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Abstract

Having presented Emperor Friedrich III’s declaration of obedience to the new pope, Calixtus III, in August 1455, the emperor’s top diplomat, Bishop Enea Silvio Piccolomini, laid before the pope a proposal for settling the Hussite issue which posed a serious and permanent religious as well as political problem. The proposal was based on discussions between Piccolomini and George Podiebrad, the Regent of Bohemia. It took the form a memorandum, possibly a draft treaty, presented in the oration Res Bohemicas which was either delivered directly as an oration to the pope or formed the basis of a written memorandum. The main points of the proposal were to grant communion under both species to the Bohemians, to refuse the recognition of the Hussite cleric Rokycana as Archbishop of Prague, and to appoint someone else instead. The pope was sympathetic towards finding some pragmatic solution to the Hussite issue, but he did not act on the proposal – either because extreme caution was necessary in this rather complicated matter, which would soon become even more so with the death of the young catholic King Ladislaus, or because his brief pontificate was focused on the more important cause of a crusade against the Turks.
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I. INTRODUCTION
1. Context

The Hussite movement in Bohemia, based on the teachings of Czech reformer Jan Hus, constituted a permanent religious and political crisis.

It was a religious crisis because it was both a schism from the Roman Church, whose authority the Hussites did not recognize, and a heresy since some of its teachings went against the traditional teachings of the Church.

It was a political crisis because it divided the Bohemian population into two factions, a Hussite faction against a Catholic faction that remained loyal to the Roman Church. The consequences were threefold: civil war in Bohemia, wars with the neighbouring countries remaining loyal to Rome, and problems of government since the kings of Bohemia, Emperor Sigismund, Emperor Elect Albrecht II, and his posthumous son Ladislaus were all staunch catholics and thus opposed to the Hussites.

The Council of Basel (1432-1439) negotiated a settlement with the Hussites, the so-called Hussite Compacts, which allowed the Hussites to have communion under both species – one of the central Hussite tenets – but categorically stated that this form of communion was not a condition for salvation.

By the 1450’s it had become quite clear that the communion under both species remained the main claim of the Hussites and that papal confirmation of the Compacts of Prague was a condition sine qua non for reuniting Bohemia with the Roman Church. The Bohemians also continued to insist on the recognition of Jan Rokycana as Archbishop of Prague.

Moreover, the accession of the young Habsburg king, Ladislaus the Posthumous, to the thrones of Bohemia and Hungary and to the position of Archduke of Austria, and thus the fulfilment of Habsburg ambitions of uniting the three realms under Habsburg government, made it politically very desirable to end a situation where the King of Bohemia would not be able to govern that country effectively because of problems with the Hussite population.

It was therefore in the interest of all parties, the Papacy, the Habsburg Dynasty, King Ladislaus, Bohemia, and its neighbours to resolve this conflict and to find a modus vivendi concerning the religious issues.

---

1 Voigt, III, 4, pp. 164-170; Kaminsky, pp. 297-298. For a summary of the situation in Bohemia at the time, see Heymann: George, pp. 3 ff.
2 Ca. 1369-1415
3 Heymann: George, pp. 6-8
Meeting in Beneschau 1451

In 1451, Enea Silvio Piccolomini, imperial top diplomat and Bishop of Siena, was sent to Bohemia to communicate the emperor’s refusal to end his wardship over the then 11 year old boy king, Ladislaus, and send him to Bohemia. In this connection, Piccolomini had talks with the regent of Bohemia, Georg Podiebrad, which were presumably instrumental in establishing an understanding between regent and emperor which turned out to be quite useful to both of them.

Piccolomini also discussed the Hussite issue with Podiebrad with the aim of finding some solution acceptable to all parties. Indeed he formed a rather positive impression of Podiebrad as

*a man of strength and cleverness, even wisdom, whose personal role within the general structure of Bohemia – with her painful divisions and struggles and the heretical infections of her religious mind – he viewed as, at least potentially, highly promising.*

In a letter to Cardinal Carvajal of 21 August 1451, Piccolomini drew this conclusion from his talk with Podiebrad:

*You see what I discussed with George Podiebrad. It is, I believe, of no small importance. For Georg has a great name among the Bohemians and great power in the party which communicates under both species. And from the other party, many are his allies in war. If anybody can draw the cities to a reunion, it is George.*

Piccolomini’s assessment of Podiebrad’s importance was quite correct, but he may have underestimated the strength of Hussite – and Podiebrad’s - attachment to communion under both species as well Hussite support for the top Hussite cleric, Jan Rokycana, whom the Bohemians had promised the Archbishopric of Prague, a promise confirmed both by Emperor Sigismund, by Emperor Elect Albrecht II, and by King Ladislaus. And generally he may have overestimated Podiebrad’s power to effect a reunion between Bohemia and Rome on Rome’s conditions.

---

1 Kaminsky, p. 287-295
2 Heymann: George, p. 51
3 i.e. the Catholic party
4 i.e. with the Roman Church
5 Quoted after Wolkan, II, p. 36: *Intellexistis, que cum Pogiebratio contuli; non sunt, ut mea fert opinion, parvi ponderis; nam Georgius apud Bohemos magnum nomen habet et potens est illius partis, que sub duplici specie communicat; et multi ex alia parte in rebus bellicis juncti sunt ei. Si quis est, qui civitates ad unionem trahere posit, Georgius est*
As a result of Piccolomini’s discussion with Podiebrad and his subsequent report to Rome, Pope Nicolaus wrote a remarkable letter to King Ladislaus which, as reported by Heymann, expressed the pope’s conviction that Podiebrad, and Podiebrad alone, could and would lead the Czech people away from their religious errors to true Catholic orthodoxy. It is also remarkable in that it voices none of the strong reservations which the Curia had so often uttered towards the Compacts. The letter shows that Piccolomini’s view had prevailed in the highest circles of the Roman hierarchy, a view which was to dominate papal policy for the next nine years, though not always with equal conviction.1

Fall of Constantinople, May 1453

After the Fall of Constantinople to the Turks, in May 1453, both emperor and pope endeavoured to organize a military expedition, a crusade, against the Turks. In this context it became highly desirable to have Bohemia join the war effort and to dispose not only of a strong Bohemian army but also of an experienced military leader in the person of Podiebrad. This development strongly reinforced the imperial and papal interest in settling the Hussite issue.

Accession of Ladislaus Posthumous as King of Bohemia, October 1453

In the spring of 1452 all parties had officially recognized Podiebrad as regent2 of Bohemia, and after the coronation of King Ladislaus in Prague, in November 1453, he served as regent appointed by that king. As a condition of Bohemian recognition of his kingship Ladislaus had – like his father King Albrecht and his grandfather, Emperor Sigismund, before him – to accept Bohemian rights to communion under both species and the promise of the archbishopric of Prague to Rokycana.

Imperial Diet of Frankfurt, October 1454

In the aftermath of the Fall of Constantinople, three imperial diets were held to organize a European military response to Turkish expansion into Europe. The second of these diets was held in Frankfurt in October 1454.

---

1 Heymann: George, pp. 87-88
2 “gubernator”
On Podiebrad’s instruction, the Bohemian ambassadors to this diet took the opportunity to further discuss with Piccolomini, in his capacity as papal envoy to Bohemia, the possibilities for a reunion of the Bohemians with Rome.

*Imperial Diet of Wiener Neustadt, Spring 1455*

Podiebrad himself continued these discussions when he attended the third of the three imperial diets, held at the emperor’s residence in Wiener Neustadt in the spring of 1455. In the oration itself, Piccolomoni says about this event:

*Therefore, when this year Georg Podiebrad, Regent of the Kingdom of Bohemia, a most intelligent man with a noble soul and mind, came to the emperor, the emperor desired me to speak with him in order to assess his position and see if it gave any hope of reunion. For this man is one that all Bohemians respect. Obeying the emperor’s command, I spoke with him twice. Our interpreter was Prokop von Rabstein, Chancellor of the Realm, a man with a loyal soul and a pleasant disposition. We discussed and considered many things that I shall not relate now. In the end, the governor’s position was this: the Bohemians want the Apostolic See to confirm their agreements with the Council of Basel. If this is not possible, then they demand that the Roman See should, on its own authority, grant them the same conditions that the synod had conceded and that it should require of all the community of believers to refrain from speaking evil of the Bohemian people and from avoiding them as a people having gone astray. Moreover, they desire that the Apostolic See should appoint a Bishop of Prague from a list of ten or twelve persons. They will not omit Rokycana from the list of nominees. [Sect. 14]*

*If they are informed that their demands are not in vain, they will immediately send eminent orators to offer obedience to Your Holiness, to nominate persons for the diocese of Prague, and to ask for a legate to come to the kingdom in order to consecrate the archbishop and carry out reforms. This is as much as I was able to get from the regent. On his own initiative, the regent himself had confirmed it to me through orators of the kingdom sent to the emperor before the Diet of Frankfurt. He also asked me to write to Pope Nicholas of blessed memory, but I refused to deal with so great an affair in writing, since then questions could not be answered and objections not be refuted. [Sect. 15].*

In conclusion: In the years 1451 and 1455 Piccolomini had two direct discussions with Georg Podiebrad, Regent of Bohemia. The third participant in these discussions was Prokop von Rabenstein, Chancellor of Bohemia, and a close personal friend of Piccolomini. Even though Prokop’s main function was to interpret back and forth between Bohemian and Latin, he

---

1 He was appointed papal nuntius to Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia and neighbouring regions in a bull dated 18 April 1452, cf. Voigt, III, 4, p. 55, 164 ff.
would undoubtedly have informed Piccolomini of his own views on the Bohemian situation in general and the substance of the Bohemian position as expressed by Podiebrad.

Apart from the two face-to-face discussions with Podiebrad, Piccolomini also had discussions with his envoys to the Diet of Frankfurt.

Finally, his understanding of the Bohemian situation was based on personal experiences and exchanges, including with Hussites, during his embassy to Beneschau in 1451.

His views of the Bohemian situation and the possibilities for a solution of the Hussite problem were thus based on direct, serious and high-level diplomatic negotiations.

In the matter of the Hussite problem and the Bohemian Compacts he had formed the opinion that

- the central Bohemian claim concerned the right to continue to communicate under both species and that the fulfilment of this claim was a necessary condition for reunion with Rome, and that

- the Bohemian regent was willing to give up the demand for papal appointment of the Hussite prelate Rokycana as Archbishop of Prague, something which had until then been a stumbling block in Roman-Bohemian relations.

On one crucial point his assessment of Podiebrad’s position may have been faulty: the Bohemian Compacts had stipulated that the practice of communion under both species would be restricted to those already following that practice, whereas all others, including those to be born in the future, would not have it. This meant that the practice of communion under both species would effectively die out in one to two generations. The Bohemians, however, had not previously respected this restriction, imposed by the Council of Basel, and for Podiebrad to publicly agree to it would undoubtedly be completely unacceptable to the Hussites and seriously endanger his position as regent. Still Piccolomini included it in his proposal, either because he had not understood Podiebrad’s personal position on the matter or the unacceptable political consequences, or because these two consummate negotiators and politicians had arrived at a common understanding that this issue could somehow be resolved later.

After the death of Pope Nicolaus and the end of the Diet of Wiener Neustadt, Piccolomini went to Rome, as the emperor’s ambassador, to present the imperial declaration of obedience to the new Pope. He also brought with him the conviction – and possibly also a

---

1 “illi et illae qui talem usum habent, communicabunt sub duplice specie!”, cf. Voigt, III, 4, p. 169
formal proposal - to end the Hussite schism through a papal grant of communion under both species to Bohemia. He did so with the backing – and probably at the express demand - of the two Habsburg sovereigns, Emperor Friedrich III and King Ladislaus of Bohemia and Hungary, Archduke of Austria, and in full understanding with the Bohemian governor, Georg Podiebrad.

When he came to Rome, he found that the new pope was amenable to some kind of settlement of the Bohemian question, though orthodox diehards might still be adamantly against any accommodation with the Bohemians.

Under such conditions, it was not without risks for Piccolomini – at least in terms of his career opportunities, viz. his long hoped for appointment to cardinal – to champion a settlement with the Bohemians based on a papal grant of communion under both species.

It is not known when Piccolomini presented his proposals or gave the oration Res Bohemicas, and he does not himself mention it in his Commentarii nor do his contemporary biographers. This may due to the fact that, as pope, Piccolomini/Pius in 1462 refused to grant Bohemia the right to communion under both species – circumstances had changed greatly since 1455 – and that it would then have been awkward, to say the least, to relate his earlier arguments for the pope to grant this form of communion.

Still, as pope he did include the oration in the collection of orations prepared under his own auspices.

But, whether Piccolomini actually delivered the speech in the form in which it was later included in the collection of his orations or whether the speech is an edited form of a memorandum setting out his thoughts is somewhat uncertain. However, there is no reason to doubt that a reasoned proposal was actually presented by Piccolomini in some form or other and that it influenced the development of the Hussite issue at the papal court, though later events, including the death of the catholic King of Bohemia, Ladislaus the Posthumous, in 1457 would completely change the fundamentals of the whole Bohemian and Hussite situation.

Concerning the oration itself, Voigt called it a “sehr unterrichtende und anziehende Oratio”, while according to Kaminsky it was “a model of rhetorical cogency”.

Podiebrad’s modern biographer, George Heymann wrote:

---

1 Palacky, 4.1., pp. 408 ff
2 Like the quite inflexible Cardinal Juan Carvajal
3 Voigt, III, 4, p. 165: Er trug dem Papste Calixtus eine ausführliche Denkschrift vor, Pläne, die – so schien es wenigstens – die Möglichkeit eines endliches Sieges der Kirche in sich trugen
4 Voigt, III, 4, p. 165, n. 4
5 Kaminsky, p. 297
This great speech, in some ways a masterpiece of intelligent persuasion, went farther in recommending concessions to the Czechs than had ever before been considered by the Church of Rome. Having surveyed the many reasons that coercing the Czechs toward full unity had failed and was bound to fail again (how prophetically right Aeneas here argued against his own later policy and that of his successor) he came to the conclusion, with the use of many of the arguments previously employed by the Czechs themselves in defense of the Chalice, that a confirmation of the Compacts was the wisest policy and the one most likely to lead to true reunification...

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-Neustadt and Aeneas’ great speech to Calixtus III, and especially in the years 1457-1458.¹

Still, there was no settlement of the Hussite problem under Calixtus III.² Though the pope remained sympathetic to a settlement with Bohemia, conditions there developed in such a way that Rome had to be cautious.

Nonetheless, the text of the oration, *Res Bohemicas*, remains as an exquisite testimony not only to Piccolomini’s political pragmatism and diplomatic skills, but also to a clear-sighted understanding of the religious issues involved, and a policy of tolerance in matters of rite remarkable for that period.

Some, like Piccolomini’s 19th century German biographer, Georg Voigt, may believe that Piccolomini’s aims were not mainly those of high policy and religious toleration, but rather concerned his own career advancement and the rewards for settling the Bohemian conflict... mainly in the form a cardinal’s hat. Such motives may indeed not have been absent from Piccolomini’s mind, but there is really no evidence that he did not have higher motives, too.

At any rate, the inclusion of the oration *Res Bohemicas* in the “official” collection of Piccolomi/Pius’ orations is quite remarkable in view of the fact that when this collection was put together Pius had already, as pope, rejected the proposals presented by him in this oration, on behalf of the emperor and the King of Bohemia. This rejection he announced in his papal oration *Superioribus diebus* to the Bohemian ambassadors held on 31 March 1462. The inclusion in the papal collection is even more remarkable when one considers that actually the oration may not have been delivered as an oration, or if it was, it may have been to a very limited audience, and later it appears not to have circulated widely, if at all.

¹ Heymann, p. 165. Cf. also Voigt, III, 4, p. 168
² Voigt, III, 4, p. 170
2. Themes

The main subject of the oration is the possibility of an agreement between the Apostolic See and Bohemia, granting communion under both species as a special right to Bohemia.

Apart from a lucid, if somewhat biased account of the Hussite movement and the events leading up to the present day,¹ the focus of the oration is three-fold:

The first major point is to demonstrate that the issue of communion under both species is not a theological issue in itself and that the grant of this form of communion does not go against Faith. This Piccolomini knew quite well from his days at the Council of Basel where he was close to central people like the papal legate and president of the Council, Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini, a friend of mentor of his.² Says Piccolomini in the oration:

So consider this: do the Bohemians demand something that is against your faith and apostolic tradition? Absolutely not. For those who take the sacrament of the Eucharist under the species of bread and wine neither go against divine commands nor orthodox faith, if only they do it out of devotion and with permission from the Church, and do not claim that they are obeying any command from Our Lord [sect. 40].

The second one is to demonstrate that all other alternatives had failed and were bound to do so in the future. Piccolomini mentions eight alternatives: war, debates, preaching, silence, ecclesiastical censures, withholding priests, financial subsidies, and new treaties. He argues, very reasonably and persuasively against them all and concludes that none of them is suitable for bringing back the Bohemians [sect. 38].

The third one is to cautiously recommend an agreement between the two parties on communion under both species, based on his discussions with the Regent of Bohemia, and possibly presented to the pope in the form of a draft treaty. The recommendation takes this form:

If we grant their demands, we call a powerful people, a large kingdom, and the most ferocious peoples of Europe to the obedience of the Holy Roman Church, we unite the disunited peoples of Bohemia, we give King Ladislaus a tranquil region, we give the

¹ It is probable that Piccolomini did not have a clear conception of the differences between the various branches of Hussitism, cf. Kaminsky (p. 302) according to whom Piccolomini falsely identified Taboritism with Hussitism which led him to misjudge Podiebrad’s position
² Oration “Audivi”, sect. 82: Now, I beseech you, benevolent Father and Cardinal of Santa Sabina: take care not to lose in one day the reputation which you have built over many years, with considerable effort and diligence. Whatever happens, you will always be praised for bringing back the Hussites. (Hic, te precor, humanissime pater cardinalis sanctae Sabinae, intentas, ne quam pluribus annis summo labore summaque vigilantia famam perquisivisti, unus dies eripiat. Quamquam, quidquid eventiat, Bohemicae reductionis te laus assequatur.)
neighbouring peoples peace, we become reconciled with strongly armed people whom we can mobilize against the Turks. Above all, we open the gates of Paradise to an infinite number of souls, and this is what I consider to be the most important of all, for nothing more pleases the Greatest and Best God, who rules in Heaven, than gaining souls [Sect. 43].

A minor issue in the oration, but not unimportant, is Piccolomini’s endeavour to show that the rites of the Church had developed variously in various regions and that this situation did not constitute a problem of Faith. He says:

... ceremonies and solemn holy rites are found to be different in different peoples. The Lord has not told us what 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. It is not for us to oppose those forms of devotion that are not contrary to divine law [sect. 63].

Toleration of ritual diversity was somewhat unusual in that age, though men like Ramon Llull and Piccolomini’s friend since the Basel period, Cardinal Nikolaus of Kues, had begun to develop this theme. The cardinal had even coined the phrase: “Una religio in rituum varietate.” Actually Piccolomini’s statement may have been directly influenced by the cardinal who had written, in his De pace fidei, that “nations are entitled to their own devotions and ceremonies, provided faith and peace be maintained.” This statement should be seen together with Piccolomini’s statement on converting peoples by war:

But, let us assume that the Bohemians will succumb to our military might: would that really be a holy and honourable way of converting Bohemia? The early Church did not draw straying people back to the way by sword or fire, but by kind words and gentle exhortations. It always abhorred bloodshed. Too much blood will colour the earth before Bohemia is subdued by the sword. They will fall, and our people will fall, too. We shall send countless souls to hell before the Bohemians will declare themselves defeated. What is bought by human blood is far too expensive. A mind is not acceptable to God if it only adores the crucified [Lord] because it has been coerced through war. The Bohemians who survive the war may be forced to accept our rites, but they will not do so voluntarily. They will accept our faith through fear alone, and not with their hearts. They will always be thinking about how to escape servitude [Sect. 22].

