearent¹⁸ errorem, potum calicis renuerent¹⁹, obviaturus tantae nequitiae pontifex statuit, ut qui sub una specie communicasset, ab altera non abstineret.

[61] Sic²⁰ plurima saepe statuta sunt²¹ ex²² causa, ex²³ persona, ex loco, ex tempore²⁴, quae considerare²⁵ oportet, qui de illis judicant, ne prius inculpent²⁶, quam intelligant, prius arguant, quam sensa²⁷ perquirant. At²⁸ cum hodie alius sit rerum status, cum vestri nostrique progenitores sub una specie communicaverint²⁹, cum multi doctores ab ecclesia recepti et in catalogo sanctorum³⁰ conscripti, miraculis³¹ coruscantes, retinendum plebi calicem³² dicant, cum Latina ecclesia id servet, doceat, mandet, suadeo, ut vos illi obtemperetis custodiatisque legem matris, ut *addatur gratia capiti vestro et torques collo vestro*, sicut Salomonis verba promittunt his, qui sunt matribus obsequentes.

¹ in N
² ad U
³ aut U
⁴ communicantes L; commouentes N, U
⁵ loquuntur L, N
⁶ sed L
⁷ *omit.* M
⁸ illud L
⁹ de textura : dextura N
¹⁰ euangelistarum N
¹¹ commemoras N
¹² nil N
¹³ nam L, M, N
¹⁴ *omit.* U
¹⁵ corpore sed : sed corpore L
¹⁶ nec L; *omit.* N

¹⁷ celebrarent L
¹⁸ palliant F, M, O, U, V, WO
¹⁹ renuerunt L
²⁰ sed L
²¹ saepe statuta sunt : statuta sunt saepe N
²² *omit.* L
²³ et N
²⁴ parte N
²⁵ considerari L, N
²⁶ culpent V
²⁷ sensu L; sensum N; pensa U
²⁸ et N
²⁹ communicarint L, N
³⁰ patrum *add.* N
³¹ mirabiliter N
³² catholicam fidem N

6.4.2.5. Doctors

[60] And it should not affect you that several doctors, when speaking about sacramental communion and arguing for it to be given to the people, refer to John's words, for this is not the true and proper meaning of this passage: the meaning [they give it] is drawn from some similarity and related sense, rather than deduced. Indeed the doctors speaking like orators sometimes use images, sometimes metaphors, and often move from the sign to the signified. But it is most important whether in speaking they are teaching by definition or urging by persuasion. And it should be noted that though many doctors relate John's words about the sacrament of the altar incidentally, nobody does so in a systematic exposition of the matter, as Zachary of Besancon¹ states in his book about the structure of the gospels. Your reference to Leo's decree in no way disturbs our line of argumentation, for during Leo's pontificate, the Manicheans² preached that Christ does not have a real body but only a phantom body, without blood.³ They did not believe in his resurrection, nor did they keep holy the day of the Lord,⁴ and they only took Christ's body under the species of bread and – to palliate their error – refused to drink from the chalice. It was to oppose this wickedness that the pontiff decreed that those who communicated under one species should not abstain from the other.

[61] Thus, in the course of time, many decisions have been made on the basis of the matter itself, the person, the place, and the time, and these must be taken into consideration by those who would judge those decisions so that they do not criticize before they have understood deeply nor argue before they have inquired diligently. Since the situation is different today, since yours and our ancestors received communion under one species, since many doctors accepted by the Church and entered into the catalogue of saints, resplendent with miracles, say that laypeople should not have the chalice, and since this is what the Latin Church maintains, teaches and commands, I urge you to obey and keep the law of your mother, so that *grace may be added to your head, and a chain of gold to thy neck*,⁵ as the words of Solomon promise those who obey their mother.

¹ Zacharias Chysopolitanus (d. ca. 1155): Biblical scholar of the Premonstratensian order, from Besancon (Chrysopolis). Ca. 1140-1445, he published his great work on the gospels, the *Unum ex quattuor, sive concordia evangelistarum* (MPL, CLXXXVI, cols. 11-620)

² Manicheism: Long considered a Christian heresy, it was a major religion founded in the 3rd century AD by the Persian prophet Mani (ca. 216–274 AD). Manicheism taught an elaborate dualistic

cosmology describing the struggle between a good, spiritual world of light, and an evil, material world of darkness

³ This is the docetist view of Christ. Docetism taught that the phenomenon of Jesus, his historical and bodily existence, and above all the human form of Jesus, was mere semblance without any true reality

⁴ Sunday

⁵ Proverbs, 1, 9

[62] **Nicolaus:** Estne ullum apostolicae sedis aut generalis concilii decretum, quod laicos sub utraque specie communicare prohibeat¹?

Aeneas: Vultis obtemperare, si decretum ostendo?

Nicolaus: Obtemperabimus, si non erit legi divinae contrarium.

Aeneas: Lex divina nulla est², cui talis sanctio possit esse contraria.

Nicolaus: Tibi sic videtur, nobis longe alia sententia est.

Aeneas: Vos communionem duplicis speciei de praecepto domini dicitis³, nos contra. Cui magis credendum est^{4 5}, vobis⁶ an⁷ sedi Romanae⁸?

Nicolaus: Ei⁹ credendum est¹⁰, cui scriptura divina suffragatur¹¹.

Aeneas: At¹² vos dicitis legem¹³ divinam sentire vobiscum, nos contra. Quid modo?

Nicolaus: Qui verbis divinae legis propinquior est, hunc fide digniorem puto.

Aeneas: Quid, si est hoc^{14 15} dubium¹⁶, quis obtinebit¹⁷?

Nicolaus: Christus dominus judicabit.

¹ prohibebat U

² nulla est : est nulla V

³ *omit.* U

⁴ *omit.* U

⁵ credendum est : est credendum N

⁶ nobis WO

⁷ aut V, WO

⁸ sedi Romanae : apostolicae sedi L

⁹ et N

¹⁰ *omit.* WO

¹¹ divina suffragatur : suffragatur divina N

¹² et N

¹³ dicitis legem : legem dicitis L

¹⁴ *omit.* L

¹⁵ est hoc : hoc est N

¹⁶ est hoc dubium : dubium est L

¹⁷ quis obtinebit *omit.* L

6.4.2.6. *Popes and councils*

[62] **Mikulas:** Is there any decree from the Apostolic See or a general council forbidding laymen to communicate under both species?

Enea: Will you obey if I show you one?

Mikulas: We will obey if it is not against divine law.

Enea: There is no divine law that such a decree could be against.

Mikulas: You may think so, but we have a very different view.

Enea: You say that communion under both species is a command of the Lord's, and we say the opposite. Whom should we most believe, you or the Roman See?

Mikulas: We should believe whoever is supported by divine Scripture.

Enea: But you say that divine law agrees with you, and we the opposite. So what now?

Mikulas: Whoever is closest to divine law merits most to be believed.

Enea: But who prevails in case of doubt?

Mikulas: Christ the Lord will be our judge.

[63] **Aeneas:** Nullum ergo, ut intelligo¹, iudicem², nullum in terra³ superiorem⁴ vultis, qui res dubias diffiniat. Sic neque Romanum pontificem caput esse Christiani populi creditis⁵, neque generalia concilia⁶ recipitis⁷, militantem ecclesiam inhonoratis⁸, quamvis est magistra fidelium, doctrix veritatis, inimica mendacii, mater nostra, quae nos Christo regeneravit⁹ et alit atque nutrit in fide. Quod si vos aliud non¹⁰ moveret¹¹, vestra vos paucitas exterrere¹² deberet. Quot enim¹³ estis, qui adversus vivos¹⁴ innumerabiles¹⁵ et mortuos infinitos linguas¹⁶ acuitis? Tota {135r} Christianitas contra vos et, et tamen a sententia non receditis, quae, si vera esset, omnes vestri¹⁷ progenitores¹⁸ cum diabolo¹⁹ et angelis ejus arderent²⁰, qui calicis expertes fuerunt. Nam regnum hoc²¹, postquam sacramentis ecclesiae relictis idolis initiatum est, semper apostolicae sedis ritu communicavit, exceptis paucis annis aevi nostri²², in quo monitore Johanne Hus²³ atque Jeronimo ab ecclesiae unitate recessistis²⁴.

Galechus: Arguis paucitatem nostram, sed Christus adversus multitudinem Judaeorum paucis discipulis circumdatus praedicare non timuit, nec multi erant Judaei considerata gentilium multitudine²⁵, quando legem acceperunt Mosaicam.

Aeneas: Christus, Deus et homo, dominus et magister, novam daturus legem in mundum venit redempturus²⁶ populum. Qualis comparatio lucis ad tenebras, terrae ad caelum, Christi ad Belial? Non tamen dominus sine miraculis creditus est, neque Moyses absque²⁷ signis legem tulit. At vos, quae²⁸ signa facitis, ut vestrae paucitati credamus et²⁹ vobiscum³⁰ simus?

¹ ut intelligo *omit.* L

² *omit.* U

³ nullum in terra : in terra nullum L

⁴ ut intelligo *add.* L

⁵ Christiani populi creditis : populi creditis Christiani L

⁶ *omit.* U

⁷ concilia recipitis : recipitis concilia L

⁸ militantem ecclesiam inhonoratis : neque militantem ecclesiam honoratis L, M, N

⁹ regnavit N

¹⁰ *omit.* L

¹¹ moneret M

¹² quod si vos ... exterrere *omit.* U

¹³ vos *add.* L

¹⁴ et *add.* F

¹⁵ innaturales N

¹⁶ linguam N

¹⁷ *omit.* N

¹⁸ vestri progenitores : progenitores vestri N

¹⁹ diabolis M

²⁰ penas eternas luerent L

²¹ Boemie N

²² vestri N

²³ Huszone L; Huss N

²⁴ discessistis L

²⁵ gentilium multitudine : multitudine gentilium N

²⁶ redempturusque L, M, N

²⁷ sine N

²⁸ qui N

²⁹ *omit.* F, O, U

³⁰ et vobiscum : uobiscumque L, M

[63] **Enea:** As I understand it, you do not accept any judge or any superior on Earth who could settle dubious matters. Thus, you do not believe that the Roman Pontiff is the head of the Christian people, nor do you accept the general councils, but you disdain Militant Church, although she is the mentor of the faithful, the teacher of truth, the enemy of lies, our mother that gave us rebirth in Christ, and who raises and nourishes us in the Faith. But if nothing else impresses you, you should still be greatly upset at how few you are. How many are you who sharpen your tongues against innumerable living and countless dead people? The whole of Christendom is against you, but still you do not back away from your own opinions: were they true, all your ancestors would be burning [in Hell] with the Devil and his angels because they did not have the chalice. Ever since this kingdom left the [pagan] idols and was initiated into the sacraments of the Church, it has always received communion after the rite of the Apostolic See except for a few years in our own age in when, under the guidance of Jan Hus and Jerome¹, you left the unity of the Church.

Galka: Now you are arguing on the basis of our small numbers, but Christ himself did not fear to preach against the multitude of Jews even if he had only a few disciples around him. Moreover, compared to the multitude of gentiles, the Jews were not many when they received the Mosaic law.

Enea: Christ, God and man, Lord and master, came into the world to give a new law and to save the people. How can you compare light with darkness, Heaven with Earth, Christ with Belial? But the Lord was not believed without miracles, and Moses did not bring the law without signs². But you, what signs do you give that may make us believe your few numbers and agree with you?

¹ Jan Hus and Jerome of Prague, two leading Hussite theologians, who were burnt as heretics at the Council of Konstanz

² I.e., miracles

[64] **Galechus:** *Generatio prava¹ et adultera signum² quaerit. Nos paucitatis nostrae tutorem Christum³ habemus, qui⁴ apud evangelium dicit: Ubicumque fuerint duo aut tres collecti⁵ in nomine meo, ego cum eis sum⁶. Non indigemus humano favore, qui ducimur⁷ caelesti doctore⁸.*

Aeneas: Apud Cyprianum martyrem his sororia⁹ verbis nonnulli jactabant¹⁰, quibus ille sic¹¹ respondit: *Corruptores evangelii et¹² interpretes falsi extrema ponunt et superiora praetereunt, partim memores, partim subdole¹³ comprimentes. Ut ipsi ab ecclesia scissi sunt, ita capituli unius sententiam scindunt. Dominus enim, cum discipulis¹⁴ suis unanimatem suaderet^{15 16} et pacem dico, inquit, vobis, quoniam si duobus¹⁷ ex vobis convenerit¹⁸ in terra, de omni re, quam¹⁹ petieritis, continget vobis a patre meo, qui in caelis est²⁰. Ubicumque enim²¹ fuerint²² duo aut²³ tres collecti in nomine meo²⁴, cum eis sum, ostendens non multitudini, sed unanimitati deprecantium plurimum tribui. Si duobus²⁵, inquit, ex vobis convenerit²⁶ in terra, unanimatem prius posuit, concordiam pacis ante praemisit²⁷. Ut²⁸ conveniat vobis²⁹ fideliter et firmiter docuit. Quomodo autem³⁰ potest ei cum aliquo convenire, qui cum corpore ipsius ecclesiae et cum universa fraternitate non convenit? Notate verba et³¹ signate mysteria. Non est cum eis Christus, qui³² ab ecclesia recedunt. In³³ una³⁴ ecclesia fuimus omnes³⁵ prius³⁶: una fides, unus Deus, unus ritus et³⁷ vobis³⁸ et nobis erat³⁹. Non⁴⁰ nos a vobis, sed vos a nobis recessistis facientesque vobis⁴¹ conventicula diversa peregrinaque dogmata recipientes, quae non audiverant⁴² patres vestri. Veritatis caput atque originem reliquistis⁴³. Quod si Christi praesentiam {135v} cupitis, ad sponsam ejus redeundum est.*