Toleration of ritual diversity and rejection of war and violence as means to convert other peoples are the signs of the tolerant humanism – coexisting with rather conservative views

---

1 Cf. Watanabe, p. 11
2 Nikolaus of Kues: De pace fidei, p. 62: Permittantur nationes – salva fide et pace – in suis devotionibus et ceremonialibus. Quoted and commented on by Moudarres, p. 46
on politics and the Church - of a man who stood at the crossroads between the middle ages and the modern age.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that as one of his arguments for accepting communion under both species Piccolomini refers to the fact that this practice was accepted by the Council of Basel – before it was dissolved by the pope in 1438. He says:

*If this form of communion were a heretical crime, then those fathers, learned and filled with the zeal of faith, who assembled from the entire world at the Council of Basel, would never have granted it. It is indeed a fact that communion under both species was granted by the authority of this Council [sect. 40].*

Though in another place Piccolomini cautiously states the decision of the Council was made before it was dissolved by Pope Eugenius III, the issue of the Council’s relation to the Papacy was still a very sensitive one. The Council, where Piccolomini had later played an important role, systematically endeavoured to limit the power and means of the papacy, and the papacy had in its turn systematically endeavoured to counter its ideas, influence, and importance. It therefore took some courage for Piccolomini to assert the doctrinal authority of the Council, especially in the matter of the Bohemian Compacts which the Roman Curia had so consistently refused to support.

### 3. Date, place, audience, and format

For the purpose of the present text, it is presumed (but not otherwise documented) that the *Res Bohemicas* was actually delivered in the form of an oration to Pope Calixtus and not just handed in as a written memorandum or kept back by Piccolomini for reasons of expediency – though these possibilities cannot be excluded.\(^1\) If so, the *terminus post quem* of the oration is the date of the oration in which Piccolomini declared the empire’s obedience to pope Calixtus, i.e. 13 August 1455, since he could not publicly address the pope in the emperor’s name before the declaration of obedience. The *terminus ante quem* is his appointment as cardinal on 18 December 1456 since the titles of the text in the manuscripts do not refer to him as cardinal, but only as Bishop of Siena, and since he speaks of the Cardinals’ College as an outsider. The time between those two dates he spent mainly in Rome, except for the period from March\(^2\) to June 1456 where he was on a peace mission for the City of Siena to King Alfonso V of Naples. So, the oration must either have been given in the period from

---

\(^1\) Heymann seem to believe that the oration was actually delivered as an oration, cf. Heymann: *George*, p. 165. It is not mentioned in Rainaldus, nor in the *Commentarii*, nor by Pius’ contemporary biographers, but it was included in the collection of orations prepared under Pius’ direct supervision

\(^2\) Voigt, III, 4, p. 189
August 1455 to March 1456 or in the period from June to December 1456. In the oration itself, Piccolomini mentions that “when this year Georg Podiebrad, Regent of the Kingdom of Bohemia ... came to visit the emperor ...” [sect. 13]. Podiebrad arrived at the Imperial Court in Wiener Neustadt on 18 March 1455. This means that the oration, if indeed it was held as such, was most probably given during the first of the two periods.2

The place was the city of Rome, and as the oration is addressed to the pope it would have been given before the pope in the Apostolic Palace. Piccolomini does not in the speech refer to the circumstances, and the whole subject matter was so delicate that the oration might not have been given in a meeting of the consistory but under more private forms.

The format is clearly that of a formal oration addressed to the pope in an errand entrusted to Piccolomini by the two Habsburg monarchs, though he did in this context not style himself as their ambassador.

4. Text

The text is only known in the form in which it was included in the collection of Piccolomini/Pius’ orations, prepared under his own direct supervision as pope in 1462. It is not known to which extent it was revised in this context.

4.1. Manuscripts

The oration is contained in all seven manuscripts containing the papal collection:

*Lucca, Bibl. Cap. Feliniana*
544, ff. 117r – 131v (G)

*Mantova, Bibl. Com.*
100. A-IV-26, 198v-228r (F)

*Milano, Bibl. Ambrosiana*
I.97 inf., ff. 191v - 208r (E)

---

1 Georg Podiebrad arrived at the Diet of Wiener Neustadt on 18 March 1455, cf. Palacky, Geschichte, 4.1
2 There is some doubt as to the calendar year used by Piccolomini in various contexts, since various systems were used by the European chancelleries and one of them had the new year start on April 1
4.2. Editions


4.3. Present edition

Text:

The present edition is based on all seven manuscripts containing the oration, with the Chis.I.VIII 284 as the lead manuscript.

Presentation:

The Latin text and English translation are presented synoptically, with the Latin text on the left side and the English text on the right side.

Quotations (and semi-quotations) are given in italics.

Pagination:

Pagination is from the lead manuscript.
Textual apparatus:

In the main text the readings from the lead version are preferred unless readings from other manuscripts are clearly better. Variants are placed in the textual apparatus, with the exception of standard orthographical variants, see below.

Variants from B and E are given in blue. Variants from D/G are given in red, and from G alone in green.

Margin notes indicating content are included in the textual apparatus.

Orthography and punctuation:

Standard variations from contemporary lexical practice are not indicated in the textual apparatus. For such variants, the reader is referred to the orthographical profiles of the mss., given in the bibliography volume of the collected edition.¹

The punctuation is the editor’s own.

Translation:

The translation is intended to be a close rendition of the meaning of the Latin text, but not to directly transpose Latin grammatical forms which would result in a stilted and convoluted text.²

Translations of quotations from classical authors are from the Loeb Classical Library (Digital), unless otherwise stated. Translations of quotations from the Bible are from the Douay-Reims translation of the Vulgate into English.
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II. TEXT AND TRANSLATION
Oratio Aeneae Silvii Piccolominei, episcopi Senensis, qui postea pontificatum maximum adeptus Pius II. appellatus est, habita coram Calixto papa III de compactatis Bohemorum¹

[1] {68r} Res bohemicas ad te hodie perfero, beatissime pater, res barbaras, res obscuras, ac perplexas nimis, non tamen indignas tuis auribus, siquidem salus animarum in his quaeritur, et maximi principes eas promovent, divus Fridericus, Romanorum imperator, et patruelis ejus, inclytus Hungariae ac Bohemiae rex Ladislaus: imperator quia² feuendum ejus Bohemia est; Ladislaus³ qui⁴ regnum Bohemicum paterno jure atque avito possidet. Itaque cupiunt ambo regionem illam pacatam esse ac cum sancta Romana ecclesia concordem. Cum enim longo jam aevo seorsum ab ecclesia catholica⁵ gens Bohemica vixerit, optat uterque princeps te illum esse pontificem, qui suo tempore nobilissimum atque amplissimum regnum reliquo Christianitatis annectas corpori. Digna profecto res, in qua tua beatitudo nervos intendat suos. Nec fortasse negotium est, quod diligentius isto jam curare ⁶ oporteat, si quemadmodum ostensio est, contra Turcos arma paramus. Nisi enim res domi quiescant, non est tutum pugnare foris. At regnum Bohemiae in medio nationis Germanicae situm et undique cinctum Theutonibus, quamvis quiescere nunc et pacem cum vicinis habere videatur; non tamen plena securitas est, nisi res ecclesiasticae componantur.

¹ Oratio ... Bohemorum : Enee Silvii episcopi Senensis oratio ad Calistum pontificem pro compactatis Bohemorum
D, G
² qui corr. from quia A; qui F, D
³ imperator quia ... Ladislaus omit. C, B, E
⁴ qui corr. from quia A, C
⁵ seorsum ab ecclesia catholica : ab ecclesia catholica seorsum G
⁶ jam curare : curare jam G
Oration of Enea Silvio Piccolomini, Bishop of Siena, ¹ who after he became pope was called Pius II, given before Pope Calixtus III, on the Bohemian Compacts

0. Introduction

[1] Holy father! The Bohemian matter that I lay before you today is barbarian, obscure, and inordinately complex. However, it is not unworthy of your ears since it concerns the salvation of souls and is supported by great princes, Friedrich, Holy Roman Emperor, ² and his nephew Ladislaus, King of Bohemia:³ the emperor because Bohemia belongs to his feudal domain, and Ladislaus because he possesses the Kingdom of Bohemia by right of his father and grandfather. They both desire this region to be at peace and in harmony with the Holy Roman Church. But since the Bohemian people has for a long time been separated from the Catholic Church, both princes wish for you⁴ to be the pontiff who, in his time, reunites this noble and great kingdom with the rest of Christianity.⁵ This cause is truly one that merits the full attention of Your Holiness. Indeed, there may be no other enterprise more urgent than this one since we are now preparing for war with the Turks. For if there is no peace at home it is not safe to fight abroad. The Kingdom of Bohemia is situated in the middle of the German Nation and is surrounded by Germans on all sides. Though it appears to be tranquil for now and to have peace with its neighbours, security cannot be complete unless the ecclesiastical issue is settled.

¹ The oration was evidently held before Piccolomini was appointed cardinal, on 18 December 1456
² Friedrich III of Habsburg (1415 – 1493): Duke of Austria (as Friedrich V) from 1424. Elected King of Germany and Holy Roman Emperor in 1440, crowned in Rome in 1452
³ Ladislaus the Posthumous of Habsburg (1440 – 1457): Archduke of Austria from 1440, King of Hungary from 1444 and King of Bohemia from 1453 to his death
⁴ Calixtus III [Alfons de Borja] (1378 – 1458): Pope from 1455 to his death in 1458. The first Borgia Pope
⁵ The Hussites were a Christian movement following the teachings of Czech reformer Jan Hus (c. 1369–1415) Their main tenets were expressed in the four Articles of Prague, see below. Hussitism was one of the forerunners of the Protestant Reformation
[2] Huc accedit infinitarum paene animarum perditio, quae singulis diebus e corporibus commigrantes catervatim in Gehennae\textsuperscript{1} mancipium deferuntur. Est enim maxima pars regni Bohemiae extra tuam oboedientiam, extra ecclesiam Dei, extra arcam domini, extra quam non est salus regnante diluvio. Cogitandum est igitur de tanti regni salute; studendum est, ne filii ecclesiae pereant, ne filia, quae potest esse dilectissima matris, ultra complexus fugiat, ne gens fortissima Bohemorum aberret amplius. Atque hoc est quod imperator quodque Ladislaus ex te summa prece deposcunt.

[3] Quomodo autem et quibus conditionibus quaerenda sit hujus regni reductio, non est eorum tuae sanctitati praescribere. Tu patris es loco et matris, tu magister, tu medicus populi Christiani, dominici gregis pastor. Tuum est cogitare, quibus aberrantes filios ad te revoces. Novit providus pater abeunti filio, quo supercilio sit obviandum; novit pia mater, quo lacte nutriat fastiditum infantem; novit cautus magister, qua mansuetudine retrahat alienatum discipulum; novit eruditus medicus, aegroto quae medicina conveniat; novit bonus pastor, quae suis armentis salubria sint pascua. Nec te fugit, quibus blanditiis, quibus sponsionibus allicienda sit natio Bohemorum. Illud certum est, quia nihil\textsuperscript{68v} omittere convenit, propter quod isti populo salubriter consulatur, idque quo pacto peragas, tuo gravissimo judicio remittunt et Caesar et Ladislaus. Hoc tantum quaerunt, ut tandem Bohemicum regnum Romanæ concilietur\textsuperscript{2} ecclesiae, et nunc potissime, quando hujus provinciae fortissimis viris contra Turcos egemus.

\textsuperscript{1} Gehennae E
\textsuperscript{2} reconcilietur C
[2] Moreover, there is the loss of an almost infinite number of souls which every day leave their body and are brought to slavery in Hell. For the greater part of Bohemia lives outside your obedience, outside the Church, and outside Noah’s Ark, outside which there is no salvation while deluge reigns. Therefore we must consider the salvation of this great realm. We must avoid that the sons of the Church perish, that she who could be the most beloved daughter of the Church flees her embrace, and that the mighty people of Bohemia persists in its error. This is what the emperor and Ladislaus urgently request of you.

[3] It is not up to them to prescribe to Your Holiness how and on what conditions this realm should be reunited with the Church. You are in the father’s and mother’s place, you are the teacher, you are the doctor of the Christian people, you are the shepherd of the Lord’s flock. Your task it is to consider by what means and promises you may bring the erring sons back to you. The caring father knows how to frown at a son who wants to leave. The pious mother knows the milk to use in feeding the squeamish child. The prudent teacher knows how to draw back an estranged pupil through kindness. The learned physician knows what medicine to use with a patient. The good shepherd knows what pastures are good for his herd. You know which blandishments and promises to use to lure back the Bohemian Nation. Certainly, nothing should be left undone that may be salutary for this people. How you do it, the emperor and Ladislaus leave to your own earnest judgment. They only request that the realm of Bohemia be finally reunited with the Roman Church, and especially now when we need the strong men from this province [in the fight] against the Turks.¹

¹ After the Fall of Constantinople and the German failure to mobilize a European military response to Turkish expansion into Europe, the Papacy was preparing to undertake a Christian crusade against the Turks. The participation of the militant and warlike Bohemians might very well be crucial to such a venture.
Ceterum, quia de tollenda Bohemiae labe curam gerimus, duo principaliter nobis exponenda sunt. Alterum quomodo regnum hoc labefactum sit; alterum quo pacto purgari et ad pristinam possit reduci sanitatem. Atque in his duobus tota nostra consumetur oratio.

Florentissimum olim hoc regnum fuit, eorum, qui sunt in occidenti, potentatuum nulli cedens. Sub Carolo autem ejus nominis quarto Romanorum imperatore ad summum venerat. Inaestimabiles illic opes erant, incredibles deliciae, potentissimi nobiles, honoratissimi sacerdotes, urbes munitissimae, palatia nedum magnatum, sed mediocrum\(^2\) civium ad regalem magnificentiam fastigiata, templa et monasteria supra quam dici queat ornata et opulenta, argenti inexhaustae\(^3\) minerae\(^4\), mercatura praedives, splendida militia, schola philosophiae nobilis, quasi reginarum ita matronarum habitus.

---

1 Qualis fuit Bohemia sub Carolo IIII marg. note D, G
2 mediocrum C
3 inexhausto corr. from inexhauste E
4 munere B, E
Since we are dealing with how to end the Bohemian debacle, we must talk about two matters: firstly, how this realm fell into error; and secondly, how it may be cleansed and restored to its former health. My whole oration will deal with these two issues.

1. Hussite schism

1.0. Former glory of Bohemia

There was a time when this kingdom flourished, equalling all the other Western powers. It reached its summit under Karl IV, Emperor of the Romans. At that time its wealth was inestimable, its delights incredible, its nobles powerful, its priests honoured, its cities fortified, the palaces of the magnates and even of ordinary citizens adorned with royal splendour, the temples and monasteries undescribably adorned and opulent, the silver mines inexhaustible, the commerce flourishing, the army splendid, the school of philosophy outstanding, and the apparel of matrons like that of queens.

---

1 Karl IV of Luxembourg (1316 – 1378): second King of Bohemia from the House of Luxembourg. Elected King of the Romans and Holy Roman Emperor in 1346. Crowned emperor in Rome in 1355
2 i.e. the University of Prague, founded by Emperor Karl IV in 1348
[6] Sed caduca sunt omnia sub luna, nulla potentia longa, prona est ignominia sequi gloriam. Cecidit alta Bohemorum superbia. Non tamen externa manu concussa est; nulli vicinorum datum est has opes evertere. Ipsa sibi manus conscivit Bohemia; non tuli seipsam gens elevata nimis. Nam cum pax divitias, divitiae superbia luxumque peperissent, saevire fortuna ac miscere omnia coepit. Sub Venceslao, Caroli filio, rege vinoso et admodum deside, paulo ante Constantiense concilium, surrexerunt in Bohemia viri pestiferi presudoprophetae, qui non ferentes otium regni et florentem rerum statum, summo studio conati sunt apostolicam sedem et omne sacerdotium in commune odium trahere. Neque fefellit eos opinio; nam magistri prurientibus ² facti, cum sacerdotes inique possidere divitias praedicassent, tum crimen illud eis impinxerunt, quia necessariam communionem calicis plebi subtraherent. Populi vero simplices et avari suapte natura, sub spe magni lucri, et vana religione decepti, a nitore nostrae religionis et puritate fidei facile recesserunt. Divinum enim eucharistiae sacramentum sub specie panis et vini petentes, cum non obtinerent, in Christos domini manus injecerunt³, alios occiderunt, alios mutilarunt, alios in exilium expulerunt, bona ecclesiarum invaserunt, divinas aedes incenderunt, nobilitatem quoque crudeler persecuti, quae facta eorum abhorrere videbatur. Omne regnum caedibus, rapinis, atque incendiis oppleverunt.

1 Sub Venceslao rege marg. note D; sub Venceslao rege orta est heresis marg. note G
2 prurientibus corr. ex prurientes C
3 iniecerunt G
1.1. Hussite movement

[6] However, all things under the moon are fleeting, no power lasts long, and disgrace quickly follows glory. Also the overweening pride of the Bohemians was brought down, but it was not done by the hands of others. It was not the neighbours who overthrew this wealthy people, no, Bohemia was brought low by its own hand. Indeed, this great people could not bear itself. For when peace had bred wealth and wealth had bred pride and soft living, Fortune began to rage against them and confound all. Under Wenceslaus, son of Karl and a bibulous and lazy king,¹ and shortly before the Council of Constance,² evil men and pseudoprophets rose up in Bohemia. Not tolerating the peace of the kingdom and the flourishing state of things, they strove with all their might to make the Apostolic See and all the priesthood hateful to the people. And public opinion followed them. For these teachers, acquiring itching ears,³ preached that it was bad for priests to possess wealth, and they accused them of the crime of denying the necessary⁴ communion of the chalice to the people. The common people, simple and greedy by nature, hoping for great gains, and deceived by the false religion, easily deserted the splendour of our religion and the purity of our faith. They demanded the divine sacrament of the Eucharist both under the species of bread and wine⁵, and when they did not get it, they laid their hands on the anointed⁶ of the Lord, killing some and mutilating or exiling others. They invaded ecclesiastical properties, set fire to religious buildings, and cruelly persecuted the nobility which was appalled by their acts. They filled the whole kingdom with murder, pillage, and burning.

¹ Wenceslaus (1361 – 1419): King of Bohemia (as Wenceslaus IV) from 1363 and by election, German King (formally King of the Romans) from 1376. He was the third Bohemian and third German monarch of the Luxembourg dynasty. Deposed in 1400 as King of the Romans, but continued to rule as Bohemian king until his death
² Council of Constance (1414-1418): Deposing three rival popes, it restored the unity of the Church
³ 2. Timothy, 4, 3
⁴ i.e. necessary for salvation
⁵ i.e. bread and wine
⁶ 1. Chronicles, 16, 22; Psalms, 104, 15
Princeps autem hujus haeresis ac seductor Bohemici populi habitus est Johannes Hus¹, qui
Johannes Anser appellari potest, obscuro loco natus, lingua promptus, et astu praeditus,
praeter sophismata quaedam dialectica, et lecturam biblicam, ac Johannis Wicleff Anglici
damnata volumina paucis imbutus litteris, quem qui secuti sunt, Hussitarum nomen
acceperunt. Et in Bohemia quidem civitates et villae universae (paucas adimo) in errorem
Hussitarum prolapsae sunt. Nobilitas fere omnis in fide permansit. Contra in Moravia² actum
est: errantibus nobilibus, plebes in sanitate religionis perstiter. Sed horum conditio dura et
asperrima fuit, quorum multi pro legibus paternis et³ integritate religionis periere, inter
Christianos facti martyres, cum haereticorum quotidianiurgerentur insultibus.

¹ Johannes Hus marg. note A, D, G
² Moravia marg. note D, G
³ ac C
[7] The leader of this heresy who seduced the Bohemian people is considered to be John Hus (who may also be called John Goose\(^1\)), a talkative and cunning man of lowly origins. He had little learning apart from some dialectical sophisms, readings from the bible, and the condemned books of John Wycliff, the Englishman. His followers were called Hussites. In Bohemia almost all cities and towns fell into the Hussite error, while almost all the nobility remained true to the Faith. The opposite happened in Moravia: there the nobles fell into error, while the people remained true to salutary Faith. But the condition [of the faithful] was hard and bitter: many were killed for the laws of their fathers and the integrity of religion; they joined the Christian martyrs, while every day having to suffer the attacks of the heretics.