¹ parua U

² signa L, N

³ tutorem Christum : Christum tutorem L

⁴ quid N

⁵ congregati N

⁶ nos *add.* L; cum N

⁷ dicimur L; ducitur U

⁸ ductore N, WO

⁹ sordida N

¹⁰ iactitabunt L; iactabatur U

¹¹ *omit.* M

¹² atque L, M, N

¹³ et superiora ... subdole *omit.* U

¹⁴ cum discipulis *omit.* L

¹⁵ suadet L, N

¹⁶ unanimatem suaderet : suadet unanimatem N

¹⁷ duo N

¹⁸ conuenerint N

¹⁹ quacumque L, M; quamcumque N

²⁰ in caelis est : est in celis L

²¹ autem L; *omit.* V

²² *omit.* N

²³ uel L

²⁴ ego *add.* L, M, N

²⁵ duo N

²⁶ *omit.* N

²⁷ promisit L, N

²⁸ et N

²⁹ nobis N; *omit.* U

³⁰ ergo N

³¹ *omit.* L, N

³² quia N

³³ *omit.* U

³⁴ prius *add.* L

³⁵ fuimus omnes : omnes fuimus L

³⁶ *omit.* L

³⁷ *omit.* L; enim *add.* N

³⁸ nobis N

³⁹ nobis erat : erat vobis N

⁴⁰ *illeg. add.* N

⁴¹ erat non nos ... vobis *omit.* U

⁴² audierant L; audierunt N

⁴³ discessistis L; reliquise M

[64] **Galka:** *An evil and adulterous generation seeketh a sign.*¹ We have Christ as our protector to defend our few numbers, for in the Gospel he says: *Where there are gathered two or three in my name, there I am in the midst of them.*² We are led by a heavenly teacher, and therefore we do not need the favour of men.

Enea: Several people made similar boastful claims to Cyprian the Martyr. He answered them as follows: *Corruptors of the Gospel and false interpreters, they lay down the last words, and omit what goes before: giving heed to part, and deceitfully suppress in part. As they have cut themselves out from the Church, they cut out one sentence from the whole chapter [of the Gospel]. For the Lord when preaching to his disciples unanimity and peace said: 'I say unto you that if two of you shall agree on Earth, concerning anything whatsoever ye shall ask, it shall be done to you by my Father. For wheresoever two or three are gathered together in my name, I am with them,' showing that most is given, not to the number, but to the unanimity of the petitioners. With the words "if two of you shall agree on Earth", he places agreement first: the concord of peace is the preliminary condition. He taught you faithfully and firmly how you should agree. Yet how can he possibly be at agreement with another, who is at variance with the body of the Church and with the universal brotherhood?*³ Take note of the words and mark the mysteries. Christ is not with those who leave the Church. Formerly, we were all in one Church: you and we shared one Faith, one God, one rite. *We did not leave you, it was you who left us, setting up separate conventicles*⁴ and accepting foreign teachings that your own fathers had not heard. You have *abandoned the head and spring of truth.*⁵ If you desire the presence of Christ, you must return to his bride.

¹ Matthew, 12, 39: *Generatio mala et adultera signum quaerit*

² Matthew, 18, 20

³ Cyprianus: *De unitate ecclesiae*, 12; MPL, IV, col. 508-509: *Ne se quidam vana interpretatione decipiant, quod dixerit dominus: Ubi cumque fuerint duo aut tres collecti in nomine meo, ego cum eis sum. Corruptores evangelii atque interpretes falsi extrema ponunt et superiora praetereunt, partis memores, et partem subdole comprimantes, ut ipsi ab ecclesia scissi sunt, ita capituli unius sententiam scindunt. Dominus enim, cum discipulis suis unanimatem suaderet et pacem, Dico, inquit, vobis, quoniam si duobus ex vobis convenerit in terra de omni re quamcumque petieritis, continget vobis a patre meo, qui in caelis est. Ubi cumque enim fuerint duo aut tres collecti in nomine meo, ego cum eis*

sum, ostendens non multitudini, sed unanimitati deprecantium plurimum tribuendum. Si duobus, inquit, ex vobis convenerit in terra, unanimitatem prius posuit, concordiam pacis ante praemisit, ut conveniat nobis fideliter et firmiter docuit. Quomodo autem potest ei cum aliquo convenire, qui cum corpore ipsius ecclesiae et cum universa fraternitate non convenit? Quomodo possunt duo aut tres in nomine Christi colligi, quos constat a Christo et ab ejus evangelio separari. Non enim nos ab illis, sed illi a nobis recesserunt. Et cum haereses et schismata postmodum nata sunt, dum conventicula sibi diversa constituunt, veritatis caput atque originem reliquerunt.

⁴ Cyprianus: *De unitate ecclesiae*, 12; MPL, IV, col. 509

⁵ Cyprianus: *De unitate ecclesiae*, 12; MPL, IV, col. 509

[65] **Galechus:** Nos¹ in ecclesia sumus nec ab illa recessimus umquam². Transire autem³ ad vos⁴, dum Christi legem violatis, nulla ratio⁵ suadet, quia numquam mystico Christi⁶ corpori jungitur, qui ab ejus evangelio separatur. Sed cur nobis⁷ retices⁸ ⁹, si qua est constitutio, quae sumere calicem vetat?

Aeneas: Quia noluitis¹⁰ oboedientiam polliceri, sed dicam¹¹ tamen¹². Ego ita vos peritos arbitror, ut consuetudinem universalis ecclesiae non minoris efficaciae censeatis¹³ quam scriptam legem, quia vis legis ex consensu resultat. Consensus autem non minor¹⁴ inest consuetudini quam legi conscriptae¹⁵, nam consuetudinem longus¹⁶ et approbatus¹⁷ usus inducit¹⁸, quae nullius impedita¹⁹ clamore divino²⁰ magis quam humano videtur recepta consilio²¹. Leges autem, quamvis Dei nutu decerni credantur, saepe tamen vel populi vel senatus magna parte dissentiente traduntur. Ob quam rem non minus plectendus est vestustae²² consuetudinis quam scriptae legis praevaricator. Cum igitur jam pluribus saeculis observarit²³ ecclesia, ne plebes²⁴ de calice biberent²⁵, decebat²⁶ et vos²⁷ Bohemos hujus observantiae tamquam paternae legis aemulatores existere, quae – sicuti²⁸ ante dictum est – neque novi neque veteris testamenti codicibus adversatur, sed ratione²⁹ magna et honestate subnixa est.

¹ *omit.* M

² numquam L, M

³ transire autem : autem transire M

⁴ nos U

⁵ res N

⁶ *omit.* L

⁷ *omit.* N

⁸ reticetis M

⁹ nobis retices : retices nobis L

¹⁰ nolutisti L; uoluitis N, U

¹¹ dico L

¹² dicam tamen : tamen ego dicam N

¹³ ego ita vos ... censeatis *omit.* N

¹⁴ minus WO

¹⁵ scripte L, N, V

¹⁶ longius U

¹⁷ approbatus U

¹⁸ ibi ducit N

¹⁹ impedito L

²⁰ clamore divino : diuino clamore L

²¹ concilio L, N

²² ne iuste F

²³ obseruasset L; observaret N

²⁴ plebs L, N

²⁵ biberet L, N

²⁶ docebat L; dicebat N

²⁷ *omit.* L

²⁸ sicut L, M, N

²⁹ ecclesie *add.* N

[65] **Galka:** We are in the Church and have never left it. There is no reason for us to join you as long as you are violating the law of Christ, for nobody who separates himself from Christ's Gospel can be part of his mystical body. But why do you not tell us if there is any decree¹ that forbids the taking of the chalice?

Enea: Because you have not wanted to promise obedience. But I shall tell you anyway. I consider you to be so knowledgeable that you do not consider the custom of Universal Church as having less power than the written law, for the vigour of law is the result of consensus. But consensus is no less important for custom than for written law, for long and approved use creates a custom, that, when uncontested, must be considered as having been established by divine rather than human counsel. But even though laws are considered to be made with God's assent, they are often passed despite dissent from a large part of the people or the senate. Therefore, someone who transgresses an old, established custom must be punished no less than someone who transgresses a written law. So, since the Church has for many centuries observed [the custom] not to have laymen drink from the chalice, you Bohemians, too, were obliged to keep this practice just as much as if it had been an ancestral law, since - as already said - it is not against the old and the new testament, but is most reasonable and decent.

¹ "constitutio"

[66] Verum, quia¹ scripti decreti sanctionem requiritis, non frustrabor expectationem vestram. Evolvite Constantiense concilium² atque ejus acta perquirite: consuetudinem, quam³ modo exposui, et approbatam et pro lege⁴ receptam⁵ et scripto firmatam⁶ reperietis. In Basilea quoque⁷, dum generalis synodus illic erat, postquam exacte visa⁸ sunt et diligenter excussa sacrarum testimonia litterarum, magnorum conciliorum decretis ac sanctorum patrum et illustrium doctorum traditionibus enucleate pensatis, decretum promulgatum est, quod aperte declarat fideles laicos sive clericos communicantes et non conficientes ad suscipiendum sub specie panis et vini⁹ divinum eucharistiae sacramentum ex praecepto domini non esse astrictos. In cujus fine subjungitur¹⁰ laudabilis quoque¹¹ consuetudo¹² communicandi laicalem populum sub una specie ab ecclesia et¹³ sanctis patribus introducta ac hactenus diutissime observata¹⁴ et a doctoribus divinae legis sanctarum¹⁵ scripturarum atque canonum multam peritiam habentibus jam longo tempore commendata pro lege habenda est nec¹⁶ alicui licitum est¹⁷ reprobare aut¹⁸ sine auctoritate ecclesiae ipsam immutare. Sic ergo et scripta conciliorum habetis decreta et vetustum ecclesiae ritum.

¹ que N

² consil... *et passim* N

³ quando U

⁴ pro lege : perlonge L

⁵ ratam L; rectam M

⁶ firmam N

⁷ autem V, WO

⁸ iussa N

⁹ *omit.* U

¹⁰ subiungere N

¹¹ quomodo N

¹² quoque consuetudo : consuetudo quoque L

¹³ a *add.* L

¹⁴ diutissime observata : observata diutissime L

¹⁵ sacrarum L

¹⁶ et M

¹⁷ eam *add.* L, M; eam N

¹⁸ *omit.* N

[66] But if you require the sanction of a written decree, I shall not frustrate your expectations. Leaf through the [annals] of the Council of Konstanz and examine its acts: you will find that the custom I have now explained has both been approved and accepted as having the force of law, and is confirmed in writing.¹ Also in Basel, while the general council was there, after careful examination and diligent search of the testimonies from Holy Scripture and after intense reflection on the decrees of the great councils and the teachings handed down from the holy Fathers and illustrious doctors, a decree was promulgated which declared that the faithful laymen as well as clerics receiving communion without performing the sacrament were not obliged by divine command to receive the divine sacrament of the eucharist under both species of bread and wine. It was added that the praiseworthy custom of laypeople receiving communion under one species alone had been introduced by the Church and the holy Fathers and had now been observed for ages and had for a long time been recommended as having the force of law by doctors with great knowledge of the divine law of Holy Scripture and the canons, and that it was unlawful for anybody to reject it or change it without the authority of the Church.² Thus you have both the written decrees of councils and the ancient rite of the Church.

¹ *The decree Cum in nonnullis, of 15 June 1415, see Appendix.* The conciliar decree was confirmed by Pope Martin V *Inter cunctas* of 22 February 1417 (see Mansi, XXVII, col. 1204-1216)

² Fudge: *Hussites*, p. 277: *As for the council itself, it ratified the compacts [of Iglau] on 15 January 1437 but waited almost an entire year before making a formal statement. This occurred at the 30th session on 23 December [1437] wherein the synod concluded that Utraquism was in no sense obligatory, the Church could and should determine the proper mode of celebration,*

the doctrine of concomitance trumped any argument, and the practice of communion sub una was lawful. In other words, Utraquism was allowed with the caveat that its practitioners not force the matter on traditional Catholics and make clear that the Catholic practice of communing in one kind only was equally valid. Pope Eugenius had issued a bull on the *Compactata* on 18 September 1437 but couched in such language that it was unclear whether he approved or rejected them (Fudge, *ibidem*)

[67] **Galechus:** Potest ecclesia vel concilium, quae Christus instituit, {136r} sacramenta pervertere?

Aeneas: Non potest.

Galechus: At¹ sacramentum hoc sub specie panis et vini Christus instituit. Cur pervertit ecclesia, quae panem solum ad² laicos defert³?

Aeneas: Non pervertit ecclesia sacramentum, sed ritum mutat. Quae sunt enim de necessitate sacramentorum, immutabilia perseverant. Quae circa⁴ ritum sunt, mutare ecclesia⁵ potest⁶, cujus potestas non minor est hodie quam sub apostolis erat. Potestas⁷ autem et administratio ecclesiae, sicut doctores⁸ tradunt, tribus in rebus consistit: in ordinibus diversorum praelatorum, in administrationibus sacramentorum, in diversis praeceptis subditorum.

[68] Ob quam rem non sine ratione putavit doctor insignis⁹ Aquinas¹⁰ in arbitrio esse ecclesiae diversos gradus praelatorum instituere et institutos pro¹¹ rerum diversitate vel¹² temporum amovere. Sic subdiaconi sunt ordinati, quos ecclesia primitiva¹³ nescivit¹⁴. Sic praelati presbyteris¹⁵ episcopi, quos olim Jeronimus aequalis fuisse potestatis affirmat. Sic cardinalium sacer senatus inventus, ecclesiae magnum decus et stabile firmamentum.