---

\(^1\) Jan Hus (c. 1369 – 1415): Czech priest, philosopher, early Christian reformer and Master at Karl University in Prague. Inspired by the teachings of John Wycliffe. “Goose” is a word play connected with his name.
[8] Interea magna synodus apud Constantiam, Alamannorum urbem, congregata est, ad quam vocati Johannes Hus, de quo paulo ante mentionem fecimus, et Jeronimus, ejus discipulus, vir facundus et doctus, sed spiritu perversitatis imbutus, dum sua tueri\(^1\) pertinaciter\(^2\) ingerere quam humiliter aliena discere volunt, igne cremati sunt. Cinis eorum clanculum raptus et in Bohemiam vectus intra martyrum reliquias venerationem obtinuit. Post haec arma cum Bohemis temptata: saepe Sigismundus imperator, saepe alii Theutoniae principes adversus Bohemos duxere procinctum. Cardinales quoque, ex hac curia missi, numerosas militum copias in Bohemiam\(^3\) duxere. Sed qualis reditus fuerit, pudet dicere. Non\(^4\) tam foeda Xersis ex Graecia refertur fuga, quam turpes atque ignominiosas\(^5\) nostrorum exercituum ex Bohemia regressiones vidimus. Fugerunt nostri nemine persequeunte, et repleta bonis omnibus castra, quos nusquam\(^6\) viderant, hostibus reliquerunt. Et quamvis aliquando Bohemos quoque belli fortuna deluserit, numquam tamen tanta clades illata Bohemis est, quin recepta major ab his fuerit.

---

\(^1\) *omit. B, E*
\(^2\) *atque add. in marg. D; atque add. G*
\(^3\) *Bohemia E*
\(^4\) *Johanne Chrysostomo hoc cooperante marg. note. G*
\(^5\) *ignominiosas A, C; ignominiosas corr. from ignominosas B; ignominiosa E*
\(^6\) *nunquam B, E*
1.2. Council of Constance

[8] In the meantime a great synod\(^1\) assembled in Constance, a German city. To this synod were summoned Jan Hus, whom we have just mentioned, and Jeronimus\(^2\), his disciple, a man who was learned and eloquent, but full of the spirit of perversity. Because they stubbornly wanted to spread their own tenets rather than humbly learn from others, they were burnt. In secret, their ashes were taken and brought to Bohemia where they are now venerated among the relics of the martyrs. After these [events], military measures were tried against the Bohemians. Often did Emperor Sigismund and other German princes lead armies against the Bohemians. Cardinals, too, were sent by the Curia with great forces against Bohemia.\(^3\) But I blush to tell you how they returned. The flight of Xerxes\(^4\) from Greece was not as shameful as the contemptible and disgraceful retreats of our armies from Bohemia we have seen. Our people fled even though nobody was pursuing them, and they left their camps, filled with all kinds of goods, to enemies they had not even seen. And although the fortune of war did sometimes desert the Bohemians, they never suffered as great a defeat as the one they inflicted on us.

\(^1\) i.e. council

\(^2\) Jeronimus of Prague [Jeroným Pražský] (1379 – 1416): Bohemian church reformer and one of the chief followers of Jan Hus. Burned for heresy at the Council of Constance

\(^3\) Among them Giuliano Cesarini (1398-1444): created cardinal by Pope Martin V in 1426. Papal president of the Council of Basel until 1437. Died at the Battle of Varna against the Turks in 1444. Mentor and friend of Piccolomini

\(^4\) Xerxes I the Great (519–465 BC): fourth of the kings of the Achaemenid Empire. Ruled from 486 BC until his murder in 465 BC. Notable for his invasion of Greece in 480 BC and his subsequent defeat
Intercessit deinde Basiliense concilium. Huc legati Bohemorum accersuntur, oblata facultate, quaecumque voluerint\textsuperscript{1}, et dicendi et disputandi; nam querimonia eorum erat, quod inauditi per Constantiense concilium damnati fuissent. Quattuor\textsuperscript{2} tunc notissimi articuli per Bohemos recipiuntur, quos regni nomine tueri volunt: de praedicatione verbi Dei, quam nulli prohibendam arbitrabant; de peccatis publicis, quae nusquam permittenda quacumque ob causam existimabant; de dominio c\textsuperscript{3}leri, quod interdictum asserebant; de communione calicis, quam laicis etiam necessariam et de praecepto domini judicabant. Disputatum est super his quinquaginta diebus, sed noluerunt vinci Bohemi, cum vincerentur. Haereticis enim, etsi mente confundantur, cum tamen verbis res agitur, verba non desunt. Synodus vero, cum nec armis vinci nec disputationibus trahi posse Bohemos animadverteret, ad tertiam, quae restabat, viam confugit: tractatum quasi inter \{69v\} amicos est.

\textsuperscript{1} voluerint B, E
\textsuperscript{2} Bohemorum quatuor articuli marg note D, G
\textsuperscript{3} add. in marg. A; omit. C, F
1.3. Council of Basel

[9] Later came the Council of Basel. Legates of the Bohemians were summoned and given the liberty to say and discuss anything they wanted, for they complained that they had been condemned by the Council of Constance without being heard. The legates presented the four well-known articles\(^1\) which, in the name of their kingdom, they wanted to safeguard. The first concerned preaching the word of God which they thought should be allowed all men; the second concerned public sins which they considered should not be tolerated for any reason whatsoever; the third concerned secular government by priests which they claimed was forbidden; and the fourth concerned the communion of the chalice which they considered to be necessary also for laypeople and to be based on a command of the Lord. These articles were discussed for 50 days, but the Bohemians did not want to admit defeat even when they were in fact defeated. For as long as matters are discussed in words, heretics do not lack words even if they are defeated by reason. When the synod saw that the Bohemians could not be defeated by arms or by discussions, it took refuge in the third way remaining, that of amicable discussion.

---

\(^1\) The Four Articles of Prague: (1) Freedom of preaching; (2) Communion under both species, also for the laity; (3) Poverty and no secular power for priests; (4) Punishment for mortal sins, especially public ones. Note that Piccolomini in this list omits the poverty of priests. Cf. Heymann: *John*, p. 148
[10] Sed cum res Basileae concludi
non posset, missi legati sunt in Bohemiam, viri sapientes, et qui divinae atque humanae legis peritiores habebantur, qui petitionibus Bohemorum ad verum discussis nonnulla cum his capitula confecerunt, quae compactata dicuntur. Horum vigore abdicant ab sese Bohemi quosvis articulos erroneos, illo dempto, qui de communione duplici nuncupatur. Neque enim super hoc legati et Bohemi convenire potuerunt, cum illi ex praecepto salvatoris communionem calicis debere populo dicerent, nostri negarent. Conventum tamen inter eos est hanc disceptationem ad concilii decisionem remitti, Bohemos autem in omnibus universalis ecclesiae ritum resumere debere, excepta sacramenti communione, quam sub duplici specie his, qui usum haberent, ex auctoritate universalis ecclesiae concedi voluerunt. Intervenerunt et aliae pleraeque pactiones, quarum meminisse non est modo necessum.

---

1 res Basileae concludi : Basileae concludi res G
2 Compactata marg. note D, G
3 quovis G
4 spe F
1.4. Negotiations in Prague

[10] As the matter could not be settled in Basel, the council sent legates to Bohemia, wise men known as experts both in divine and human law. After intense discussions about the Bohemian petitions, they worked out the four paragraphs called the *compacts*. By virtue of these *compacts*, the Bohemians renounced a number of erroneous tenets, except the one concerning the so-called double communion. For the legates and the Bohemians were unable to agree on this issue since the Bohemians claimed that the communion of the chalice is owed to the laypeople by command of the Lord, whereas ours denied it. They agreed, however, to refer this dispute to the decision of the council. Otherwise, the Bohemians should restore all the rites of Universal Church except the sacrament of communion, which they demanded should be granted, by authority of Universal Church, under both species to those who already had this usage. There were several other agreements, but there is no need to mention them here and now.
Habuit sancta synodus ratum¹, quod legati fecerent; nam quamvis Theutones³ adversari viderentur, aliis nationibus non placuit infinitas paene animas perditum iri communione negata. Constabat enim paucis exceptis, qui mentis inflatione contra patrum instituta surrexerant, Bohemicum populum errare ⁴ seductum. Declaravit deinde synodus communionem calicis quoad populares non⁵ cadere sub praecepto domini, nec licere laicis illam sibi auctoritate propria usurpare, misitque⁶ Philibertum⁷, Nortmanicae Constantiae pontificem, eruditum et integrum virum, qui legatione inter Bohemos utens, favente Sigismundo Caesare, qui per hunc modum et Pragam et regnum recuperavit, in usum compactata redegit. Intervenerunt et aliae inter regni communitatem et Sigismundum pactiones, quibus ecclesia Pragensis Johanni de Rokezana promissa est.

¹ gratum D, G  
² fecerunt C, G  
³ Theutones adversi marg. note D, G  
⁴ errore G  
⁵ omit. D, G  
⁶ misit F  
⁷ Promubertum F  

1.5. Bohemian Compacts

[11] The Holy Synod approved the actions of the legates. Though the Germans opposed it, the other nations did not accept that an almost infinite number of souls should perish because communion was denied to them. For it was found that except for some who had resisted the decisions of the fathers out of arrogance, the Bohemian people had only erred because they had been deceived and seduced. The synod then declared that the Lord had not made the communion of the chalice obligatory for the common people, and that laypeople could not take up that practice on their own authority. With the support of Emperor Sigismund, who thus recovered both Prague and the kingdom, it [then] sent Philibert, Bishop of Coutances in Normandy, a learned and upright man, as its legate to the Bohemians. He wrote a version of the Compacts for general use. There were also agreements between the community of the kingdom and Sigismund by which the diocese of Prague was promised to Jan Rokycana.3

---

1 Sigismund of Luxemburg (1368 – 1437): King of Hungary and Croatia from 1387, King of Bohemia from 1419, and and crowned Holy Roman Emperor in 1433
2 Philibert de Montjeu (1374 – 1439) : Bishop of Countances from 1424 to his death. Prominent participant in the Council of Basel
3 Jan Rokycana (c. 1396 – 1471): theologist and leading Hussite cleric
[12] Post haec exortae sunt notissimae illae et omni ecclesiae graves inter summum pontificem Eugenium et patres, qui Basileae remanserant, contentiones. Sigismundus viam universae carnis ingressus est; Bohemi de rege discordes, alii Albertum, Sigismundi generum vocavere, alii ad Polonos\(^1\) defecere. Et\(^2\) quamvis superior Albertus regnum obtinere videretur, numquam tamen vel Tapsco vel Thaboritae in ejus potestatem venere. Alberto vitam\(^3\) functo regnum confusius fuit, cum filii ejus Ladislai pupillarem aetatem universi contemnerent\(^4\). Itaque sicuti res temporales ita\(^5\) et ecclesiasticae neglectae sunt, et in priores errores itum. Petita\(^6\) est tamen\(^7\) aliquotiens et ab Eugenio et a Nicolao, tuis antecessoribus, compactatorum confirmatio, sed cum Rokezana simul in archiepiscopum efflagitaretur, anima nigra et pestilens, abhorruit apostolica sedes alterum cum altero simul\(^70r\) admittere. Et licet Johannes Sancti Angeli cardinalis, natione Hispanus, illuminatae mentis et animi rectissimi pater, regni caput Pragam petierit, salutem gentis et unionem quaerens, Nicolaus autem Sancti Petri ejusdem ordinis praealtus, homo Alamannus, et non minus doctrina quam vitae puritate memorabilis, ad metas regni eadem ipsa de\(^8\) causa pervenerit, numquam tamen de concordia verbum audire Bohemi voluerunt, nisi pontifex Rokezana promitteretur.

---

1 Polones A, D, F; Polonos corr. ex Polones C
2 omit. D, G
3 vita B, E
4 universi contemnerent : contemnerent universi G
5 sic G
6 Petita compactorum confirmatio marg. note D, G
7 est tamen : tamen est C
8 omit. G
1.6. Later developments

[12] After these events arose those well-known conflicts, harmful to the whole Church, between Pope Eugenius¹ and the Fathers who had remained in Basel. Sigismund went the way of all flesh, and the Bohemians disagreed on who should be king. Some elected Albrecht,² Sigismund’s son-in-law, and others defected to the Polish. Though Albrecht prevailed in obtaining the kingdom, he never got Tapsco or the Taborites³ in his power. When Albrecht died, the kingdom was in a state of great confusion as all rejected his son Ladislaus because he was an infant. Ecclesiastical matters were neglected in the same way as the secular, and the Bohemians returned to their former errors. However, under your predecessors Eugenius and Nicolaus,⁴ they several times applied for confirmation of the Compacts. But as, at the same time, they begged for Rokycana, that black and pestiferous soul, as their archbishop, the Apostolic See shrank from granting one with the other. Juan, Cardinal of Sant’ Angelo,⁵ a Spaniard and an insightful man of great integrity, arrived in Prague, the capital of the kingdom, seeking the salvation and the reunification of the people.⁶ And Nikolaus of San Pietro,⁷ also of the order of cardinals, a German notable both for his learning and purity of life, arrived at the frontiers of the kingdom in the same cause.⁸ Still, the Bohemians did not want to hear any talk of peace before they had been promised Rokycana as bishop.

---

¹ Eugenius IV [Gabriele Condulmer]: 1383 – 1447): Pope from 1431 to his death
² Albrecht II of Habsburg (1397 – 1439): Archduke of Austria. King of Hungary and Croatia from 1437. Uncrowned King of Bohemia. Elected Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire in 1438, but died the following year
³ Taborites: Hussite sect named after their main city, Tabor, a Bohemian city founded in 1420 by the most radical wing of the Hussites, who soon became known as the Taborites
⁴ Nicolaus V [Tommaso Parentucelli] (1397 – 1455): Pope from 6 March 1447 until his death
⁵ Juan Carvajal (1399/1400 – 1469): Appointed Cardinal by Pope Eugenius IV in 1446. His title church in Rome was Sant’ Angelo
⁶ Cardinal Juan Carvajal’s visit to Prague in may 1448 was an “utter fiasco”, cf. Heymann: George, pp. 36-41: Carvajal’s mission was a major turning point in the development of this phase of Bohemian history. Its failure illuminated more clearly than any event since 1436 the precarious and artificial structure of the peace, or rather armistice. between Czech Hussitism and the Roman Church (p. 40-41)
⁷ Nikolaus of Kues [Nicholas of Cusa] (1401 – 1464): German philosopher, theologian, and jurist. Appointed cardinal in 1448. His title church in Rome was San Pietro in Vincoli
⁸ After the meeting in Beneschau, another cardinal, Nikolaus of Kues, now papal legate to Germany and Bohemia, tried his hand at a solution of the Bohemian schism, but nothing came of it, partly because he came under criticism from the Franciscan preacher, John of Capistran, cf. Heymann: George, p. 65-80
[13] Ladislaus exinde, cum adolevisset, in Bohemiam veniens, quamvis honore summo et incredibili populorum laetitia exciperetur, coronamque regni fавentibus cunctorum animis assequeretur, usum tamen communionis et Rokezanae spem pontificatus auferre non potuit. Sed adnитente gubernatore suo, facta est omnis Bohemia quasi unus populus, permissо cuique ritu suo еt poena constitueta adversus eum, qui super haeresi partem alteram criminetur¹. Atque in hunc modum lupus cum agno² et pardus cum catulo leonis accumbit. Sed dicunt "Pax", et non est vera pax, quando cor eorum non est cum Deo rectum, qui suas observantias absque sedis apostolicae permissione sequuntur. Atque ita regnum illud in hanc usque diem suis moribus utens et peregrinis opinionibus consentiens, tantum a veritate remotum! quantum ab ecclesia Romana sequestratum remansit. Hoc aegre habet imperatorem et regem; neque enim terra Bohemia est, quae contemnenda sit, neque populus ille est, quem perdere debeamus.

¹ criminaretur corr. from criminetur D; criminaretur G
² magno F
1.7. Present situation

[13] Later, when Ladislas had grown up, he came to Bohemia. Though he was received with the highest honours and incredible joy among the people and obtained the crown of Bohemia with the assent of all,¹ he was not able to quash their hopes concerning communion and the appointment of Rokycana as bishop. But due to the efforts of the regent,² Bohemia became as one people: all were allowed to follow their own rite, and they decreed that all who accused the other party of heresy should be punished. And in this way the lamb lies with the wolf and the leopard with the lion’s pup.³ But although they say “Peace”, there is no true peace,⁴ for their heart is not sincerely with God as long as they use their own rites without the permission of the Apostolic See. Thus the kingdom to this day follows its own customs and holds alien opinions. They are as far from the truth as they are remote from the Roman Church. The emperor and the king do not accept this situation; and the country of Bohemia certainly is not insignificant, and this people is not one that we should lose.

---

¹ November 1453
² “gubernator”. Georg Podiebrad
³ Isaiah, 11, 16: The wolf shall dwell with the lamb: and the leopard shall lie down with the kid: the calf and the lion, and the sheep shall abide together (Habitabit lupus cum agno, et pardus cum haedo accubabit; vitulus, et leo, et ovis, simul morabuntur)
⁴ Jeremiah, 6, 14; 8,11: Peace, peace: and there was no peace (pax, pax, et non erat pax)
2. Bohemian demands

[14] Therefore, when this year\(^1\) Georg Podiebrad,\(^2\) Regent of the Kingdom of Bohemia, a most intelligent man with a noble soul and mind, came to the emperor, the emperor desired me to speak with him in order to assess his position and see if it gave any hope of reunion. For this man is one that all Bohemians respect.\(^3\) Obeying the emperor’s command, I spoke with him twice. Our interpreter was Prokop von Rabstein,\(^4\) Chancellor of the Realm, a man with a loyal soul and a pleasant disposition. We discussed and considered many things that I shall not relate now. In the end, the governor’s position was this: the Bohemians want the Apostolic See to confirm their agreements with the Council of Basel. If this is not possible, then they demand that the Roman See should, on its own authority, grant them the same conditions that the synod had conceded and that it should require of all the community of believers to refrain from speaking evil of the Bohemian people and from avoiding them as a people having gone astray. Moreover, they desire that the Apostolic See should appoint a Bishop of Prague from a list of ten or twelve persons. They will not omit Rokycana from the list of nominees.\(^5\)

\(^1\) Georg Podiebrad arrived at the Diet of Wiener Neustadt on 18 March 1455, cf. Palacky, Geschichte, 4.1. This information indicates that the text was written in 1455
\(^2\) Georg Podiebrad (1420 – 1471): Regent of Bohemia during the minority of Kings Ladislaus the Posthumous. King of Bohemia from 1458 to his death
\(^3\) Cf. Heymann: George, p, 27: *... if some historians have tried to characterize him [Podiebrad] as a man without any real religious, feelings, and ties, they were clearly mistaken. Indeed it his greatest antagonist among the Catholic clergy, Aeneas Sylvius, who impressively testifies to the contrary*
\(^4\) Prokop von Rabstein [Rabenstein] (ca. 1420 – 1472): Bohemian noble. From 1453 to 1468 Chancellor of Bohemia. Piccolomini and Prokop were colleagues in the Imperial Chancery in their younger years and became friends
\(^5\) This compromise formula had been proposed by Piccolomini himself to Podiebrad, at their meeting in Beneschau in 1451, cf. Piccolomini’s letter to Cardinal Carval of 21 August: *In my opinion, you should nominate not just one man to the pope, but several, among whom he may choose one who has given proof of his learning and manner of life (Mea tamen sententia est ne unum solum sed pape viros plures nominetis, ex quibus unum doctrina et vita probatum posit eligere).* Wolkan, II, p. 23
[15] Quod si certi reddantur, haec non frustra [70v] requiri, mittent e vestigio praestantes oratores, qui oboedientiam tuae sanctitati afferant, personas ad Pragensem ecclesiam nominent, et legatum petant, qui regnum ingressurus archiepiscopum consecret et deformata reformet. Haec tantum exculpere\(^1\) summatim ex gubernatore potui. Haec eadem gubernator ipse ante diem Frankfordiae dictam per oratores regni ad Caesarem\(^2\) missos suoipe\(^3\) ingenio mihi denuntiaverat, petens ut ea sanctae memoriae Nicolao papae rescriberem. Sed\(^4\) recusavi tantum negotium litteris agitare, quae nec interrogatae respondent, nec confutatae repugnant. At cum statuissem Frankfordia reversus domum petere, decreveram coram eadem apostolicae pietati proponere\(^5\). Quod cum modo datum sit, plenius de his agam.