[69] Potest etiam¹⁶ ecclesia in administratione sacramentorum abolitis prioribus novos ritus inducere¹⁷ et ceremonias novas. Qua de re, licet dominus discipulos suos facta cena communicaverit, ecclesia tamen neque pransos neque cenatos fratres, nisi necessitatis causa tantum sacramentum permittit¹⁸ assumere¹⁹. Rursus quoque, quamvis accinctus *linteo* Christus quotidianaque veste indutus hoc sacramentum instituerit dixeritque²⁰ paucissima verba, ecclesia tamen ob ejus reverentiam et ornamenta vestimentorum sacerdotibus²¹ dedit et missarum sollemnia prophetarum et apostolorum lectionibus et²² devotis orationibus adornavit. Sicut enim in lege veteri *rubricatas*²³ *pelles* et rudia²⁴ tabernaculi sacra sublimis templi gloria²⁵ secuta est²⁶, sic et in novo testamento post illa ecclesiae primitivae rudimenta pedetentim splendor²⁷ in cultu divino et ritus sacramentorum expolitior²⁸ et²⁹ majestas sacerdotii major successit.

¹ et N

² et N

³ reffert N

⁴ cetera N

⁵ mutare ecclesia : ecclesia mutare L, M

⁶ mutare ecclesia potest : ecclesia potest mutare N

⁷ Potestas et administratio ecclesie *margin note in Pius II's own late and hardly legible hand beginning with the words ... O*

⁸ tractores N

⁹ Thomas *margin note in Pius II's own late and hardly legible hand O*

¹⁰ aliquos L

¹¹ per U

¹² et N

¹³ ecclesia primitiva : primitiva ecclesia N

¹⁴ nescit N

¹⁵ presbiteri L, N

¹⁶ enim WO

¹⁷ indicere L

¹⁸ permittitur N

¹⁹ sumere L

²⁰ dixitque M

²¹ *omit.* F, O, U, V, WO

²² *omit.* L

²³ lubricatas N; rubricatas F, L, M, O, U

²⁴ *omit.* L; rubeas N

²⁵ templi gloria : gloria templi L, M, N

²⁶ *omit.* L

²⁷ splendorem N

²⁸ spolitior U

²⁹ est N

[67] **Galka:** Can the Church or a council corrupt the sacraments instituted by Christ?

Enea: No, they cannot.

Galka: But Christ instituted this sacrament under the species of bread and wine. Why, then, does the Church corrupt it by only giving bread to the laypeople?

Enea: [In doing so,] the Church does not corrupt the sacrament but changes the rite. That which belongs to the essence of the sacrament continues unchangeably. That which belongs to the rite the Church can change, for its power is not smaller today than it was under the apostles. As the doctors teach, the power and administration of the Church comprise three things: the orders of the various prelates, the administration of the sacraments, and the various rules for its subjects.

[68] This is why the excellent doctor, Aquinas, justly considered that the Church had the competence to create various ranks of prelates and to remove them because of different conditions and times. Thus we ordain subdeacons though they were unknown in the Primitive Church. Thus bishops were set above priests, though – as Jerome states – they once had equal power. And thus was established the holy senate of cardinals, a great ornament and stable foundation of the Church.¹

[69] In the administration of the sacraments, the Church can also abolish previous rites and introduce new rites and ceremonies. Therefore, though the Lord gave communion to his disciples after they had eaten dinner, the Church does not, except under urgent circumstances, permit brothers who have eaten breakfast or the noon meal to receive this great sacrament. And though Christ instituted this sacrament girded with a *towel*² and only said a few words, the Church out of reverence for the sacrament gave ornamental vestments to the priests and adorned the solemnity of the mass with readings from the prophets and the apostles as well as with pious prayers. In the Old Law, the *skins dyed red*³ and the primitive tabernacle were followed by the holy glory of the high temple, and similarly, the simple ways of the Primitive Church in the New Testament were gradually followed by splendour in the divine worship and a lustrous ritual for the sacraments and a greater majesty of the priesthood.

¹ Piccolomini would return to the theme of the rise of the order of cardinals in his *Report on in Imperial Mission to the Diet of Regensburg, 1454* (Nr. 4 in the present series of reports), sect. 48-49

² John, 13, 4

³ Exodus, 25, 5 *et al.*

[70] Tertio loco potest ecclesia statuta et ordinationes patrum, que de moribus agunt, prout loco et¹ tempori et personis viderit convenire, immutare et abrogare – sicut et prius diximus².

[71] Sed quantum ad sacramenta³ pertinet, quod necessarium est, tolli non potest, quod necessitati non subest, et variari potest et tolli. In eucharistia vero – sicut ante probatum est – non est usus utriusque speciei populo necessarius. Adimi ergo altera⁴ species non inepte potuit, quia non est hoc sacramentum variare sed usum.

[72] **Galechus:** Sacramentum est⁵ sub specie vini, {136v} quis neget? Ergo qui speciem vini⁶ tollit, Christi⁷ sacramentum⁸ tollit.

Aeneas: Haud⁹ recte infers. Septem sunt ecclesiae sacramenta, etsi vos quinque tantum¹⁰ recipitis. Ex his unum est eucharistia praecellentissimum¹¹ et maximum. Hoc semper integrum et unum^{12 13} est, sive sub una specie sumatur, sive sub duabus¹⁴. Et licet mille particulae panis fiant vinique¹⁵ totidem, unus tamen est¹⁶, ubique¹⁷ totus et integer Christus. Nec subtracta vini specie subtrahitur sacramentum, quia totum in altera sumitur. Recte igitur¹⁸ et sanctissime Romana ecclesia in hujus observantia sacramenti sese habet.

[73] Quibus ex rebus, si consolationem spiritus cupitis, si quietem amatis, si veritatem quaeritis, si lucrifacere animas¹⁹ vultis²⁰, sedem apostolicam audite, sequimini traditiones ejus, honorate illam, quoniam sancta est,²¹ immaculata Christi sponsa, columba pura et albissima²², ex cujus ore felicitis²³ *ramus olivae*²⁴ dependet, qui pacem humilibus²⁵ pollicetur²⁶, superbis bella minatur.

¹ *omit.* M

² sicut et ... diximus *omit.* L

³ sacramentum L, N

⁴ alteri U

⁵ esse V

⁶ speciem vini : vini speciem L, N

⁷ *omit.* L, N

⁸ vim O

⁹ hanc N

¹⁰ quinque tantum : tantum quinque N

¹¹ excellentissimum L

¹² vinum N

¹³ integrum et unum : unum et integrum L

¹⁴ sumatur sive sub duabus : siue duabus sumatur L

¹⁵ unique U

¹⁶ tamen est : est tamen V

¹⁷ est ubique : ubique est M

¹⁸ ergo WO

¹⁹ lucrifacere animas : lucri animas facere L

²⁰ animas vultis : vultis animas N

²¹ et *add.* WO

²² pura et albissima : albissima et pura N

²³ felici L, N

²⁴ olivarum L, N

²⁵ hominibus L, O, U, V, WO

²⁶ humilibus pollicetur : pollicetur hominibus L

[70] Thirdly, as said before, the Church can change and abolish the statutes and decisions of the Fathers dealing with morals, as it fits place, time and persons.

[71] But as far as the sacraments are concerned, what belongs to the essence may not be taken away, whereas that which does not belong to the essence can be changed and abolished. In the eucharist - as already shown – the use of both species is not essential to the people. Therefore, the other species could fittingly be taken away since that does not change the sacrament but only the practice.