---

\(^1\) *exculpare E*

\(^2\) *imperatorem C*

\(^3\) *suapte A; sua pre F*

\(^4\) *Littere interrogate minime respondent marg. note D, G*

\(^5\) *preponere C*
[15] If they are informed that their demands are not in vain, they will immediately send eminent orators to offer obedience to Your Holiness, to nominate persons for the diocese of Prague, and to ask for a legate to come to the kingdom in order to consecrate the archbishop and carry out reforms. This is as much as I was able to get from the regent. On his own initiative, the regent himself had confirmed it to me through orators of the kingdom sent to the emperor before the Diet of Frankfurt. He also asked me to write to Pope Nicholas of blessed memory, but I refused to deal with so great an affair in writing, since then questions could not be answered and objections not be refuted. But when I had returned from Frankfurt and decided to go home,¹ I resolved to put this matter to Your Apostolic Piety. Since this has now been granted, I shall expound on the matter fully.

¹ i.e. return to Italy
[16] Intellexisti, beatissime praesul, quae pestis ab ecclesia nostra regnum Bohemiae separatavit, et, quid illa gens cupiat ad unionem reversura, tenes. Nunc diligentem examinandum est, an concedenda sint, quae Bohemia petunt. Quod si requiras opinionem meam, dicam, et vere dicam¹, me non esse tanti acuminis, ut de rebus tam altis tamque profundis opinari praesumam. Namque si summa cardinalium ingenia in hoc negotio titubant, quid agam ego stupidae mentis asellus? Sed quoniam rem hanc ad te detuli jussu principum, non debo, sicut² mihi videtur, indiscusso negotio quasi mutus atque elinguis abire. Dicam ergo non quod ego sentio, sum enim ipse admodum incertus, sed quod magnos viros sentire didici, quos in hunc modum ratiocinatos³ memini. If quaerimus, inquiunt illi, an Bohemis permittenda sit, quam sitiunt, communicandi libertas, pensitandum est, an alio modo magis expedienti ad nos trahi Bohemia possit. Si potest, non est indulgendum, quod petitur. At si alio modo reduci Bohemi nequeunt, rursus aliter ratiocinat: aut potest admitti postulatio Bohemorum salva fide majorum, aut non potest. Si violatur fides, neganda petitio est. Sin fides integra perseverat, iterum considerandum est, quae comoda secum¹ quaeve incommoda concessio, et quae rursum negatio secum afferat. Si negatio utilior est, negetur; si praestat concedere, concedatur. Et nos igitur hunc⁵ sequamur ordinem, si tamen audire vacat, quae nos ex prudentibus viris mutuati sumus.

¹ et vere dicam omit. G  
² ut G  
³ ratiocinatos G  
⁴ secundum D, G  
⁵ igitur hunc : hunc igitur F
[16] Now you understand, Holy Bishop, what plague has separated the Kingdom of Bohemia from our Church, and you know the desires of that people regarding a return to [church] union. We must now examine carefully whether the demands of Bohemia should be granted. If you ask for my opinion, I will say – and rightly so – that I am not clever enough to presume to have an opinion on so great and profound matters. For if the great intellects of the cardinals are uncertain about this matter,¹ what may I do, having the dumb mind of an ass? But since, on the command of the princes,² I have raised this matter before you, I believe that I should not depart, mute and dumb, without having discussed the matter. So I shall say not what I myself think, for I am really much in doubt, but what I have learnt from great men whom I remember reasoning about the matter as follows: if we ask, they say, whether the Bohemians should be granted the freedom of communion which they desire, it must be considered whether or not Bohemia may be drawn back to us in any other and more expedient way. If that is possible, their demands should not be granted. But if there can no reunion with the Bohemians in any other way, then another reasoning must be followed: either the demands of the Bohemians can be granted [as] fully compatible with the Faith of our forefathers, or they cannot. If their petition is incompatible with that Faith, it must be denied. But if Faith is respected entirely, then, again, the advantages and disadvantages of granting the petition must be considered. If the advantage of denying the petition is greater, it should be denied. If the advantage of granting the petition is greater, it should be granted. So let us follow this order of reasoning, if you have time to hear what we have borrowed from wise men.

¹ The oration was evidently held before Piccolomini’s appointment as cardinal, on 18 December 1456
² I.e. Emperor Friedrich and King Ladislaus
[17] At quoniam audire paratam tuam pietatem intueor, illud ante omnia discutiendum assumo, an lucrificere Bohemos commodiori¹ via possimus quam communionem calicis indulgendo. Et² sunt octo viae, quae praeferuntur. Nam primi ferro certandum potius arbitrantur, quoniam si coacto exercitu magnis viribus contra Bohemos eatur, parta victoria supplices ante pedes nostros Hussitae cadent³, et quas dabimus leges, quos praescrbemus ritus {71r} accipient. Principes haeresis aut igne comburentur aut gladio ferientur, neque posthac tam facile reperientur, qui contra sedem apostolicam cornua erigant. Resecanda est enim ferro quae cuncte adversus ecclesiam Dei se se attollit⁴ impietas, cum majores nostros hoc ipsum factitasse non sit obscurum. Secundi⁵ existimant, si vocentur in disputationem magistri Bohemorum cum nostris, errores eorum facile posse convinci, ita ut ad sanatatem reversi, qui populum seducunt, contraria prioribus de communione praedicent. Nam et Origenis, et Basilii, et aliquorum sanctorum patrum disputationibus diversas haereses evulsas novimus.

¹ commoditori E
² Octo sunt via ad Bohemos reducendum marg. note D; Octo viae sunt ad reducendum Bohemos marg. note G
³ Armis marg. note D, G
⁴ attullit E
⁵ Disputatione marg. note D, G
3. Eight alternatives to granting the Bohemian demands

3.0. Introduction

[17] Seeing that Your Holiness is prepared to listen, I consider that first of all we should consider whether we can assist the Bohemians in better ways than by granting them the communion of the chalice. Eight different ways have been proposed.

A first group prefer military action: if an army is gathered and the Bohemians are fought with all our strength, the defeated Hussites will fall begging at our feet and accept the conditions we impose and the rites we ordain. The leaders of the heresy will be burnt or killed by sword, and thereafter it will not be so easy to find men who will raise their horns against the Apostolic See. For whatever impiety arises against the Church of God, it must be cut off with the sword as our forefathers are clearly known to have done.

The second group thinks that if the Bohemian teachers are invited to debate with ours, they will easily be persuaded that they are in error. And when those who seduce the people come to their senses, they will start to preach the opposite of what they preached formerly concerning communion. For we know that Origenes¹ and Basil² and some of the holy fathers put an end to various heresies through debate.

---

¹ Origen [Origenes] (184/185 – 253/254): scholar and early Christian theologian who was born and spent the first half of his career in Alexandria
² Basil of Caesarea (c. 329 - 379): Greek bishop of Caesarea Mazaca in Cappadocia, Asia Minor (modern-day Turkey). Doctor of the Church. Saint
Tertii, praedicatorum in Bohemiam mittendos censent, non solum eloquentia, sed vitae sanctimoniam, et divinae legis peritia memorabiles, qui communionis usurpationem condemnantes, in quanto periculo Bohemi sint, vivis edoceant rationibus. Namque si colentes idola gentes ad praedicationem apostolorum conversae sunt et Christo manus dederunt, quis dubitet Bohemiam quoque bonis praedicatoribus auditis ad nostrum dogma converti? Quarti opinantur, si taceat catholica ecclesia neque concordiam Bohemorum ultra perquirat, recognituros illos, dum se contemni viderint, suam inscitiam, venturosque supplices ac sine pacto, sine conditione Romanae ecclesiae parituros. Neque enim dulce illis est ab omni Christianismo seorsum vivere. Quinti putant innovandas censuras esse, mandandumque vicinis, ne quod habeant cum Bohemis commercium; nam vitati per circuitum resipiscere compellentur, qui et vino, et sale, et aromatibus utuntur importatis.

---

1 Predicatoribus *marg. note* D, G
2 *edoceant* corr. *ex edocent* D; *edoceant* G
3 Bohema *add.* F
4 Taciturnitas et dissimulation... *marg. note* D; Taciturnitate et dissimulatione G
5 pacato E
6 Christianissimo F, E
7 Innovatio censurarum *marg. note* D, G
8 *commentium* B, E
The third group thinks that preachers should be sent to Bohemia, men who are notable not only for their eloquence, but also for their holy life, and their knowledge of divine law. Condemning the abuse of the communion [under both species], they will show the great danger of the Bohemians with vivid reasoning. For if the worshippers of heathen idols were converted and went over to Christ by the preaching of the apostles, then who may doubt that Bohemia, too, will be converted to our teachings by hearing good preachers.

The fourth group considers that the Catholic Church should remain silent and no longer seek an understanding with the Bohemians. Then they will see how they are despised and understand how ignorant they are. They will come begging and obey the Roman Church without any treaties and conditions. For it is not pleasant for them to live in isolation from all Christianity.

The fifth group proposes to renew the [ecclesiastical] censures and to order their neighbours not to trade with the Bohemians. If they are shunned by all their neighbours, they will be forced to recant since they depend on imported wine, salt, and spices.¹

¹ This solution amounts to a trade boycott.
[19] Sextis¹ persuasum est, si prohibeatur presbyterorum consecratio, qui sectae² illorum sunt, communionem calicis brevi desituram, deficientibus, qui eam ministrent, presbyteris. Septimi³ consulunt dandum esse pecuniam his, qui populum ducunt. Nihil est enim, quod in auribus eorum argento dulcius aut auro sonet. Octavi⁴ suadent tractatus iterum atque iterum alios cum Bohemis habendos, donec sequestrato communionis articulo melioribus pactis unionem amplectantur. Quaelibet autem harum viarum, ut istis videtur, ad reducendos Bohemos et honestior est ecclesiae et Christianae plebi salubrior, quam communionis, ut petitur, indul tum.

¹ Presbyterorum consecratio marg. note D, G
² sanctae E
³ Pecunia marg. note D; pecunia agendum marg. note G
⁴ Novos tractatus habendos marg. note D, G
The sixth group is convinced that if the consecration of priests from their own sect is forbidden, the communion of the chalice will soon disappear, since there will no longer be priests to administer it.

The seventh group recommends giving money to the leaders of the people. For nothing sounds sweeter in their ears than silver or gold.

The eighth group argues that we should conclude treaty after treaty with the Bohemians: eventually the article concerning communion may be dropped and the Bohemians will accept reunion on better terms.

All these [people] believe that their way is more honourable for the Church and more beneficial to the Christian people than granting the communion [under both species] which the [Bohemians] request.

[20] But the specialists, whom I have often heard speaking about this matter, consider that these ways are neither beneficial nor suitable for bringing the Bohemians back to Christ.

3.1. War

[21] Concerning the way of war they have this to say: Often we have fought the Bohemians. Numerous armies have been sent against them. Apostolic legates as well as dukes, kings, and emperors took part in our expeditions. All the might of Germany, all the strength of the neighbouring peoples marched against the Bohemians. And what was the outcome of that war? What was the result of the battles? It embarasses me to talk about the shame of our people! I blush to tell you how our large forces were put to flight by small Bohemian bands of soldiers. The victorious Hussite armies dashed through to the Rhine, to the Danube, to the Baltic Sea, and to Hungary. We should not count on gaining victory over an enemy who habitually slaughters our [armies]. Fear accompanies the losers, audacity the winners. It is a reckless, not a prudent general who repeatedly invites a victorious enemy to battle. Though God hides the future in an impenetrable cloud,¹ the past times to a great extent reveal the pattern of things to come. Even if there be high hopes for a victory, nothing is certain. Doubtful is the outcome of war. Even a small error may cause the total defeat of an army. Fortune is considered to be the ruler and governor of battles, and not without reason have the poets imagined her to be blind. It is foolish to fight before a blind judge.

¹ Horace: Odes, 3, 29-30: God in his providence hides future events in murky darkness (prudens futuri temporis exitum caliginosa nocte premit deus)

\(^1\) est B, E
\(^2\) ex pondere add. F
\(^3\) Dei nuntius : nuntius Dei F
\(^4\) tingit C
[22] But let us state the truth as it is: Fortune is nothing, and the outcome of war depends on God. Why should we hope for victory today more than yesterday? We are neither better men, nor do we have a prophet who will be there as God’s messenger to promise victory.

But, let us assume that the Bohemians will succumb to our military might: would that really be a holy and honourable way of converting Bohemia? The early Church did not draw straying people back to the way by sword or fire, but by kind words and gentle exhortations. It always abhorred bloodshed. Too much blood will colour the earth before Bohemia is subdued by the sword. They will fall, and our people will fall, too. We shall send countless souls to hell before the Bohemians will declare themselves defeated. What is bought by human blood is far too expensive. A mind is not acceptable to God if it only adores the crucified [Lord] because it has been coerced through war. The Bohemians who survive the war may be forced to accept our rites, but they will not do so voluntarily. They will accept our faith through fear alone, and not with their hearts. They will always be thinking about how to escape servitude. To use the words of the orator, fear as the counselor of duty is short-lived.

But our God wants free obedience, not forced. He looks into the hearts of men, and not on their works. Therefore, war is not the means to settle the Bohemian matter well.

---

1 “Mars”
2 “voluntas”
3 Cicero: *Philippic*, 2, 36: *Quamquam bonum te timor faciebat, non diurnus magister offici*
Minus secunda disputationis via, quae cum Johanne ac Jeronimo in Constantiensii concilio et in Basiliensi cum Rokezana Cibram et aliis plerisque frustra temptata est. Nisi judex adsit, quem partes ambae suscipiant\textsuperscript{1}, numquam disputando vincas haereticos. At illi\textsuperscript{2} judicem solum Deum recipiunt, cujus diffinitionem sine miraculo non\textsuperscript{3} reperimus. Testis est Ariana perfidia, quae multis reprobata conciliis, numquam caruit defensoribus. Nestoriana quoque, et Eutychetis\textsuperscript{4}, Dioscorique vesania saepius condemnata, numquam (72r) tamen deserfa est, habentque adhuc Hodie Nestoriani inter Saracenos monasteria. Nam Mahumetus, cum animadvertisset horum temerariam sectam suae insaniae proximam, Nestorianis inter suos pacem esse mandavit. Hussitae vero, si quaeras ab eis disputationis campum, nihil est, quod magis affectare se dicant; garrula est enim gens et disputationis aida. At si roges stante controversia, quem sequi judicem velint, neque Romanum pontificem, neque generale concilium, neque mortalium quempiam acceptabunt\textsuperscript{5}. Solius novi et veteris testamenti sese diffinitioni submittent; cumque ad id ventum fuerit, ut sacrarum litterarum testimonio sit utendum, nullas doctorum nostrorum interpretationes admittent. Habent et ipsi suos sensus, quibus inhaerent. Inter sensum vero et sensum, inter interpretationem et interpretationem solius Dei arbitrium asserunt audiendum, atque ita vim omnem disputationis eludunt.

\textsuperscript{1} suscipiatur E
\textsuperscript{2} at illi : et alii F
\textsuperscript{3} omit. B, E
\textsuperscript{4} \emph{em.}; Uticetis codd.
\textsuperscript{5} acceptabant F
3.2. Debate

[23] The way of debate is unsuitable, too. It was tried in vain with Jan¹ and Jeronimus² at the Council of Constance, and with Rokycana, Pribram³, and several others at the Council of Basel. In the absence of a judge whom both parties accept, you will never overcome these heretics by debate. They only accept God as judge, and God’s ruling⁴ we only get to know about through a miracle. This is witnessed by the Arian perfidy: though it was rejected by many councils, it never lacked defenders. Also the insane views of Nestorius,⁵ Eutyches,⁶ and Discorus⁷ were often condemned, but never abandoned: even today the Nestorians have monasteries among the Saracens. For when Muhammad realized that their reckless sect was very close to his own insanity, he ordered that there should be peace between Nestorians and his own people.

If you ask the Hussites to arrange a debate, they say that they desire nothing more than a debate.⁸ 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 God’s judgment between meaning and meaning, between interpretation and interpretation should be heard, and thus they rob the debate of any significance.

---

¹ Jan Hus
² Jerome of Prague
³ Jan Pribram (ca. 1387 – 1448): Bohemian priest. Hussite theologian
⁴ “diffinitio”
⁵ Nestorius (c. 386 – 450): Archbishop of Constantinople from 428 until August 431, when he was condemned by the Council of Ephesus
⁶ Eutyches (ca. 380–ca. 456): priest and archimandrite at Constantinople. In 431, at the First Council of Ephesus, he vehemently opposed the teachings of Nestorius. His condemnation of Nestorianism as heresy led him to an equally extreme, although opposite view, for which he was denounced as a heretic himself
⁷ Probably Pope Dioscorus I of Alexandria (d, 454): Deposed by the Council of Chalcedon in 451, but recognized as Patriarch by the Coptic Church until his death
⁸ Cf. Piccolomini’s first-hand report on Hussites debates in connection with his visit to Tabor in 1451. See his letter to Juan Carvajal (Introduction / Context)
Cum verba disputando faciunt, indoctae plebis praesentiam requirunt, brachia in diversas partes extendunt, manus complodunt, nunc hoc, nunc illud digitis ostendunt, cervices erigunt, oculos in partes varias\(^1\) contorquent, inspicientes an circumstantes sententiolas et argutiolas suas demirentur, sublatisque vocibus ignavi populi plausum extorquere conantur, et quasi pulcherrime ac suavissime perorent, ipsi suum sonum patulis auribus auscultant. Origenes autem et reliqui errores, qui disputando destruxere, apud eos locuti sunt, qui doceri cupiebant. Praeceptores vero Bohemorum numquam inducas, ut discipuli formam induant. Dulcissimum iis\(^2\) est magistri nomen, \textit{et vocari} in\(^3\) turbis “\textit{Rabbi}”, et \textit{cathedram pestilentiae} regere. Nihil turpius quam discere putant. Non est igitur, quod disputatio ad salutem Bohemiae\(^4\) conferat, cum pertinacia\(^5\) magistros teneat, plebes autem suis tantum\(^6\) praepreceptoribus credant.

\(^1\) partes varias : diversas partes D, G
\(^2\) his E
\(^3\) omit. F
\(^4\) ad salutem Bohemiae : Bohemiae ad salutem G
\(^5\) cum pertinacia : compertinacia E
\(^6\) tanto E
When they debate, they require the presence of the ignorant people, they gesture, they clap their hands together, 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 learning.

Bohemia cannot be saved by debate, since its teachers are stubborn and the people only believes its own teachers.

---

1 Matthew, 23, 6-7: And they love the first places at feasts, and the first chairs in the synagogues, And salutations in the market place, and to be called by men, Rabbi (Amant autem primos recubitus in coenis, et primas cathedras in synagogis et salutationes in foro et vocari ab hominibus Rabbi)

2 "regere"

3 Psalms, 1, 1: Blessed is the man who hath not walked in the counsel of the ungodly, nor stood in the way of sinners, nor sat in the chair of pestilence. (Beatus vir qui non abiit in consilio impiorum, et in via peccatorum non stetit, et in cathedra pestilentiae non sedit)

1 de sapientum E
2 et hac doctrina ... eminenti omit. F
3.3. Preaching

[25] Preaching is believed to be a third way suitable for converting the Bohemians. We do not have much to say about it except that this way, too, has been tried in vain. Often did our own people preach in Bohemia and Moravia. But our adversaries also preached, and what our people confirmed, they afterwards denied. Minds imbued with evil errors do not easily abandon their point of view. The Bohemians believe their own teachers, and they scorn others as speaking out of envy. Maybe someone will say that it was the fault of our preachers themselves that the Bohemians did not believe them, because they lacked eloquence, learning, or purity of life. Leaving aside the others, I shall only speak of Giovanni da Capistrano,1 in my opinion a man full of God. Traveling through a large part of Bohemia and Moravia he preached [everywhere], but he was unable to uproot their heresy.2 Actually, some of them did believe his preaching and renounced the Hussite absurdities – but in view of the great number of foolish people, their number is insignificant.3 The Bohemians had absolutely nothing for which they could blame Giovanni: he was an eloquent and learned man and an eminent specialist in the discipline that we call the pontifical discipline and the more useful one;4 he despised the splendour of this world, he had tamed the flesh, and he had conquered greed, following only in the footsteps of Christ and his apostles.

---

1 Giovanni da Capistrano (1386 – 1456): Franciscan friar and priest from the Italian town of Capestrano, Abruzzo. Famous as a preacher, theologian, and inquisitor. Led the defense at the siege of Belgrade in 1456 with the Hungarian military commander John Hunyadi. Saint
2 Actually Piccolomini’s assessment of the Giovanni da Capistrano’s saintliness was remarkably cool
3 In 1451/1452, the Giovanni da Capistrano had been sent by the pope on a mission to preach in Bohemia and prepare Bohemian minds for a reunion with Rome, but his fiery intolerance of Hussitism made the mission an unmitigated and counterproductive disaster, cf. Heymann: George, p. 65-80
4 Canon law
[26] Nimis diu praedicare oportebit, antequam Bohemia nobis consentiat. Impar est nostri et\footnote{omit. F} apostolorum temporis conditio; licet enim difficile fuerit daemones ostendere, qui pro diis colebantur, quia tamen vitam suillum sine doctrinae fundamento gentiles ducebant, apostoli autem domini nitidos mores summa cum ratione praedicabant, naturale quoddamodo fuit, qui erant\footnote{qui erant : querant F} homines ad se reverti et relicta bestiali consuetudine modestiam et honestatem humano generi convenientem, sicut evangelium Christi docebat, induere. Inter nos autem et Bohemos non est de moribus contentio. Quae nos vitia fugimus, illi saltem vituperant. De sensu evangelii disceptatio est, quod illi non minus intelliga seipsis quam a nobis existimant. Difficillima profecto et inextricabilis contentio, ubi non est cui partes credant arbitrium boni viri.
It would take far too much preaching before Bohemia would agree with us.

Our situation is different from that of the apostles. It may have been difficult, then, to show that those who were worshipped as gods were really demons. But since [morally] the gentiles lived as pigs, without the foundation of doctrine, whereas the apostles preached, with superior reasoning, the splendid morals of Our Lord, it was somehow natural that men of that time would come to their senses, abandon their debased lifestyle, and welcome the modesty and decency that befits the human race, as taught in the gospel of Christ.

But between us and the Bohemians there is no disagreement as to morals. The vices that we avoid, they actually condemn. Our controversy concerns the meaning of the Gospel which they believe they understand better than we do. This controversy is really difficult and unsoluble since there is no good man whose arbitration both parties will accept.
Nec apostoli sola praedicatione mundum illuminassent, nisi signa intercessissent, quae divinitus fieri populi crediderunt. At cum caecis visum, leprosis munditiam, mortuis vitam in nomine Jesu apostoli restituerent, multitudinis fidem facile consequebantur. Hodie autem non est ita nobiscum domini manus, ut mirabilia per nos operari velit. Immo vero non sunt opera nostra, quae signa mereantur ostendere. Fuit tamen de Johanne Capistrano suisque miraculis ingens rumor, de quibus nihil me attinet disputare. Ego veri periculum in alios transferam, qui novarum rerum curiosiores habentur. Illud notissimum est, quia post praedicationem Johannis remansit Bohemia eadem, quae prius fuerat. Neque, qui sapiunt, verisimile ducunt aevos nostro cujuspiam praedicatione Bohemiae ad nos redire populos.

1 caeci E
[27] And the apostles would not have illuminated the world with their preaching if there had not been signs that people believed to have come from God. When, in the name of Jesus, the apostles restored sight to the blind, health to the lepers, and life to the dead, they easily won the faith of the multitude. Today, however, the Lord does not favour us to the extent of letting us perform miracles. And indeed our own acts do not merit such signs.

Actually, there were many rumours about Giovanni di Capistrano and his miracles that I am not prepared to discuss. In this matter I leave the discernment of truth to others who may be more interested in novel things. But it is quite clear that after Giovanni’s preaching Bohemia remained unchanged. And those who are knowledgeable about such matters consider it unlikely that the people of Bohemia will return to us in our time because of anyone’s preaching.
De silentio vero, quod quarto loco commendatum est, haec sententia sapientum\(^1\) est. Si tacemus nihilque de Bohemis agimus, minime illi se spretos, sed nos desperasse judicabunt. Comfortabunt seipsos et gloriabuntur quasi victores. Praedicatorum eorum, sicut eis mos est, diebus singulis plebes instruent, et pestiferlacte nutrientes populum laetabundi sese jactabunt, quia jam silentium de suis erroribus factum sit. Ridiculum est, si tum putes hostem victum, cum ille pro sua voluntate quiescit. Nihil est, quod Rokezana magis\(^73r\) cupiat, quam ut sinamus Bohemos suis legibus vivere\(^2\), neque ritum impediamus eorum. Sic enim gloriosus ille in pingui populo pacem nactus, inter suas mulierculas sermocinabit securus; quocumque voluerit, plebes impellet; nec exagitatas diversis tractatibus populi mentes moliri adversus se quidquam\(^3\) timebit. Rem divinam pro suo arbitro faciet; in altari\(^4\) ministribut agnus, in ambone praedicabit ut leo; in mensa vorabit ut lupus.

\(^{1}\) sapientium D, G
\(^{2}\) vincere G
\(^{3}\) quisquam D, G
\(^{4}\) altare D, G
3.4. Silence

[28] Concerning the silence recommended as the fourth way, this is the view of wise men: if we remain silent and do nothing about the Bohemians, they will not at all consider themselves to have been snubbed, but rather believe that we have given up. They will congratulate themselves and brag like victors. As is their wont, their preachers will instruct the people daily, and nourishing the people on poisonous milk they will be happy and conceited because there is silence concerning their errors. It is ridiculous to consider an enemy to have been vanquished if he lives tranquilly as he wants to. Indeed, Rokycana would like nothing more than that we should allow the Bohemians to live according to their own laws and not interfere with their rites. For having won peace, he will be the pride of a flourishing people, he will preach among his women, he will push the people wherever he wishes, and he will not fear that the people would be stirred in various ways and plot against him. He will conduct services as he pleases, at the altar he will serve like a lamb, in the pulpit he will preach like a lion, and at the table he will eat like a wolf.
Fietque Bohemia altera Bosnia, quam cum invasissent olim Manichaei, qui nefanda de Christo sentientes primatum ecclesiae Romanae\textsuperscript{1} inficiantur\textsuperscript{2}. Conati sunt majores nostri armis extinguere surgentem haeresim; quod cum parum succederet, quieverunt. Ac silentio facto Bosnienses pro suis desideriis ambulare siverunt. Sed quid profuit silentium? Quid secutum est, obsecro? Quis audivit eos de reditu\textsuperscript{3} cogitasse? Fortificati sunt nobis tacentibus et aucti numero, jamque arcem erexerunt, ad quam omnes confugiunt, qui sedis apostolicae mucronem timent; et, quod pessimum est, Turcorum unitate laetantur.

\textsuperscript{1} ecclesiae Romanae: Romanae ecclesiae G
\textsuperscript{2} inficiabantur B, E; inficiatur D, G
\textsuperscript{3} rite B, E
Bohemia would become another Bosnia. That country was once invaded by the Manichees who have abominable notions about Christ and reject the primacy of the Roman Church.¹ Our forefathers tried to stop that rising heresy with weapons, but, having little success, they kept their peace. They remained silent and let the Bosnians live as they pleased. But how useful was their silence? What happened afterwards, I ask? Whoever heard those people speak about returning to us? While we remained silent, they grew stronger and more numerous, and now they have built a fortress where all take refuge who fear the sword of the Apostolic See. And, what is worse: they are happily united with the Turks.

¹ The medieval Church in Bosnia was possibly related to Bogomils, a stridently dualist sect of gnostic Christians heavily influenced by the Manichaean Paulician movement. The Church was considered as heretic by Rome.
[30] The Bohemians will do the same unless we find the proper remedies in time. It should be added that in the meantime, while we remain silent, all who die are the prey of the Devil: through our fault, Heaven is denied to an infinite number of souls. Their voices constantly cry out before the tribunal of the Lord, accusing the Apostolic See of negligence. It is not easy, Holy Pontiff, to justify so great a calamity. Grave is your situation as you are responsible for the whole world. Your office is that of a watchman: unless you warn them of the coming sword, the blood of those who perish will be required from your hands, as Ezechiel says.\textsuperscript{1} I insist: unless you provide for the salvation of everyone with all your might, you are as much at fault as if you had personally destroyed those who perish. If the Bohemians fall, it will be to your detriment; if they stand, it will be to your benefit. Therefore, the advice of those who prefer silence must be rejected. It is not pleasing to God or honourable among men.

\textsuperscript{1} Ezechiel, 33, 6

\(^1\) sceleritati A; scelerati \textit{corr. from sceleritati} D
3.5. Ecclesiastical censures

[31] But what shall we think of the arguments of those who propose, in the fifth place, to renew the ecclesiastical processes against the Bohemians? This advice is ridiculous, not to say stupid. It is easy to say: condemn, excommunicate, strike, kill, withdraw sacraments, put places under interdict – but who is willing to obey? People’s obedience towards us is precarious. Everyone obeys our decrees only as far as he wishes to. Formerly, kingdoms and great princedoms feared the censures of the Church. Now, even the smallest cities spurn the commands of the Supreme Bishop. Faith has died in our heart; all charity is gone; we have become the dregs of humanity and impious criminals, and the end of times is upon us.

\begin{quote}
Esse aliquos manes, et subterranea regna ...

Nec pueri credunt, nisi qui nondum aere lavantur.
\end{quote}


\(^1\) putarant G
\(^2\) omit. G
I could remind you of many examples of Italian cities which considered ecclesiastical censures as the products of a deranged mind, but I prefer to relate events from Germany, since the Bohemans we are talking about are [like] the Germans. Of what use was it to excommunicate the people of Utrecht who fought the Church for seven years and then still got the bishop they wanted? And what about the people of Münster? Do they attach any importance whatsoever to an excommunication now? What about the Prussians? Did they not rebel against their lords in spite of ecclesiastical censures? And what about the Austrians? How much did they care about the injunctions of the Roman Pontiff when they were ordered to honour the emperor and molested him instead? Nobody fears the spiritual sword unless it is reinforced by the physical sword. Words are not feared if whips are not at hand. Few are worried about a calamity threatening the kingdom in the future; everybody only cares about the present. Not stupidly did someone write:

*The existence of ghosts and the underworld realms ... not even boys believe in that, except those not yet old enough to pay admission at the baths.*

But why not come directly to the matter? The ecclesiastical weapons have been directed at the Bohemians, too. They have been cursed, condemned, excommunicated, and given into the hands of Satan. And what was thought to be the most fearsome of all: the reckless Bohemians were attacked with temporal weapons and spiritual arrows conjointly, but they were never vanquished. So, should we now return to excommunications? If the Bohemians did not fear armed censures, would they now be scared of unarmed ones? The Roman Church will be ridiculed and become a laughing stock if once again it proclaims a condemnation of the Bohemians.

---

1 In 1424 the Cathedral Chapter of Utrecht elected Rudolf of Diepholt as Bishop of Utrecht. He was the preferred candidate of the town council of Utrecht. The pope, Martin V, appointed another bishop and excommunicated the citizens in 1425 and the region was put under interdict. In 1433, Rudolf of Diepholt was appointed bishop of Utrecht by Martin’s successor, Pope Eugene IV. Cf. *Handbook of Dutch Church History*. Ed. by H. Selderhuis. Göttingen, 2015, pp. 108-109

2 In the *Münsterische Stiftsfehde* from 1450 to 1457 two candidates fought to become Bishop of Münster, Walram von Moers und Erich von Hoya. Pope Nicholas V intervened in the conflict, excommunicating the opponents of his candidate/s and putting the district under interdict. The University of Erfurt pronounced against the papal censures which were then ignored by the concerned parties

3 In spite of being declared illegal by Emperor Friedrich III, in 1453 (Piccolomini himself participated in the trial the Imperial Court), and in spite of ecclesiastical censures, the *Preussische Bund* (an association of Prussian estates) in 1454 – with Polish aid – rebelled against the Teutonic Order and started a thirteen year war in which they were, in the end, victorious

4 On the Austrian insurrection against the emperor in 1452 and their rejection of a papal monitorium supporting the emperor, see Piccolomini’s oration *Sentio*

5 Play on the words “verba” (words) and “verbera” (whips)

6 Juvenal: *Satires*, 2, 149 and 152
Neque enim vicini parebunt\textsuperscript{1}, qui sciunt bellum\textsuperscript{2} necessario futurum quamprimum Bohemos quasi praecisos ab ecclesia devitaverint. Recens est apud eos praeteritarum memoria pugnarum. Stant adhuc ante oculos rapinae, incendia, caedes Bohemici belli, nec sine terrore\textsuperscript{3} tantorum malorum meminerunt: nactique tandem pacem et\textsuperscript{4} otii dulcedinem experti quamvis occasionem oderint, quae belli fomitem ministrare possit. Scimus praeterea Bohemos, qui sunt Hussitarum infecti lepra, alienos ab ecclesia esse; excommunicatus est enim\textsuperscript{5} omnis\textsuperscript{6} haereticus. Non tamen vitantur Hussitae, cum veniunt ad nostros. Ingrediuntur pacifice civitates nostras, emunt, vendunt, pro libito negotiantur, visitant ecclesias, intersunt divinis officiis, foedera cum nostris principibus percutiunt, matrimonia contrahunt. Inter Hussitas et nostros discrimen nullum. Et nos putabimus jam novis censuris utendum? Vana est et prorsus inepta eorum cogitatio, qui censuras ecclesiae aut Bohemos timere, aut circumjacentes populos tenere censent.

\textsuperscript{1} parabunt E
\textsuperscript{2} bello E
\textsuperscript{3} errore F
\textsuperscript{4} omit. G
\textsuperscript{5} est enim : enim est G
\textsuperscript{6} enim omnis : omnis enim E
Nor will the neighbours obey for they know that war will necessarily follow as soon as they begin to avoid the Boehemians as being cut off from the Church. The memory of past fights is still fresh. They still see in their mind the plunderings, the burnings, and the killings in the Bohemian war, and they remember these great calamities with terror. Having finally obtained peace and tasted the sweetness of peace and quiet they will hate everything that provides a reason for war. Moreover we know that the Bohemians, being infected with the Hussite plague, are already estranged from the Church for everyone who is a heretic is an excommunicate. Nonetheless, the Hussites are not being shunned when they come to our people. They enter our cities in peace, they buy, they sell, they trade as they wish, they visit our churches, they attend our religious services, they make treaties with our princes, they intermarry. There is no difference between the Hussites and our people. So, should we now think of employing new ecclesiastical censures? The thinking of those who believe that the Bohemians fear ecclesiastical censures and that the neighbouring peoples will respect them is vain and absurd.
Ad sextos illos nunc transeundum est, qui presbyteros Hussitarum consecrandos negant; sic enim, ut illis videtur, deficientibus, qui calicem ministrent, sacerdotibus, et ipsa duplex communio deficiet. Bella sane cogitatio, bella inventio, ne dicam, deliratio! Et quis erit, obsecro, qui mentes hominum videat\(^1\), et cujus sit hic aut ille sectae cognoscat? Homine\(^2\) nullum est versutius {74r} animal, nullum magis fallax, alius in ore, alius in corde gerit. Clausum est cor hominis homini et inscrutabile, Deo soli apertum; mille in eo latebrae, mille receptacula; simulare ac dissimulare novit. Deo similis nos esse oportebit, si dogmatis Hussitarum qui sequaces habeantur, nosse voluerimus. Johannes, Gurcensis episcopus, anno ante hunc quinto, decem presbyteros ex Bohemia consecravit, qui se fideles affirmaverunt. At ex his septem comperti sunt, qui postmodum ad Rokezanam\(^3\) defecerunt. Dicat hic fortasse quispiam, Pragensæ capitulum, quod apud Pilznam moram trahit, in fide solidum esse, nullumque consecrari debere, nisi cum litteris capituli. Sed neque capitulum Deus est, qui mentes hominum introspiciat. Falsificantur deinde litterae atque sigilla, et quod una via negatur, altera impetratur. Sunt praeterea nonnulli\(^4\) episcopi, qui pecuniae causa clericos undecimque\(^5\) venientes consecrantes, neque Deum verentes, neque canones.

\(^1\) videatur E
\(^2\) hominum E
\(^3\) postmodum ad Rokezanam : ad Rochezanam postmodum G
\(^4\) quidam G
\(^5\) undecimque F
3.6. Withholding priests

[34] We must now pass on to the sixth group, those who would refuse to consecrate Hussite priests. They believe that if there are no more priests to administer the chalice, there will be no more communion under both species. Oh, what beautiful reasoning, what beautiful device, or should I say delusion? Who, I ask, may see into the minds of men and know who belongs to what sect? No animal is more cunning than man, none more deceitful who says one thing and means another. The heart of man is inscrutable and closed to another man, it is only open to God. Within a man there are a thousand subterfuges, and a thousand places of refuge. He knows how to simulate and dissimulate. We must be like God himself if we wish to know who is a believer in Hussite teachings. Five years ago, Johann, Bishop of Gurk, consecrated ten priests from Bohemia who declared that they were loyal to us. But afterwards it was heard that seven of them defected to Rokycana. Here, someone may say that the Cathedral Chapter of Prague, now residing in Pilzen, remains steadfast in the faith and that nobody should be ordained without letters from that Chapter. But the Chapter is not God either, who can look into the hearts of men. And letters and seals may be faked so that what cannot be achieved in one way is achieved in another. Moreover, there are some bishops who for the sake of money will consecrate clerics coming from anywhere, fearing neither God nor the canons.¹