[72] **Galka:** But who denies that the sacrament is under the species of wine? So, whoever takes the species of wine away, takes away the sacrament.

Enea: Your reasoning is false. The Church has seven sacraments, even if you only recognize five. The greatest and most eminent of these is the eucharist. This is always complete and one, whether it is taken under one or two species. Even if the bread is divided into a thousand particles and the wine in as many, each one is Christ, whole and complete. If you take the species of wine away, you do not take away the sacrament, for you still have the whole Christ in the other species. Therefore, the practice of the Roman Church in the administration of this sacrament is legitimate and pious.

[73] So, if you desire consolation of the spirit, if you love peace, if you seek truth, if you want your souls to thrive, then heed the Apostolic See, follow its traditions, and honour it, for she is holy, the immaculate bride of Christ, the pure and brightly shining dove, carrying a bough from that happy *olive tree*¹ in her mouth, who promises peace to the humble, and threatens the proud with war.

¹ Genesis, 8, 11

[74] Finitis¹ sermonibus istis assurexit² unus ex primoribus Thaboritarum et animo satis³ inflato⁴, “Quid tu nobis,” inquit, “apostolicam sedem tot verbis amplificas? Nos papam et cardinales avaritiae servos novimus, impatientes, inflatos, tumidos⁵, ventri⁶ ac libidini deditos, ministros scelorum, diaboli sacerdotes, et Antichristi praecursores, quorum deus venter est, pecunia caelum.” Erat hic homo ventrosus, crassus et multo⁷ abdomine⁸ pinguis, quem cum aspexissem, admovi ventri ejus leviter⁹ manus ac¹⁰ subridens, “Unde,” inquam¹¹, “tumor hic¹² ¹³ ventris est¹⁴? Cur te jejunio maceras et affligis inedia¹⁵?” Riserunt omnes magnisque illum cachinnationibus exceperunt¹⁶.

[75] At ego, cum animadverterem¹⁷ sacerdotes illos magis studio contradicendi quam voto discendi¹⁸ ad me venisse, posui modum verbis meis subtraxique disputationi pedem. Intellexi enim, quia facilius et levius esset turbulenti maris concitos fluctus clamoribus retundere quam illorum rabiem sermonibus coercere. Nam labor irritus et nullius¹⁹ effectus est offerre lumen caeco, sermonem surdo, sapientiam bruto. Conversus tamen ad eos dixi: “Collegae mei pransi sunt et itineri se accingunt²⁰. Hora est, ut a vobis recedam. Satis diu simul²¹ disputavimus. Vos tamen, ut video, nec meis verbis²² fidem praebetis²³, nec ego vestris argumentationibus moveor. Remaneamus²⁴ omnes, quod²⁵ ante fuimus. Existimavi hoc priusquam inciperem, nolui tamen silere, ne²⁶ mea taciturnitas opinionum²⁷ vestrarum²⁸ fieret auctoritas, ne²⁹ quis posthac diceret: ‘Fuit apud Thaboritas Senensis episcopus³⁰, nec quidquam adversus illorum³¹ sententiam dixit. Aut eos vera sentire {137r} putavit, aut eorum³² argumenta superari³³ posse disputando diffisus est.’ Quod si nihil aliud verba nostra³⁴ fecerunt, hoc tamen praestant, quod me vestris opinionibus adversantem omnes, qui astant, intellexerunt. Vos tamen amplius et fortasse melius cogitabitis. Tunc illi: “Si tempus esset, afferemus huc³⁵ libros³⁶ ostenderemusque tibi, qui³⁷ Christi sequaces et legis Dei³⁸ zelatores³⁹ sumus⁴⁰. Sed vale.” Ad quos ego: “Nec vobis nec mihi⁴¹ otium est: Valete.”

¹ NB: margin note in Pius II's own, late and hardly legible hand beginning the words Is Thaborita multos reliquit ... O

² omit. L; surrexit N

³ sanctis U

⁴ dixit add. N

⁵ inflatos tumidos : tumidos inflatos M

⁶ servientes add. L

⁷ multus N

⁸ a deo N; omit. U

⁹ omit. N

¹⁰ et M, V, WO

¹¹ omit. L, N

¹² omit. U

¹³ tumor hic : hic tumor L, N

¹⁴ inquam add. L, U; inquit add. N

¹⁵ media nocte L; media F, M

¹⁶ acceperunt L

¹⁷ adverterem N

¹⁸ dicendi N, U

¹⁹ nullus L

²⁰ itineri se accingunt : itineris ea cingunt N

²¹ omit. N

²² meis verbis : verbis meis N

²³ habetis V, WO

²⁴ remanemus L, M

²⁵ ut L, N

²⁶ ut L, N

²⁷ opinionem WO

²⁸ ne add. L; non add. N; nostrarum U

²⁹ nec L

³⁰ Senensis episcopus : episcopus Senensis N, WO

³¹ horum L; illos M; eorum N

³² horum L

³³ superare L, N

³⁴ mea L

³⁵ omit. L; tibi N

³⁶ hic add. N

³⁷ quia L, M, N

³⁸ omit. L

³⁹ zelatores WO

⁴⁰ sumus L, M, N, O

⁴¹ nobis N

7. End of visit to Tabor

[74] When we had finished speaking, one of the notables of the Taborites, a rather presumptuous man, rose and said, "Why do you praise the Apostolic See to us at such length? We know that the pope and the cardinals are the slaves of greed, impatient, arrogant, puffed up with pride, given to the pleasures of the flesh, servants of crime, priests of the devil, and precursors of Antichrist, whose god is their stomach and whose heaven is money." This man was thick and fat, with a large stomach. I looked at him and then pricked him lightly in the stomach and said, with a smile, "Where does this lump in your stomach come from? Why do you torment yourself with fasting and abstain from food?" Then they all burst into guffaws and laughed at him.

[75] But now I knew that those priests had come to me to dispute, not to learn, so I would not say more and withdrew from the debate. I realized that it would be easier to quell the violent waves of a stormy sea by shouting than to keep their madness in check by words. For it is a futile and unsuccessful labour to offer light to a blind, speech to a deaf, and wisdom to a brute. So I turned towards them and said, "My colleagues have now lunched and are preparing to leave. It is time for me to leave you. We have debated together long enough, but I see that you do not trust my words, and on my part, I am not moved by your arguments. So, let us remain as we were before. This is what I thought [would happen] before I began, but I did not want to be silent so that my silence would become a proof of your views, and people would later say: 'The Bishop of Siena visited the Taborites and spoke nothing against their views. Either he thought that their views are true, or he did not think that their arguments could be defeated by debate.' So, if our words did nothing else, they at least made it clear to all the attendants that I oppose your opinions. But you will think more and perhaps better [about these matters]. Then they said, "If there was time, we would bring our books here and show you that we are followers of Christ and zealously adhere to the law of God. But farewell." And I said to them, "Neither you nor I have time. So, farewell."