¹ I.e. Church Law. The matter of the ordination was indeed a problem for the Hussites, but not insoluble, cf. Heymann: George, p. 67: During the thirty-three years of his [Rokycana] administration his church suffered increasingly from the lack of ordained priests (despite the fact the Utraquist clerics frequently succeeded in receiving ordination outside Bohemia, from bishops in Poland, Hungary, and especially in Italy)
Polonia quoque, si cetera desint, satis presbyterorum Bohemiae subministrabit. Subnectam hic unum, quamvis turpe ac foedissimum, ad rem tamen, quam tractamus, accommodatum: Polonus quidam in Bohemia plures annos rurali parrochiae quasi sacerdos praefuit, atque pro subditorum desiderio communionem praebuit. Huic concubina fuit, quae peccato demum renuntians, miscri ultra Polono recusavit. Interrogata cur sese redderet alienam, “Quia damnatae sunt,” inquit, “sacerdotum nuptiae; poenitet me tui concubitus, neque posthac in oscula presbyteri aut amplexus veniam.” Tum Polonus, “Tace,” inquit, “femina, nihil est, cur me horreas, qui neque sum presbyter, neque sacris initiatus ullis.” Hoc\textsuperscript{1} mulier magis abhominata facinus: “Abi,” inquit, ”in malam crucem pessime\textsuperscript{2}, qui non sacer sacra ministras.” Et a Polono digressa profanatorem divini sacramenti ad contribulos detulit; illi commoti tam insueto atque inaudito scelere, Polonum repente in crucem sustulissent, nisi furore cognito veterator ille salutem pedibus quaesivisset. Similes huic forsitan multos in Bohemia reperias. Illud exploratorum est, quia venientes ex Polonia presbyteri, quemadmodum plebes volunt, sacramenta ministrant; nam domi pauperes, victus causa foris nihil abhorrent. Ego quidem, cum esses in Bohemia, offendi nonnullus ecclesiarum rectores natione Polonos, qui rogati, cur prohibitam ab ecclesia communionem exercerent, ajebant, quia non possent alio modo vivere, cum \textit{fodere non valerent, mendicare autem erubescerent}. Itaque novi Bohemiam non posse carere presbyteris, quando semper inveniuntur, qui fide malunt quam plebe carere.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{1} hic C
\item[\textsuperscript{2} omit. B, E
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
[35] Should all these means fail, Poland would provide enough priests for Bohemia. Here I shall add an episode that is shameful and disgusting, but relevant to the matter at hand: for several years a certain Pole served as pastor of a rural parish in Bohemia and gave communion to his parishioners according to their wish\(^1\). The Pole had a concubine who in the end repented of her sin and refused to have intercourse with the Pole any more. When he asked her why she would break with him, she answered: “Because marriages of priests are condemned. I regret having intercourse with you, and in the future I shall never kiss or embrace a priest.” Then the Pole said: ‘Be silent, woman, there is no reason to avoid me for I am not a priest and have never received Holy Orders.’ But this crime was even more abhorrent to the woman who said: “You administer the sacraments, but you have not been consecrated. Go to hell!”\(^2\) And leaving the Pole, she denounced his profanation of the divine sacrament to their fellow villagers.\(^3\) They were shocked by this extraordinary and unheard of crime and would quickly have crucified the swindler if he had not learnt of their fury and saved himself by running away. You might find many similar cases in Bohemia. What we know is that priests from Poland administer the sacraments according to the wishes of the people, for being poor at home they will do anything to earn a living abroad. When I was in Bohemia, I met several parish priests from Poland. I asked them why they administered communion under a form prohibited by the Church, and they answered that otherwise they could not have a living since they were not able to dig and were ashamed to beg.\(^4\) Therefore, I know that Bohemia will not lack priests, for you will always be able to find priests who would be without faith rather than without parishioners.\(^5\)

\(^1\) i.e. under both species

\(^2\) “in malam crucem”

\(^3\) “contribulos”

\(^4\) Matthew, 16, 3

\(^5\) “plebe”
[36] De pecunia vero, quam septimi Bohemos inter erogandam putant, quid aliud existimem, nisi quia\textsuperscript{1} male temptatur pecunia\textsuperscript{2}, quod virtute effici debet. Sed \{74v\} judicemus aurum dandum: ubi tactus thesaurus inveniatur, qui Bohemorum voracitatem expleat, insatiabile genus hominum? Quanto plus dederis, tanto amplius requiret. Non pactolus, non omnis harena Thagi, non litus Arabicum tantum aur\textsuperscript{3} ministrabit\textsuperscript{4}, quantum absumet\textsuperscript{5} Bohemia. Unum, si dones, mille donare oportebit; neque\textsuperscript{6} semel tantum, sed quotannis stipendia requirent. Ubi cessaveris, mox ad priora redibunt. Aut tributariam regni Bohemiae sedem apostolicam perpetuo facies, aut emptam reditionem brevi tenebis.

\textsuperscript{1} qui F
\textsuperscript{2} male temptatur pecunia \textit{marg. note} D; male tentatur quod virtute effici debet \textit{marg. note} G
\textsuperscript{3} aurum B, E
\textsuperscript{4} administrabit B, E
\textsuperscript{5} absumet F, E
\textsuperscript{6} nec D, G
3.7. Financial subsidies

[36] The seventh group proposes to pay money to the Bohemians, about which I only think that it is not good to try to achieve with money what ought to be achieved by virtue.

Be let us consider this solution: where can you find a treasure great enough to satisfy the voracious appetites of the Bohemians, that unsatiable people? The more you give, the more they will demand. Neither the river Pactolus\(^1\), nor all the sand of Tagus\(^2\), nor the coast of Arabia will yield as much gold as Bohemia will take. If you give to one, you must give to a thousand. And they will demand payment not only once, but every year. And when you stop, they will return to their former state immediately. So, either you will make the Apostolic See tributary to the Kingdom of Bohemia, or the reunion with them that you have bought will only last for a short time.

\(^1\) Pactolus: a river near the Aegean coast of Turkey. In ancient times, it contained electrum that was the basis of the economy of the state of Lydia

\(^2\) The longest river on the Iberian peninsula. In classical poetry, the Tagus was famous for its gold-bearing sands (Catullus, 29.19; Ovid: Amores, 1,15,34; Juvenal: Satires, 3.55, etc.)
Octava et ultima est illorum opinio, qui novos tractatus cum Bohemis existimant inchoandos, si forte melior inveniri\(^2\) conditio possit. Sed fluminum cursus, qui suapte natura deorsum est, facilius sursum revolvas, quam Bohemis communionem calicis subtrahas. Duo concilia generalia, Constantiense et Basiliense, cum hoc summo studio quaerent, in vanum laboraverunt. Nicolaus sancti Petri et Johannes Sancti Angeli cardinales, quorum ante meminimus, complures ecclesiastici et saeculares principes saepe Bohemos ad unionem reducere conati, nullam umquam concordiam invenire potuerunt, nisi communione calicis indulta\(^3\). Quid ergo totiens frustra instabimus? Cur totiens denegata petemus? Stulte quaeras\(^4\), quod invenire non speres\(^5\).
3.8. New treaties

[37] The eighth group thinks that we should go on making new treaties with the Bohemians so that, if possible, better conditions may be obtained. But it is the way of nature that rivers flow from higher places to lower, and it would be easier to make a river flow backwards than withdraw the communion of the chalice from the Bohemians. Two general councils, the Council of Constance and the Council of Basel, tried this with all their might, but they laboured in vain. The cardinals Nikolaus of San Pietro and Juan of Sant’ Angelo, whom I have mentioned before, as well as many ecclesiastical and secular princes have repeatedly endeavoured to effect a reunion with the Bohemians. But they could only reach agreement if the communion of the chalice was granted. So, why should we insist in vain, again and again? Why should we ask for what is refused, again and again? It is stupid to seek what you cannot hope to find.
[38] Atque ita ex his octo, quas retulimus, opinionibus, nulla est ad reductionem Bohemorum satis idonea, neque praeferenda\(^1\) tractatui\(^2\), quem cum gubernatore habitum recensuimus. Utrum autem tractatum\(^3\) ipsum admittere atque amplecti conveniat, sequenti oratione monstrabimus, si modo sufficientia fuerint, quae nos ex prudentibus audita viris explicabimus.

\(^1\) praeferenda
\(^2\) tractatui
\(^3\) tractum
3.9. **Conclusion: the eight alternatives will not work**

[38] Of the eight proposals presented here none is suitable for bringing back the Bohemians and none is preferable to our agreement\(^1\) with the regent\(^2\) that we have told you about. Whether it is expedient to approve and accept this agreement, we shall demonstrate in the following part of the oration – if only those arguments that we have heard from wise men and shall now be setting forth are convincing.

---

\(^1\) “tractatus”. The word may refer to Piccolomini’s negotiations with Podiebrad in general, but other uses of the word in this context may indicate that Piccolomini was presenting a proper draft agreement for the pope’s approval.

\(^2\) Georg Podiebrad

\(^1\) nostrae fidei : fidei nostrae B, E

\(^2\) incendendum E

\(^3\) nutandum E

\(^4\) omit. A; aut suprascr. C

\(^5\) em.; ortus codd.
4. Proposal for an agreement with the Bohemians on communion under both species

4.1. Communion under both species not against the doctrine of the Church

[39] We have already said that the Bohemian petition should be denied if the grant of communion\(^1\) violates the integrity of our Faith. Here we should not proceed blindly or with closed eyes. No Christian wants to cause prejudice to the Faith. Our salvation depends on the purity of our Faith, nothing in it must be changed nor subtracted. It is better to die than to oppose Divine Law. The testament of Our Saviour must be safeguarded with all possible care. So what? Do we petition for something that is against divine dispensation or the command of Christ? Only a foolish and insane person, Holy Father, asks for something from your throne that is either unjust or impious. Your See is a garden enclosed, a fountain sealed up,\(^2\) from where nothing impure can come. The decisions of your heart\(^3\) are mature and well-considered. From there one can only get pure gold and silver seven times refined. The pronouncements\(^4\) coming from you are salubrious and have nothing impure.

---

\(^1\) i.e. the communion under both species  
\(^2\) Song of Solomon, 4, 12  
\(^3\) “pectus”  
\(^4\) “oracula”

1 submentes E
2 ejus discipuli : discipuli ejus D, G
3 corr. from proficiscentis A, C
[40] So consider this: do the Bohemians demand something that is against your faith and apostolic tradition? Absolutely not. For those who take the sacrament of the Eucharist under the species of bread and wine neither go against divine commands nor orthodox faith, if only they do it out of devotion and with permission from the Church, and do not claim that they are obeying a command from Our Lord. If this form of communion were a heretical crime, then those fathers, learned and filled with the zeal of faith, who assembled from the entire world at the Council of Basel, would never have granted it. It is indeed a fact that communion under both species was granted by the authority of this Council. So, demanding it does not go against the faith, and neither the creator of this great sacrament, Christ Our Lord, nor his disciples forbade this form of communion. Indeed, at the time of the birth and first development of the Church it was the accepted rite that not only men, but also women should drink from the chalice. The Eastern Church still observes this rite and is not - for that reason - accused of violating Faith.
Latini vero nitidius Christi sacramenta tractantes et intelligentes, quantus honor, quanta reverence salvatoris nostri alitontantis et summi Dei filii corpori et sanguini debeatur, et cum quanto timore divinissima illa caro et supercaelestis sanguis tractari conveniat, paulatim ex communione calicis populum subtraxere, veriti, ne sacratissimus sanguis domini in turbas participatus et incautius aliquando tractatus effunderetur in terram. Atque ita successu temporis introductum est, ne quis apud Latinos laicus calicem domini postulare praesumeret. Scit enim Latina ecclesia sub una specie confecto sacramento Christum totum et integrum contineri, neque opus esse ad salutem duplici specie cibari laicos. Sed quis auctor fuerit hujus consuetudinis, et quando introducta sit prohibitio calicis in populo, neque legi hactenus neque audivi. Illud vero manifestum est, quod ante Constantiense concilium neque Romani pontifices neque universales synodi de hac prohibitione quidquam sanxisse repeririuntur. Veterum autem extant non pauca decreta, quae communione calicis mandare videntur. In Constantia prima canon promulgatus est eos damnans, qui auctoritate propria a consuetudine patrum recedentes, communicandum sub duplici specie censent. In Basiliense vero declaratum ac sanctum est, communione calicis quoad laicos sub praecipto necessitatis minime cadere; qui secur sapiant, errare, neque tolerandos esse, qui absque permissione ecclesiae ea communione utantur.

1 causa subtracti calicis marg. note D, G
2 omit. G
3 omit. F
4 Non legit quis auctor fuerit marg. note D, G
5 Multa decreta communionen calicis marg. note D
6 Constantiense marg. note D, G
7 Basiliense marg. note D, G
8 promissione C
The Latins, however, treated the sacraments of Christ with greater reverence, understanding how greatly we should honour and revere the body and blood of the son of God supreme, who thunders from on high. They also understood with how great awe the divine flesh and heavenly blood must be treated. Fearing that the holy 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 in order 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.

It is clear, however, that before the Council of Constance neither the Roman Pontiffs nor the Universal Synods are found to have sanctioned this form of communion. On the contrary, many decrees are extant which appear to mandate the communion of the chalice. It was in Constance that, for the first time, a canon was promulgated condemning those who on their own authority disregard the custom of our fathers and claim that communion must be under both species. And in Basel it was declared and decreed that that communion of the chalice is absolutely not an obligation based on a divine command: people who believe differently are in error, and those who use this form of communion without the permission of the Church should not be tolerated.

---

1 Cf. Audivi
2 “supercaelestis”
3 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 Constance, cf. Smend, p. 29 ff.
4 i.e. General Council
5 The Council of Constance, 1414-1418
6 The Council of Basel, 1431-1439
At Bohem etsi aliquando praedicaverunt sine communione calicis salvari neminem; postea tamen hoc errore dimisso, seu ficte seu vere - neque enim corda hominum possumus introspicere - putantes se aliquid gratiae sub calice recipere, hanc communionem ex auctoritate Romanae sedis expostulant. Quae res licet magna est et rustice magis quam docte petitur, nihil tamen ab evangelica lege aut apostolica traditione dissentit. Non est igitur, cur timore fidei dissolvere tractatum oporteat. Sed mali fortasse plus quam boni pariet indulta Bohemis communio. Quod si ita fuerit, abnuenda sunt postulata. Intueamur igitur, quid mali quidve boni vel concessio communionis vel negatio secum importet, eamque partem amplectamur, quae plus commodi, minus incommodi videtur afferre.

\footnote{postulanda E}
But although the Bohemians at some time preached that nobody can be saved without the communion of the chalice, they have later abandoned this error - whether sincerely or as a pretense (for we cannot look into the hearts of men). Still they believe that they receive some kind of grace with the chalice, and therefore they require this form of communion under the authority of the Roman See. Though the matter is important and their demand primitive and unfounded, it does not go against the law of the Gospel nor apostolic tradition. Therefore, there is no reason to disregard the agreement¹ for fear of violating Faith. Still, granting this form of communion to the Bohemians may have more bad consequences than good. If this is so, their demands should be denied. So let us examine the good and bad consequences of granting or refusing this form of communion, and let us accept that solution which brings greater advantages than disadvantages.

¹ The agreement with the Regent of Bohemia, Georg Podiebrad, referred to earlier
Si concedimus, quae petuntur, potentissimum populum, amplissimum regnum, fero
cissimas Europae gentes ad oboedientiam sanctae Romanae ecclesiae convocamus; dis
cordes inter se Bohemiae plebes unimus; Ladislao regi provinciam quietam reddimus; 
Theutonibus in circuitu pacem praebemus; militiam fortissimam, quam contra Turcos armare 
possimus, nobis conciliamus; et quod rebus omnibus praestat, infinitis animabus paradisi 
portas aperiemus. Atque hoc potissime quaeritandum censeo, quando nihil est, quod illi 
maximo atque optimo Deo caelum regenti animarum lucro fiat acceptius. In Bohemia vero ac 
Moravia difficile dictu est, ne dicam cogitatu, quanta populi multitudo succe
dunt, quae si 
petita concedimus, Christo acquiritur; si negamus, Diabolo. Et ajo confiderent ex auctori
tate prudentum, quia lucrifaciemus in hoc tractatu innumerabiles animas et, quae nullo pacto 
circumscribi valeant, plebes. Nam etsi duces populi fortasse\footnote{omit. B, E} fraudulent\footnote{arbitrantur G}er agant, multitudo tamen sincera est et ignorantia, non pertinacia peccat. Quae postquam semel didicerit se 
deceptam et unioni consenserit, cautior in posterum fraudibus obviabit, et bibens, te 
permit
tente, de calice fiet aeternae vitae particeps. Parumne hoc cuipiam videri potest, tot 
populos, quot Bohemia atque Moravia nutrit, lucrifacere? Tam numerosis gentibus Christi 
regnum aperire? Non est argenti aut auri lucrum, sed animarum, quae omne metallum et 
omnes gemmas antecellunt. Haec sunt bona, pater sancte, quae viri sapientes ex hoc tractatu\footnote{tractu G} 
arbitrantur emergere; magna quidem, et pro quibus Romanus pontifex, omnium Christo 
credentium rector et pastor, usque ad sanguinem et animam contendere debeat.

\footnote{si concedimus marg. note D}
\footnote{aperimus B, E}
\footnote{omit. B, E}
\footnote{tractu G}
4.2. Arguments in favour of an agreement

[43] If we grant their demands, we call a powerful people, a large kingdom, and the most warlike peoples of Europe into the obedience of the Holy Roman Church, we unite the divided peoples of Bohemia, we give King Ladislaus a tranquil region, we give the neighbouring peoples peace, we become reconciled with strongly armed people whom we can mobilize against the Turks. Above all, we open the gates of Paradise to an infinite number of souls, and this is what I consider to be the most important of all, for nothing more pleases the Greatest and Best God, who rules in Heaven, than gaining souls. It is difficult to say, or even to imagine, how much the population of Bohemia and Moravia has grown. If we grant their demands, this people will be gained for Christ; if we deny the demands, it will be gained for the Devil. This I say, confidently and on the authority of the [aformentioned] wise men, that with this agreement we shall benefit countless souls and innumerable peoples. For though the leaders of the people may perhaps be acting deceitfully, the multitude is sincere and sins out of ignorance, not out of defiance. When they realize that they have been deceived and agree to a union, they will confront deception more cautiously in the future, and as – with your permission - they drink from the chalice - they will become participants in eternal life. Can anybody think that it is a small thing to benefit the many peoples living in Bohemia and Moravia? To open the Kingdom of Christ to so many peoples? We shall be gaining not gold and silver, but souls which far surpass all metals and jewels.

These are the advantages, Holy Father, that wise men think will result from this agreement. They are certainly great and something for which the Roman Pontiff, the governor and shepherd of all believers in Christ, should strive for with all his might.¹

¹ “usque ad sanguinem at animam”
Sed audi modo, quae contra objiciuntur. Indulsit Basiliense concilium, quae petivere Bohemi; legatos ad eos misit, pacta cum regno percussit. Quid inde? An non iidem Bohemi sunt, qui ante fuerunt? Et cur nunc magis fidem servabunt? Ficta eorum reditio est et plena fraudis. Quod si aliunde non liquet, hinc patet, quia Rokezanam praesulem quaeant, hominem ante descriptum. Volunt enim ex duodecim viris, qui ad Pragensem ecclesiam nominandi sunt, unum hunc esse. Quid ergo? Sane talis sit aliorum nominatio, ut necesse sit illum assumere, si modo minus ineptum recipiendum judicabis. Tunc homo pestilens, propositi victor, cathedram sortitus, quam supra triginta annos ambivit, omnem Bohemiam ad suam sententiam reformabit, neque presbyterum patietur in regno suae sectae contrarium, potenti manu clero et populo imperabit, compactata deridebit, nolentes de calice bibere ab ecclesia separabit, atque in hunc modum apostolica sede prorsus irrisa, ad priores insanias regnum Bohemiae revocabit. Quod si eo neglecto alium quemvis Pragensi ecclesiae praefeceris, extra civitatem suam illi manendum erit; pauper, inops exulabit archiepiscopus.
4.3. **Arguments against an agreement**

[44] But hear now the objections:

“The Council of Basel granted the Bohemian demands, sent legates, and made a pact with the kingdom. And what happened? Did not the Bohemians remain as before? So, why would they better keep faith now? Their surrender was a deceitful sham. This is patently clear if not for other reasons then at least from the fact that they ask for Rokycana as bishop, the man described earlier. For they want him to be one of the twelve men whom they are going to nominate for the Church of Prague. And what [will happen] then? [Surely,] the other nominees will be such\(^1\) that it will be necessary to appoint Rokycana if you consider him to be the least unsuitable. Thus this terrible man will achieve his aims and be rewarded with a See that he has desired for more than 30 years. He will reform all of Bohemia as he pleases, and he will not tolerate any priest in the kingdom who is against his sect; he will lord it over the people and the clergy with a strong hand, he will scorn the *Compacts*, he will expel those who do not want to drink from the chalice from the Church, and when he has thus made the Apostolic See a laughing stock, he will take the Kingdom of Bohemia back to its former mad errors. But if you bypass him and put somebody else in charge of the Church of Prague, then this other man will have to remain outside the city, and he will be a poor and destitute archbishop in exile.

---

\(^1\) i.e. unsuitable
Scimus insuper Bohemorum quammultos errores esse, nec de illis mentionem audimus; et quomodo salvabuntur permissa communione, nisi universam haeresim abdicaverint? Quid de bonis ecclesiarum dicemus, quae isti rapuerunt? Lora haec et catenae sunt, quibus colla raptorum in aeterna praecipitia trahuntur, nisi restituantur. De restitutione autem verbum nullum. Dulce sapiunt laicis bona nostra; nimis eis abundare videmur. In opes nostras ore aperto inhiant. Quod si pacem Bohemis damus ecclesiastica bona tenentibus, omnium gentium avaritiam adversus ecclesiam provocabimus; nihil est enim, quod humanae cupiditati maiores flammatas adjiciat, quam malo exemplo impunita rapacitas. Sit tamen vera reditio, facessat haeresis, nihil obstent ecclesiarum rapinae, quid tum: an communionem indulgebimus?

---

1 et add. F
2 promissa E
3 omit. B, E
4 adjicias E
Moreover, we know that the other Bohemian errors are numerous, and we do not hear any mention of them at all. How will they be saved, if the get the desired communion but do not renounce their entire heresy?

And what shall we say about the church properties they have stolen? These properties are like reins and chains around the necks of the robbers that will pull them straight into eternal perdition¹ unless they are restored. But there is not one word about restitution. Our properties smell good to laymen: they think that we have far too much. They are salivating for our property with open mouths. If we grant peace to the Bohemians holding church property, we encourage the greed of all peoples for church property for nothing enflames human greed more than the bad example of unpunished rapacity.

But let us presume that there is a true surrender, that the heresy ends, and that the plunder of churches is no longer an obstacle: should we then grant the desired form of communion?

¹ “praecipitia”

1 actenus contra concessionem marg. note D; hactenus contra concessionem marg. note G
[46] To some this concession will seem scandalous: “If you ask the Austrians, the Bavarians, the Franks, the Saxons, the Silesians, and all the other Germans, they will say, as with one mouth, that the Bohemian demands should be rejected. “How can we allow the communion of the chalice,” they will say, “when our fathers, and brothers, and we ourselves fought so many wars to prevent laymen from having it? Would we not want our cities to burn, our fields to be wasted, our sons and wives to be carried off to slavery rather than allowing this new communion rite in Bohemia?” And those Bohemians will agree who remained loyal to the Roman Church during the storm of persecution. Thus the whole of Germany will be outraged and offended, and it will revile the Apostolic See for granting the communion of the chalice to the people that it was formerly considered harmful to grant – and after so great an effusion of blood, after the loss of so many illustrious men, after the plunderings and fires, and after all the calamities caused by wars. Thus, it is not possible to accommodate the Bohemians without injury to many great peoples.

To this should be added that if the Bohemians get their way, there will be no shortage of people wanting the same, whether the French, the Spanish, or other peoples. And it will not be just to deny these great peoples what would have been granted to the Bohemians.

Thus we shall fall into two evils: firstly, the Bohemians will appear to have been wiser than the Roman Church since their position is victorious whereas ours fails. And secondly, we shall again risk spilling and showing disrespect to the Lord’s blood\(^1\) which was the reason our forefathers took away the chalice from the people.”

This is how the opponents reason.

\(^1\) I.e. when administering communion
At qui eam tuentur, ut infra subnectam, respondere solent: Quod neglexere Bohemi, quae Basiliensi concilio promiserunt, inde fuit, quia post compactata mox subortum est in ecclesia Dei grave dissidium\(^1\), cum Eugenius, antecessor tuus, patres in Basilea congregatos damnaret, illi autem Eugenium multifarie perseverentur. Sigismundus imperator, qui turbida regni negotia compositurus erat, rebus excessit humanis. Filibertus synodalis legatus non diu post eum animam exalavit. Albertus Caesar, quamvis attritis regis Poloniae partibus universam paene Bohemiam in potestatem redegerit, prius tamen obiit, quam regnum reformare potuerit. Sub Ladislao diu neglecta pupillaris aetas provinciam inquietam habuit. Principes igitur haeresis, qui Basiliensis concilii leges inviti susceperant, nequitiae suae tempus idoneum nacti, ad priores blasphemias redierunt, errantemque sine pastore gregem\(^2\) in abrupta quaeque devia peplerunt. Nunc alia regni facies est. Rex adultus\(^3\) et sapiens curiosusque nostrae religionis a Deo datus est. Georgius gubernator, quamvis de calice bibat, vir tamen solidus est, promissi tenax et\(^4\) servantiissimus\(^5\) aequi. Optimates reliqui nostrum paene omnes ritum observant. Civitates, etsi calicem sitium, sub imperio tamen baronum et regis viventes, legem ferent, quam illi dabunt.

---

\(^{1}\) dissidium D, G  
\(^{2}\) regem F  
\(^{3}\) est add. F  
\(^{4}\) omit. D, G  
\(^{5}\) ferventissimus E
4.4. Refutation of the arguments against an agreement

4.4.1. Actual situation of the kingdom

[47] But those who are in favour of the concession, usually reply as follows: the Bohemians omitted to do what they had promised the Council of Basel because after the [agreement on the] Compacts there arose in God’s Church a serious conflict, when Eugenius, your predecessor, condemned the Fathers gathered in Basel, whereas those Fathers molested Eugenius in many ways. Emperor Sigismund, who was about to settle the turbulent affairs of the kingdom, left this world. Philibert, the conciliar legate, gave up the spirit shortly afterwards. Emperor Elect Albrecht had laid waste to parts of the Kingdom of Poland and gotten almost all of Bohemia into his power, but he died before he could reform the kingdom. Ladislaus was ignored during his minority which left the region in a state of turmoil. Therefore the leaders of the heresy, who had only unwillingly accepted the conditions laid down by the Council of Basel and now had a situation ripe for their evildoings, returned to their blasphemous practices and drove the flock without a pastor headlong into deviance.

But now the situation of the kingdom is quite different. God has given us an adult and wise king who is concerned about our religion. And though Regent Georg drinks from the chalice, he is a solid man who keeps his word and is a staunch defender of justice. Almost all the other nobles observe our rites. And the cities, though eager for the chalice, live under the commands of the barons and the king, and they will accept whatever law they pass.

---

1 Sacerdotes marg. note D
2 possint D, G
3 omit. B, E
And to say something more about the mood in the kingdom, there are four kinds of people in Bohemia: the priests, the nobles, the citizens, and the peasants.

The priests have never wanted unity in the past, and they do not desire it now. They are low-born plebeians, without virtues and education, though they seem to have learnt a number of sophisms and tricks of argumentation from logicians. If the affairs of Bohemia are settled, they fear the future. For then men of noble birth will come to the kingdom, men of great personal integrity and eminent learning with whom they cannot compare at all. Then the heretics will be abandoned, and the orthodox will have the upper hand. Fearing this, the Bohemian priests who never supported unity in the past will not do so today if they can have their way. During the Council of Basel they were afraid of stirring the anger of a people seeking peace. Now they fear both the barons and the people, and they hope that they may somehow make them reject the honest course. So, you see that the mentality of the clergy is wicked and dreadful.
At barones\textsuperscript{1} et \{77r\} optimates longe diversa sententia tenet. Fuerunt enim extra Bohemiam, inspexerunt nitorem nostri cultus, animadverterunt inter nostros et eorum sacerdotes quantum interest; intellexerunt contemptui esse cerimonias suas, puduit eos ineptiarum suarum, utile putaverunt pacem jam tandem cum finitimis nationibus colere vitamque suis vicinis non abhorrentem vivere, ecclesias ornatas habere, sacerdotes honoratos apud se esse, rem divinam non sine apparatu facere. Sed quoniam de calice longo tempore biberant, ac pro eo cum ceteris gentibus saepe ferro\textsuperscript{2} contenderant, veriti sunt, ne ritu mutato convicti haeresis viderentur, dicentibus populis eos alioquin salvos fieri non potuisse. Etsi enim non ignorant optimates Bohemiae sacramentum sub una specie plebi sufficere, rumorem tamen populi reformidant et murmura vulgi. Sunt namque Bohemi honoris hujus mundani et popularis aurae justo cupidiores, et mortem facilius ferant, quam turpiter egisse quidquam videri velint. Fragiles sunt, ut homines\textsuperscript{3} aegroti; colorem quaerunt, qui apud doctos nullius momenti est, apud ignaros videri aliquid potest. Nostrum est compati fratribus, et imbecillae mentis subvenire fragilitati, si dum eos quaerimus, non amittimus alios.

\textsuperscript{1} Barones marg note D
\textsuperscript{2} ferro A, F; ferro cor. ex fero C
\textsuperscript{3} ut homines : homines ut F
[49] But the view of the barons and the nobles is completely different. They have been outside Bohemia. They have seen the splendour of our services. They have noted how great is the difference between our priests and theirs: they have seen how their ceremonies are held in contempt and are ashamed of their boorishness. They want to have peace with the neighbouring nations and a life that is not abhorrent to them. They want ornate churches. They want priests who are esteemed, and a solemn liturgy. But they have been drinking from the chalice for a long time and often fought for it with the other peoples. Therefore, they fear that if their rite is changed, they will be seem as proven heretics and that the other peoples will say they could not be saved otherwise. Although the Bohemian nobles know that the sacrament under one species is enough for the people, they do fear popular rumour and the murmurings of the common people. For the Bohemians are inordinately fond of mundane honour and popularity, and they would rather die than appear to have done something shameful. In that sense they are as sensitive as sick persons and they are highly concerned about appearance – something which does not count for much among educated people, but may seem important to ignorant people. But we should have compassion with our brethren and aid their sensitive and the weak mind, so that we do not lose some while seeking others.
Civilitates autem, etsi tantum de sacramento sentiunt, quantum sacerdotum assidua praedicatione docentur, pacem tamen cum vicinis cupiunt, et unionem recta mente suscipient. Quod si semel intelligant haustum calicis non esse plebibus necessarium, suorum sacerdotum hypocrisim perpetuo insectabuntur odio. Ruricolae vero ita circa communionem se habent, quemadmodum eorum domini.

Quod si mentem cujusque Bohemi rimari possimus, inveniemus praeter sacerdotes ad concordiam totum regnum bono animo rectoque vadere. Ceterum cum sacerdotibus in Bohemia nulla reipublicae cura committatur, cives solum inter sese jus dicere possint, agricolae et qui rus incolunt loco servorum habeantur, barones autem cuncta disponent, quis non intelligit admissam semel ex imperio nobilitatis unionem stabilem atque inconssuam esse mansuram? De bello namque, de pace, de legibus, de vectigalibus, de totius regni gubernatione solius regis est cum baronibus dispositio. Non est itaque nunc formidandum, quod prius accidit, ut accepta capitula rescindantur, et sicut Basiliense concilium ita et Romana ecclesia contemptui fiat, quamvis animarum lucrum sub periculo derisionis libentius quaeram, quam jacturam sub spe laudis admittam.

---

1 civitates marg note D
2 non esse plebibus : plebibus non esse G
3 hypocresim A, F, D, G; hypocrisim corr. ex hypocresim C
4 ruricolae marg note D
5 comitatur B, E
6 colunt B, E
7 derisionibus F
Concerning the sacrament, people in the cities believe only what they are being taught in the assiduous preaching of the priests, but they do want peace with their neighbours and they accept unity in a willing spirit. If they ever understand that drinking from the chalice is not necessary for laymen, they will forever hate their priests for their hypocrisy.

The peasants hold the same beliefs about communion as their lords.

If we could probe the mind of all Bohemians, we would find that excepting the priests the whole realm accepts unity. Moreover, in Bohemia, no public charges are entrusted to priests; citizens themselves administer the law between them; farmers and peasants are considered as servants; it is the barons who decide everything. Therefore all will understand that once unity has been established by decree of the nobility, it will remain stable and unshaken. For all dispositions concerning war, peace, laws, taxes, and the rule of the whole kingdom belong to the king and the barons alone. Therefore, although it has happened once, we need not now fear that an accepted agreement will be rescinded and that the Roman Church will be disregarded, as was the Council of Basel. At any rate I would rather seek the gain of souls at the risk of scorn than accept their loss in the hope of praise.
4.4.2. Issue of Rokycana

[52] Concerning the archbishop of Prague their objection is far from the truth. For if Your Piety chooses one among the twelve men nominated by the Bohemians, they will accept him as archbishop even if Rokycana is bypassed: they will keep their promise and comply with your decision. For the Bohemians do not take their promises lightly, being serious people who always keep their word. Even the Germans who have hated the Bohemians intensely for many years unanimously praise them for keeping their promises diligently. And this is actually why they insist on Rokycana for archbishop, for there is a letter from the barons and the cities in which the Church of Prague is promised to Rokycana. This letter has been confirmed by Sigismund, and later by Albrecht, and finally by Ladislaus. If such a letter was requested today, it would not be issued. But they will not take it upon themselves to go against a letter that has already been issued. But as the king and the people do not have the right to appoint the archbishop, they are having recourse to Your Holiness, and they will refrain from offending the Apostolic See by nominating one person only.
[53] XII nominare proponunt, inter quos, velutì satisfacturi promisso, Rokezana¹ insertum cupiunt. Neque formidandum est, quod supra² suspicari aliquos diximus, omnes scilicet, qui nominabuntur, de communione calicis esse et Rokezana pejores. Est enim communi baronum et civitatum consilio facienda nominatio, quemadmodum mihi regni legati apud Novam Austriae Civitatem affirmarunt. Itaque nominabuntur pariter ex utraque parte, qui videbuntur pontifici culmine digniores. Georgius autem gubernator, cum saepius ex me percontatus esset, an Romanus praesul ad id flecti posset, ut Rokezana³ ecclesiae Pragensi⁴ praeficeret, egoque⁵ multis rationibus id negassem: "Vah⁶," inquit tandem, "non erit Rokezana, qui nobis perpetuo⁷ Romanam ecclesiam reddat infestam." De statu quoque archiepiscopi provisurum regnum gubernator asseveravit; ait enim maximam esse dignitatem illam, neque decorum videri baronibus eorum mendicare pontificem, qui sicut ceteris regibus suum esse aequalem volunt, ita et archiepiscopum regni reliquis pontificibus parem cupiunt; neque enim honoratus videri potest populus, cujus inglorius est praelatus.

¹ Rokezana E
² omit. G
³ Rokezana E
⁴ Pragensem E
⁵ ego quoque G
⁶ vel F
⁷ omit. B, E
[53] So they propose to nominate twelve men, and they will insert Rokycana among the nominees as a way of keeping their word to him. And there is no reason to fear what some, as we have said before, suspect, namely that all the nominees will be supporters of the communion of the chalice and worse than Rokycana. For the nomination will be made by the barons and cities jointly, as the legates of the kingdom told me in Neustadt¹ in Austria.² Therefore, there will be an equal number of nominees from each party, and they will be men worthy of high episcopal office. The regent, Georg, several times asked me whether the Bishop of Rome could be persuaded to appoint Rokycana to the Church of Prague, and when I had given him many reasons why this was impossible, he said: “Well, then we shall no longer have Rokycana to always poison our relations with the Roman Church.”³ The regent also confirmed that the kingdom would provide for the state of the archbishop. He said that this office is a very great one, and that the barons would consider it unseemly that their archbishop should go begging. For just as they want their king to be the equal of other kings, they want the archbishop of the kingdom to be the equal of other archbishops. And moreover, a people does not appear to be respectable if the leader of its church is an undistinguished person.

¹ Wiener Neustadt
² Presumably the regent, George Podiebrad, and the Chancellor, Prokop von Rabstein
³ Piccolomini was probably correct in believing that, by this time, the Bohemian leadership was indeed quite aware – and had accepted - that Rome would never accept Rokycana as Archbishop of Prague, cf. Heymann: George, p. 107-108: ... It seems obvious that among the people holding the important positions in the country’s government no one seriously believed any longer that Rokycana would ever be confirmed by the Curia (quite apart from the fact that the more zealous Catholics, among them the King, did not truly want him, though they did not dare to say so openly)
[54] Sed quid hic moramur? Non ego meis verbis exigo, si libet amplecti tractatum. Expetantur litterae regis ac baronum et civitatum, si expedire putatur, quibus certa reddatur apostolica sublimitas, ex XII nominandis si unus assumatur, regnum illi paritum, et usque ad praescribendum¹ aliquid summas de certis redditibus annuis intra praemonstrandum tempus provisurum. Tua vero pietas his polluceatur, quia ex XII nominandis, si modo inter eos idoneus² reperietur, unum Pragensi ecclesiae pastorem dabit; communionem calicis ea conditione indulget, ne putent illam quoad laicos necessarium; sed praedicantes talia coercent, et omnem [78r] haeresim ex regno propulsent. Aut enim ad haec suis litteris sese Bohemi³ constringent, et implebunt proculdubio, quod promittent; aut recusantes, sinistram ostendent se mentem habuisse; et apostolica sedes in honore manebit, quae tractatus fraude plenos abjecerit.

¹ scribendum E
² inter eos idoneus : idoneus inter eos G
³ Bohemum D, G
[54] But why prolong this discussion? The treaty should not be accepted on the strength of my words alone. No, let us await the letters from the king and the barons and the cities – if they intend to send one – informing Your Apostolic Highness that the kingdom will obey the one appointed from among the twelve nominees, and that they will, within a specified time, provide a sum\(^1\) from secure annual incomes. On your side, Your Piety should promise them to give a pastor to the Church of Prague if at least one of the twelve nominees is found suitable. The communion of the chalice should be granted them on the conditions that they do not consider it necessary for laymen, that they will coerce those men who preach such [errors], and finally, that they will cast all heresy out of the kingdom. Either the Bohemians will commit themselves to do this in writing, and then they will certainly fulfill their promises. Or they will decline to do so, thus showing that they have been in bad faith, and then the honour of the Apostolic See will be safeguarded since it rejected a treaty full of deceit.

\(^1\) i.e. they will settle a secure income on the archbishop
[55] De reliquis autem errorribus, quibus ajunt Bohemos esse infectos, non intelligo cur magnopere disputemus. Diximus enim supra, ex omnibus articulis errorem sapientibus quattuor dumtaxat Bohemos¹ elegisse, quos in concilio defenderent. Denique vero per compactata tribus rejectis, ad unum tantum se reduxisse de communione calicis, et hunc post multa utrimque dicta ad discussionem concilii remisisse. Quod si volunt hodie Bohemi compactatis locum esse, et integram unionem, quovis errore seposito, volunt, aut enim necesse est, Bohemos omnem haeresim abdicare, aut quae percusserunt compactata rescindere.

¹ dumtaxat Bohemos : Bohemos dumtaxat B, E
4.4.3. Other Bohemian errors

[55] Concerning the other errors with which the Bohemians are reportedly infected, I do not see the need for much discussion, either. We have already mentioned that at the Council\(^1\) the Bohemians chose to defend only four of all their erroneous theses\(^2\). When three of them had been discarded in connection with the *Compacts*, there was only the one concerning communion of the chalice left, and after much had been said on both sides, this one was referred to the Council’s discussion. If now the Bohemians want the *Compacts* to become effective, and to renounce all errors, and to have a complete union, they must necessarily abjure all heresy or they must rescind the *Compacts* that they had agreed to.

---
\(^1\) i.e. the Council of Basel
\(^2\) “articulis”
4.4.4. Stolen church properties

[56] “But what will you answer,” somebody asks, “concerning the properties of the Church? This is a very important issue, and it may destroy the kingdom if the stolen properties are not given back.” The learned men whom we have heard reasoning about these matters think otherwise. Nobody in the kingdom says that the stolen church properties should not be restored. This crime is even denounced publicly, and those who are occupying such properties are secretly suffering pangs of conscience. But they have been overcome by their own greed and are powerful at home, so neither do they make restitution on their own initiative, nor are they forced to do so by others. But why should it affect the large majority of people that ten or twenty persons have appropriated church estates? The Lord would keep Sodom safe for the sake of ten good men;¹ so, do we think that Bohemia should be destroyed because of ten evil men? We, too, have thieves in our cities, and robbers, and usurers, and adulterers, and blasphemers. No city is completely free of evil people.² But a man should not be destroyed because of the crime of a neighbour in which he has no part. The soul that sinneth, the same shall die, says scripture.³ It is not the kingdom as a whole that holds these church properties today. They have come into the hands of some powerful private persons, and the kingdom cannot force them to give the properties back without a great uproar. Therefore, we should not reject union with the Bohemians for this reason. The Council of Basel put that whole issue aside when it received the Kingdom of Bohemia back into the unity of Church. And in spite of the fact that Ulrich of Rosenberg⁴ is occupying the estates of two monasteries, we still consider him as a catholic⁵ simply because he did not defect to the Hussites.⁶ Therefore, this issue should be dealt with in a separate treaty.