Atque hoc modo eos a me dimisi¹ et exeunte domino de Rosis cum eo² Soboslaviam³ veni atque inde Curvam⁴ Insulam et seniore[m] de Rosis dominum⁵ petivi.

[76] Videbatur mihi *ultra Sauromathas et glaciale[m] oceanum* fuisse, inter barbaros, inter antropofagos aut inter monstruosas Indiae Lybiaeque gentes. Nec sane in omni terra, quam circuit⁶ Amphitrites, gens ulla est monstruosior Thaboritis. Ethiopes⁷ enim quosdam et⁸ Scythas et Taprobanos⁹ corporis vitio monstruosos ajunt, Thaboritas vero depravatae¹⁰ mentis vitia¹¹ et¹² innumerabiles¹³ animi maculae¹⁴ monstruosos efficiunt, ad quos omnes¹⁵ haereses migravere, quot¹⁶ ab initio nascentis ecclesiae usque in¹⁷ hanc diem pestifera ingenia seminarunt¹⁸. Sunt ibi Nicolaitae, sunt Arriani¹⁹, sunt Manichaei, sunt Armenii²⁰, sunt Nestoriani, sunt Berengarii, sunt pauperes de Lugduno. Praecipui²¹ tamen apud eos Waldenses²² habentur, unius Christi vicarii et apostolicae sedis capitales inimici, qui dum²³ frena superioritatis abjiciunt libertatemque²⁴ praedicant, necessarium est²⁵, ut omnes errores admittant²⁶. A quibus cum²⁷ exivissem, ex inferiori videbar inferno reversus, nec²⁸ me prius ad superos recepisse putavi, quam Pudvisseos²⁹ atque³⁰ Ulricum³¹ de Rosis offendi. Nam et Pudvissei³² nullis haeresibus inquinati³³ sunt³⁴, et Ulricus³⁵ acerrimus hostis haereticorum³⁶, verus ecclesiae filius, inter alios Bohemiae principes, qui fidem catholicam verbis armisque tuentur³⁷, anterior est, dignus, quem sedes apostolica inter caros habeat³⁸ et inter primos³⁹ honoret.

¹ diuisi M

² *omit.* L

³ Sabellaiam L; Bobeslaviam M; Sobiflaniam N; Soboslaniam U

⁴ inde Curuam : Curvam inde L

⁵ de Rosis dominum : dominum de Rosis L, N, V

⁶ circuiuit U

⁷ Ethiopas L, M, O, U, V, WO

⁸ quosdam et : et quosdam N

⁹ Tropobanos L; Trapobanos M, O, U; Trabonamos N

¹⁰ damnate gentis N

¹¹ vicina N

¹² *omit.* M

¹³ sunt *add.* N

¹⁴ maculas L

¹⁵ *omit.* F, L, O, U, V, WO

¹⁶ quas L, M, N

¹⁷ ad L

¹⁸ seminare L

¹⁹ sunt Arriani : Arriani sunt O, V, WO

²⁰ Armeni F, M, L, N, O

²¹ precipue WO

²² Guldenses L; Valdenses M, N, U

²³ qui dum *omit.* F, O, U, V, WO

²⁴ libertatem L

²⁵ *omit.* U

²⁶ admittunt M

²⁷ tamen N

²⁸ ne M, N

²⁹ Pudvisseos F; Pudvisseos L; Wudweiiis N;

Puduuisseos O; Puduiceos V

³⁰ ad N

³¹ Henricum N

³² Pudvissei L; Wudweiiis N; Puduisei O; Puduicei

V

³³ inquinata N

³⁴ est N

³⁵ Henricus N

³⁶ et *add.* N

³⁷ tenentur L, N

³⁸ caros habeat ; habeat caros N

³⁹ pravos N

And thus I took my departure from them, and leaving with lord von Rosenberg I went with him to Soboslavia and from there to Krumlov¹ and the elder lord von Rosenberg.

[76] It seemed to me that I had been *beyond the Sarmatians and the icy Ocean*,² among barbarians, among man-eaters, or among the monstrous peoples of India and Libya. For absolutely nowhere on the Earth, surrounded by Amphitrite³, is there any people more monstrous than the Taborites. They say that some Ethiopians and Schythians⁴ and Taprobanes⁵ are hideous because of bodily defects, but the Taborites are made monstrous by the flaws of a depraved mind and countless blemishes on the soul. For all heresies sowed by troublemaking minds since the days of the Early Church until now have migrated there. They have Nicolaitans,⁶ Arians,⁷ Manichees, Armenians,⁸ Nestorians,⁹ Berengarians,¹⁰ and the Poor Men of Lyon.¹¹ But the first place among them belongs to the Waldensians,¹² the foremost enemies of the one Vicar of Christ and the Apostolic See, who, casting off the reins of all lordship and preaching freedom, must of necessity permit all errors. When I left them, it was as if I had returned from deepest Hell. I did not feel that I had returned to the people on Earth before I arrived in Budweis¹³ and met Ulrich von Rosenberg. Indeed, the people of Budweiss are stained by no heresy, and Ulrich himself is the bitterest enemy of the heretics, a true son of the Church, holding the first place among those Bohemian princes who protect the Catholic Faith with words and weapons. He is indeed worthy of being loved by the Apostolic See and honoured among the first.

¹ Cesky Krumlov: City in Southern Bohemia. Seat of the von Rosenberg family

² Juvenalis: *Satirae*, 2.1

³ Amphitrite: Gk. myth. Sea goddess

⁴ Scythia: In Antiquity, region of Central Asia

⁵ Sri Lanka

⁶ Nicolaitism: Heretical sect mentioned twice in the Apocalypse (2, 6; 2, 14-16). It is not clear which specific form of heresy Piccolomini attributed to them

⁷ Arianism: the Christological position that Jesus, as the Son of God, was created by God. It was proposed early in the 4th century by the Alexandrian presbyter Arius and was popular throughout much of the Eastern and Western Roman empires, even after it was denounced as a heresy by the Council of Nicaea (325)

⁸ Armenianism: it is not clear which specific form of heresy Piccolomini attributed to them except that they gave communion to new-borns, see sect. 51

⁹ Nestorianism: a Christian theological doctrine that opposes the concept of hypostatic union and emphasizes that the two natures (human and divine) of Jesus Christ were joined by will rather than personhood. Nestorianism was named after the Christian theologian Nestorius (386–450), Archbishop of Constantinople (428-431)

¹⁰ See sect. 5

¹¹ Original name for the Valdians

¹² Waldensians: The founding of the Waldensians is attributed to Pierre Waldo, a wealthy merchant who gave away his property around 1173, preaching apostolic poverty as the way to perfection. Waldensian teachings came into conflict with the Catholic Church, and by 1215 the Waldensians were declared heretical

¹³ České Budějovice: City in Southern Bohemia

[77] Scripsi haec tuae praestabilitati festino et currenti calamo. Properante namque Romam Johanne meo, quem probe¹ nosti, malui² te, quae³ mihi in hac via⁴ contigerant⁵ utcumque narrata cognoscere⁶ quam penitus ignorare. Res altas de fide disputantes⁷ et arcanos scripturae sensus attingere praesumpsimus⁸. Scio, quod⁹ non defuerunt ineptiae, nam rudem et inexpertum tironem haec me pugna suscepit. Sed nolui latrantes impune lupos abire, nolui¹⁰ deserere¹¹ veritatem, nolui ecclesiae deesse. Et quoniam imperitiae meae tenebras non ignoravi¹², supernae claritatis lumen intrepidus expectavi. *Jactavi super dominum curam meam et ipse me* adjuvit. {137v} Sensi divinitus assistentiam, nam verba nescio quomodo suapte¹³ fluebant, quibus miseri Thaboritae miserabiliter premebantur. *Benignus et misericors dominus*, qui nec peccatorum voces obaudit. Credo et certus sum, quia non mea vita, sed mea¹⁴ fides meruit audiri, ne¹⁵ Thaboritarum elenchis involverer aut sophismatibus caperer¹⁶.

[78] Utcumque res acta est¹⁷, scio me plura et tunc dixisse et nunc scripsisse digna correptione¹⁸. Sed¹⁹ quae tunc dixi, corripere nequeunt, quia *semel emissum volat irrevocabile verbum*. Quae nunc scribo, facile poterunt emendari, priusquam edantur. Ideo te²⁰ per veterem benivolentiam et, quam mihi semper ostendisti, caritatem precor et oro, huic opusculo ut²¹ tuam limam²² summamque manum admoveas neque prius in lucem sinas exire, quam tuo fuerit acri et gravi iudicio comprobatum. Vale, nostri memor et amans. Quando²³ Deus et fata volent, veniemus ad te²⁴. Ex Nova Civitate, 12. Kalendas septembris anno domini²⁵ 1451^{26 27}.

¹ probum N

² volui N

³ vel N

⁴ in hac uia : hac in via WO

⁵ contigerunt N

⁶ cognoscemus N

⁷ disputando N

⁸ presumpsi L

⁹ quia L, M, N

¹⁰ abire nolui : opicem N

¹¹ disserere M

¹² ignoui M; ignoram U

¹³ sic apte N

¹⁴ omit. L; me M

¹⁵ nec U

¹⁶ capetur N; caperet U

¹⁷ acta est : est acta L

¹⁸ correctione N; conceptione WO

¹⁹ omit. M

²⁰ scribo facile ... te omit. U

²¹ et L

²² lunam F; omit. L, N

²³ quem M

²⁴ 1451 add. L

²⁵ omit. L

²⁶ 51 L

²⁷ Finis add. M; Deo gratias. Amen add. N

8. Conclusion

[77] I wrote this to Your Eminence with a rapid and running pen, for as my Johann, whom you know well, was to depart shortly for Rome, I wanted you to be aware of what happened to me on the way rather than to be entirely ignorant of it. It was, of course, daring of me to debate about profound matters of Faith and to touch upon the hidden meanings of Scripture. I know that there was no lack of inadequacies, for I undertook this fight as an untrained and inexperienced beginner. But I did not want to let the barking wolves go unpunished, I did not want to desert truth, I did not want to fail the Church. And since I knew the depth of my ignorance, I unhesitatingly hoped for the light of supreme clarity. *I cast my care upon the Lord and he helped me.*¹ I felt divine help, for words came flowing off themselves – I know not how – and put great pressure upon the miserable Taborites. *The Lord is gracious and merciful*, and he does not heed the voices of the sinners.² I believe, nay I am certain that not my life, but my faith merited to be heard so that I would not become entangled by the reasoning of the Taborites or caught by their sophistry.

[78] Whatever happened, I know that I have said many things then and have written many things now that require correction. What I said then cannot be corrected, for *the word once let slip flies beyond recall.*³ But what I am writing now can easily be corrected before it is published. Therefore I beg and ask you, out of the kindness and affection you have always shown me, to use your exquisite hand and polish this little work and not let it appear before it has been approved by your keen and grave judgment. Farewell, remember and love us. When God and the fates wish it, we shall come to you. From Neustadt, 21 September in the year of the Lord 1451.

¹ Psalms, 54, 23: *Jacta super Dominum curam tuam, et ipse te enutriet*

² Joel, 2, 13

³ Horatius: *Epistolae*, 1.71

Appendix: Conciliar decree *Cum in nonnullis* of 15 June 1415 (Council of Konstanz, XIII Session)¹

Cum in nonnullis mundi partibus quidam temerarie asserere praesumunt populum Christianum debere sacrum eucharistiae sacramentum sub utraque panis et vini specie suscipere, et non solum sub specie panis, sed etiam sub specie vini populum laicum passim communicent, etiam post coenam, vel alias non ieiunum, et communicandum esse pertinaciter asserant, contra laudabilem ecclesiae consuetudinem rationabiliter comprobata, cum tamquam sacrilegam damnabiliter reprobare conantur, a capite incipiendo: hinc est, quod praesens Constantiense concilium generale, in Spiritu sancto legitime congregatum, adversus hunc errorem salutem fidelium providere satagens, matura plurium doctorum tam divini quam humani iuris deliberatione praehabita, decernit et definit, quod licet Christus post coenam instituerit, et suis apostolis ministraverit sub utraque specie panis et vini hoc venerabile sacramentum, tamen, hoc non obstante, sacrorum canonum auctoritas laudabilis et approbata consuetudo ecclesiae servavit et servat, quod huiusmodi sacramentum non debet confici post coenam, neque a fidelibus recipi non ieiunis, nisi in casu infirmatis, aut alius necessitatis, a iure vel ab ecclesia concesso, vel admissio. Et, sicut haec consuetudo ad vitanda aliqua pericula et scandala rationabiliter introducta est, sic potuit simili aut majori ratione introduci et rationabiliter observari, quod, licet in primitiva ecclesia huiusmodi sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utraque specie, tamen postea a conficientibus sub utraque et a laicis tantummodo sub specie panis suscipiatur, cum firmissime credendum sit, et nullatenus dubitandum, integrum Christi corpus et sanguinem tam sub specie panis, quam sub specie vini veraciter contineri. Unde, cum huiusmodi consuetudo ab ecclesia et sanctis patribus rationabiliter introducta et diutissime observata sit, habenda est pro lege, quam non licet reprobare, aut sine ecclesiae auctoritate prohibito innovare. Quapropter dicere, quod hanc consuetudinem aut legem observare, sit sacrilegum aut illicitum, censeri debet erroneum: et pertinaciter asserentes oppositum praemissarum, tamquam haeretici arcendi sunt et graviter puniendi per diocesanos locorum, seu officiales eorum, aut inquisitores haereticae pravitatis, in regnis seu provinciis, in quibus contra hoc decretum aliquid fuerit forsitan attentatum aut praesumptum, iuxta canonicas et legitimas sanctiones, in favorem catholicae fidei, contra haereticos et eorum fautores salubriter adinventas.

Sequitur: Quod nullus presbyter sub poena excommunicationis communicet populum sub utraque specie panis et vini: Item ipsa sancta synodus ...

¹ COD, p. 418 ff.