¹ Genesis, 18-19
² Cf. Decembrio: De laudibus, p. 1021: Verum tamen nulla civitas adeo bene morata aut instituta fuerit quae malorum hominum, ut ipse professus est, omnino careret
³ Ezechiel, 18, 20
⁴ Ulrich II von Rosenberg (1403 – 1462): Bohemian magnate, one of the leaders of the Catholic party. Governor of Bohemia from 1438 to 1444
⁵ “communicamus”
⁶ Cf. Heymann: George, p. 17: Of the leaders of the Catholic magnates, Rosenberg was the greatest, the richest, in some ways the cleverest, and by all odds the most scrupulous. His changeover from the Hussitism of his adolescent years to sharp antagonism against all Hussite groups had no strong religious foundation. His main motive was the wish for material gains. No other man profited as abundantly and relentlessly from the chance to appropriate the landed estates which the Church had lost as a result of the revolution. See also p. 27
Et fortasse non est eorum opinio mala, qui relinquentum quemlibet in sua conscientia putant. Redeunt enim homines aliquando ad cor, et stimuli acti conscientiae, si non sani, saltem aegroti cum Deo in rationem veniunt, cumque voluntatis ultimae sententiam scribunt, complura ecclesiis legata relinquunt. Quod si concordia facta suae conscientiae relinquantur, qui res ecclesiasticas invasere, existimatio non paucorum, neque indoeorum est, brevi tempore ditissimas apud Bohemos ecclesias fieri. Morientibus namque baronibus aliisque divitibus, semper in partem haereditatis ecclesia vel testamenti vel codicilli jure vocabitur. Neque timendum est exinde hoc in alios derivari; neque enim impunita sunt Bohemorum spolia, qui per annos quadraginta et amplius sub anathemate viventes, dum vicinos ipsi vexant, et ab ipsis vexantur, adeo attenuati sunt, ut non modo quae rapuerunt ecclesiis bona, sed patrimonia quoque exhauserint, regnumque illud opulentissimum ad inopiam redegerint. Itaque sequatur audacter Bohemorum vestigia, spoliet ecclesias, fidem abneget quisquis aut ex divite pauper, aut ex paupere miser effici cupit. Atque ita de bonis ecclesiarium ex doctis plerique fabulantur
And, as some people think, it may not be so foolish to leave this matter to the conscience of the persons concerned. For people sometimes come to their senses and are plagued by their conscience: when they come to terms with God (maybe not when they are in good health, but towards the end when they fall ill) and write their last will, they leave many legacies to the churches. If, when unity is established, those who have appropriated church properties are left to their own consciences, many - and knowledgeable - people think that the Bohemian churches will become rich in a very short time. For when the barons and other rich people die, they will always leave some inheritance to the Church either through testamentary or other legal disposition.¹ And we need not fear that these properties will then go to other people: indeed, robberies do not go unpunished in Bohemia. For more than 40 years they have lived in the state of excommunication, and, while raiding their neighbours and being raided by them in turn, they have become so worn down that they have used up not only the robbed church properties, but also their own inherited properties, and they have brought this very prosperous kingdom to poverty. Therefore, anyone who wishes to become poor instead of rich, or destitute instead of merely poor, should boldly follow in the footsteps of the Bohemians, rob the churches, and reject our Faith.

This is what many learned people say concerning the church properties.

¹ “testamenti vel codicilli jure”
[58] Verum quia supra objectum est, si concedatur plebibus in Bohemia participium calicis, Bohemos\textsuperscript{1}, qui cum Romana ecclesia manserunt, et omnes Theutones scandalizatum iri, huic quoque parti obviandum est, ne forte credatur illic vulner esse, ubi jam est obducta cicatrix. Et de Bohemis quidem facilis responsio est, nam et ipsi, quos timemus, cum toto regno consentiunt, et compactata requirunt. At clam aliquis litteras et nuntios ad curiam mittit, magnopereque dissuadet, ne\textsuperscript{2} compactata firmentur. Fecit hoc olim Mainardus de Nova Domo et Ulricus de Rosis, quibus discordia frugi fuit; erant enim alterius factionis principes, et putantes Romanam ecclesiam manus adjutrices praebere, et argenti quantum vellent ministrare, maximas opes cumulare et Bohemiae dominatum adipisci sperabant\textsuperscript{3}. Sed nemo est hodie hujus animi; quinimmo Procopius Cancellarius et alii plerique nostrarum partium barones rogati per me saepius, quinam modi\textsuperscript{4} sint ad componendam Bohemiam aptissimi, compactata semper ante oculos habuere, asserentes hanc unam esse viam, quae tandem ad formam aliarum provinciarum Bohemiam redigere possit\textsuperscript{5}. Compactata namque, solum habentibus usum, potionem calicis indulgent, necessitatemque negant.

\textsuperscript{1} Bohemis E
\textsuperscript{2} nec F
\textsuperscript{3} sperant F
\textsuperscript{4} mundi E
\textsuperscript{5} compactata semper ... possit omit. F
4.4.5. Reaction of Bohemian catholics

[58] The objection has been made that if sharing the chalice is granted to the peoples in Bohemia, those Bohemians who remained loyal to the Roman Church as well as all the Germans will be scandalized. We must therefore present our counterarguments on this issue, too, so that nobody will think that the wound is still open where only a scar remains.

As for the Bohemians, the answer is easy, for the very people whose reaction we fear agree with the whole kingdom in demanding the Compacts. [It is true that] some have secretly sent letters and messengers to the Curia to argue strongly against a confirmation of the Compacts. This was done by Meinhard of Neuhaus¹ and Ulrich of Rosenberg who have actually been benefiting from the conflict: as leaders of the other party,² they thought that the Roman Church would assist them and provide as much money as they liked, and they hoped to gather large fortunes, and to gain lordship over Bohemia.³

But today nobody feels this way and especially not Chancellor Prokop and many other barons on our side. I often asked them about the best ways to settle the Bohemian matter, and pointing to the Compacts they claimed that these provide the only way to finally assimilate Bohemia into the other provinces.⁴ For the Compacts only grant the drinking from the chalice to those who already have this usage while at the same time denying that this practice is necessary.⁵

¹ cf. Heymann: George, p. 17: The first among the magnates were three men: Ulrich of Rosenberg, Menhart of Hradec, and Ptacek of Pirkstein. On Menhart see also p. 19
² i.e. the catholic party
³ Cf. Heymann: George, p. 18: Ulrich’s main goal thereby was to prevent the establishment of a stable and effective government inside Bohemia which might have limited or stopped the steady aggrandizement of his possessions, his wealth, and his power. It might also, on the basis of a compromise with Rome have returned to the Church at least some of the rich properties acquired by, among many others, the Rosenbergs. It is for this rather than for religious reasons that he regularly warned the Holy See against the any concessions to the Utraquists, especially against the confirmation of the Compacts and of Rokycana’s archiepiscopal position
⁴ Cf. Heymann: George, p. 7: No other issue could, in the minds of the Bohemians, compare in importance with the question of the Eucharist
⁵ i.e. by virtue of a precept from Jesus
Quod si regnum ea suscipiat, post quinquaginta annos vix aliquis vivet de calice bibens. Neque timendum est, ne patres imbuant filios, quando id prohibent pactiones, et rex est, qui a calice abstinet, idque fere barones agunt omnes. Populus autem plerumque suos mores ad vitam principis reformat; neque enim sese gratum existimat, nisi domino quam simillimus appareat. Presbyteri vero pro pactionibus praedicare cogentur, plebes praedicata sequentur. Atque ita paulatim et plebes et nobiles unum in ritu corpus efficientur, salvique omnes fient; malos autem presbyteros male perdet Deus, quibus in dies morientibus sufficientur alii, qui vias istorum nescient; atque successu temporis tota Bohemia salva fiet. Sic Bohemi sentiunt, qui mecum in hos sermones inciderunt.

\[1 \text{sufficienter A, B, E; sufficientur} \text{ corr. from sufficiente C, F, D}\]
If the kingdom accepts to observe the Compacts, then after 50 years there will be no one left who drinks from the chalice. It need not be feared that fathers pass this practice on to their sons if the agreements forbid it.¹

The king² himself abstains from the chalice as almost all the barons. The majority of the people will change their customs to fit their king’s, since people only feel acceptable if they appear to be just like their king. The priests will be forced to preach in favour of the Compacts, and the people will follow their preachings. Thus, gradually the people and the nobles will form one community of rite, and all will be saved. The wicked priests will be destroyed by God, and as they die out, they will be replaced by others who do not know their ways. Thus, in time, all Bohemia will be saved.

This is what those Bohemians feel with whom I have discussed the matter.

¹ If Piccolomini really believed this, it is an instance on uncharacteristic naivety on his part. He may, however, have considered that this issue was better left to future negotiations
² The young Ladislaus the Posthumous, a staunch catholic
[60] Theutones autem, qui vicini\textsuperscript{1} Bohemis existunt cumque his crebra bella\textsuperscript{2} gesserunt, fatemur invitos audire concessionem calicis. Sed hos odium magis quam ratio ducit. Non intuetur ira, quae caeca est, verum; oculis omnis inimicitia caret. Non tam grave his videtur, si centum milia pereant\textsuperscript{3} animarum, quam si dicatur in populis: “Justi fuerunt Bohemi, quibus relicta communio est; injusti Theutones, qui eam armis prohibere conati sunt.” At viri boni non ponunt rumores ante salutem. Vir bonus vel cum suae famae detrimento animam proximi studebit salvam facere. Nicolaus cardinalis sancti Petri, quem saepe ac libenter in medium adduco – est enim pater auctoritate dignissimus – quamvis Theutonici sanguinis est, non tamen hujus communionis causa perdendos esse Bohemos existimat; intelligit enim vir sapiens communione concessa non propterea justificari, quae bella gesserunt Bohemi, sed damnari magis.

\textsuperscript{1} vici E
\textsuperscript{2} crebra bella : bella crebra B, E
\textsuperscript{3} pareant F
4.4.6. German reactions

[60] As for the Germans, who are the neighbours of the Bohemians and have often fought with them, they will not be happy to hear that the Bohemians are granted the chalice. But in this they are led by hate rather than by reason: anger is blind and does not see things as they are – whereas enmity is without eyes at all.\(^1\) So the Germans will consider the loss of 100,000 Bohemian souls as less serious than that people should say: “The Bohemians were right and have now gotten their communion; and the Germans were wrong when they fought to prevent it.” But good men do not set chatter above salvation. The good man works to save the soul of his neighbour, even if it hurts his own reputation.

Take Nikolaus, Cardinal of San Pietro,\(^2\) whom I often and gladly refer to, for he is a Father of great authority: though he is a German by blood, he does not think that the Bohemians should perish because of this matter of communion. For as a wise man he understands that the grant of communion does not justify the wars which the Bohemians have conducted, but rather condemns them.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Piccolomini means that the eyes, as a sensory organ, see things objectively and that their function is in itself not influenced by emotions

\(^2\) Nikolaus of Kues

\(^3\) An interesting observation which is probably true since otherwise Piccolomini would not have dared make it at the Papal Court
[61] Non enim idcirco pugnatum est, quia sub utraque specie sacramentum suscipiunt, sed quia ritum ecclesiae propria temeritate mutaverant et salvari neminem asseverabant, qui non participaret de calice. At cum decretum sit communionem calicis non cadere sub praeccepto domini Bohemique loco gratiae ab ecclesia Romana permissionem calicis expectant\(^1\), nos justos, illos inquos, nos victores, illos victos, ipsius concordiae tenor ac decretum manifestabit. Quod si secus esset, non Theutones tantum, sed ipsam Romanam ecclesiam, cujus imperio pugnatum est, compactata deturparent. At quamvis abhorrent Alamani – seu Theutones – hujuscemodi concessionem, non tamen irritantur, neque sinistri machinantur aliquid. Intelligunt enim aut pugnandum esse cum Bohemis iterum, aut quem tenent ritum eis permittendum\(^2\). Et cum malum utrumque reputent, ritum illis indulgendum potius censent, quam cum periculo libertatis et vitae totiens dimicandum. Eam ob causam\(^3\) cum Basiliensis concilii concordia intercessit, murmuraverunt, et oblocuti sunt, ut in re assolet nova, Theutones, sed cognita causa et intellecto fructu quieverunt\(^4\). Idem quoque et nunc facient, verosimile est, neque enim confirmatione pacti male commovebuntur Theutones, quos prima concessione non vidimus irritatos.

\(^{1}\) expectant F  
\(^{2}\) esse cum ... permittendum omit. F  
\(^{3}\) cum periculo ... ob causam omit. F  
\(^{4}\) et inquieverunt F
Indeed, the Germans did not fight because the Bohemians received communion under both species, but because they had dared to change the rites of the Church on their own initiative, and because they claimed that nobody could be saved who did not share the chalice. But since it has been decreed\(^1\) that the communion of the chalice does not fall under the precept of the Lord, and since the Bohemians are [now] asking the Roman Church to allow the chalice as an act of grace, the substance of the agreement and the decree itself will show that we are in the right and they are in the wrong, and that we are the victors and they the vanquished. If it was otherwise, then not only the Germans, but the Roman Church at whose command they fought would revile these *Compacts*.

Although the Germans (or the Teutons) do not like this concession, they will not be exasperated nor plot any evil. For they understand that either they will have to fight again with the Bohemians, or these will have to be granted the rites they are already using. They will consider either alternative as bad, but they will prefer the Bohemians receiving the grant of communion to having to fight, again and again, at the risk of losing their freedom and life. This is why, when the agreement was made by the Council of Basel, the Germans grumbled and protested, as is often the case when something new occurs, but when they were informed about the matter more thoroughly and understood the advantages, they calmed down. This they will most likely do now, too: the Germans will not be greatly upset by the confirmation of the compacts just like they were not greatly upset when they were first granted.\(^2\)

---

1. At the Council of Basel
2. In Basel

¹ alii corr. from aliqui A, C, D; aliqui F; omit. B, E
² omit. B, E
³ omit. G
⁴ spem F
4.4.7. Reactions of other nations

[62] Finally, many fear that if the chalice is granted to the Bohemians, then the other Western kingdoms will ask for the same. What they fear is ridiculous, for men do not wish to have what they condemn in their neighbour. Knowing that the whole and complete [body of] Christ is contained in one species of the sacrament, they thought that the Bohemians were crazy when they demanded the chalice to be served to them. So why should they themselves now want to adopt the error they formerly condemned in others? Our kings and princes do not think so little of themselves that they would wish to imitate the Bohemians as if these were their teachers. The religious fervour of our race has decreased so much that it is really more to be feared that our peoples would rather flee communion than demand it under both species!

The Germans and the other neighbours of Bohemia loathe the Bohemian name and resent that people so much that they would neither imitate their bad nor their good deeds! Therefore it is not believable that the kings and cities of our world would in any way desire the Bohemian communion – unless the right hand of God should intervene.

---

1 On the indifference of laypeople towards communion, see Smend, pp. 38-39
Quod si voluntas spiritus sancti fuerit, neque debeatum, neque poterimus resistere. 
*Heu, nihil invitis fas quemquam fidere divis*, inquit ille. Deus nobis et fidem et ritum cerimoniariarn dedit. Quae sunt fidei, non variantur. Quae nunc veritas est, in aeternum veritas erit. *Eloquia domini eloquia casta et argentum examinatum septuplum*. Quod de fide verum est Indis, idem et Hispanis est verum. Cerimoniariurn autem et sacrorum solemnium ritus apud diversas gentes diverse reperiuntur; nec nobis 1 divina pieta indicavit, qua magis observatione laetetur, nisi quia credibile est, quae communiora sunt, ea Deo magis accepta esse; neque enim absque nutu divino paulatim crescere et in omnem terram exire ac recipi cerimoniariurn observationes possunt; neque nos pertinaces esse decet adversus devotiones hominum, quae non sunt divinae legi contrariae. Quod si contingat ad omnes gentes calicis participium divulgari, putandum erit Dei decretum id esse, cui credere omnes tenemur, neque Bohemia, sed Deus ipse nos superabit 2, et ipse sibi, quo pacto reverenter et caute ministretur, abunde providebit. Cum ergo fratres nostri Bohemi sint et baptismi nostri participes, quem nos veneramur Christum colentes, compati eorum ignorantiae, non indignari debemus. Tam pro illis, quam pro nobis passus est Christus. Quaerenda est omnibus artibus eorum salus. Quod si dominus et Deus noster pro redemptione nostra, ne diaboli mancipium essemus, ex summa caeli arce in terram descendere, carnem assumere, humana incommoda ferre, capi, ligari, caedi, ac demum in ligno crucis cum summam 3 turpitudine mortem subire non recusavit, quoniam 4 pacto existimare possimus clementiam ejus Bohemos malle 5 perire, quam suum his sanguinem potandum concedere, quem passim inter homines ecclesiae primitiae distribuit?

---

1 vobis D, G  
2 corr. from separabit A, C  
3 cum summa : summa cum G  
4 quoniam E  
5 male B, E
4.4.8. Diversity of rites

[63] But if that should be the will of the Holy Spirit, then we should neither want to nor be able to resist. *Alas, it is wrong for man to rely on the gods for anything against their will*! says [the poet].¹ It is God who has given us the Faith and our rites and ceremonies. What is of the Faith will not change, and what is the Truth now will alway be the Truth. *The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver refined seven times.*² What is true Faith for the Indians, is also true Faith for the Spaniards.

But ceremonies and solemn holy rites are found to be different in different peoples. The Divine Piety has not told us what 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.

So, should it happen that the sharing of the chalice spreads to other peoples, we must believe that this is God’s will. We are all bound to believe in him, and it is not Bohemia, but God himself who will overcome us. He himself will largely provide the ways in which he will be served reverently and with due caution.³

Since the Bohemians are our brothers and share the baptism that we as Christians revere, we should show compassion and not anger at their ignorance. Christ has suffered both for them and for us, and we should use all means to save them. For us to be saved and not become servants of the Devil, Our Lord and God accepted to descend from the summit of Heaven to the Earth, to take on flesh, to suffer the human condition, to be arrested, to be bound, to be scourged, and finally to die horribly on the tree of the cross. So how can we think that he would, in his mercy, rather let the Bohemians perish than grant them the drinking of his blood which he actually gave to the men of the early Church?

---

¹ Virgil: *Eneid*, 2, 402
² Psalms, 11, 7: *The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried by the fire, purged from the earth, refined seven times (eloquia Domini eloquia munda argentum igne probatum separatum a terra colatum septuplum)*
³ The reference to caution addresses the risk of spilling Christ’s blood from the chalice that was supposedly the reason for abolishing the communion of the chalice from the laypeople

(em.; hec A, C, F, D, G; hee B, E)
interpret In E
haberis ... digna sint omit. E
5. Conclusion

[64] This is what we have drawn from other sources. We do not agree with them unreservedly, for our sight cannot penetrate so profound a matter. These thoughts are too deep for me.¹ My sight grows dim when I look at the rays of the sun.

It is Your Holiness’ responsibility to examine this matter, it is the responsibility of your See to judge between between cause and cause, blood and blood, leprosy and leprosy.² You are surrounded by the Holy Senate³ that cannot fail. Your throne knows all. In your breast reposes the Testament of the Old and the New Law. You are the only one who may judge whether the Bohemian demands merit to be granted. Only Your Piety may decide the matter.

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 authority⁴ – we think, rather than believe that it should be granted to them again and for the same reason. And we are not moved by the arguments of those who refuse to finally come to terms with the Bohemians because they have not observed the earlier agreements properly. For on their side, the Bohemians can bring up many reasons why they should not be considered as having broken their word.

¹ Psalms, 91, 6
² Deuteronomy, 17, 8: inter sanguinem et sanguinem, causam et causam, lepram et non lepram
³ I.e. the College of Cardinals
⁴ In 1438
[65] Sed ignoscendum est etiam frangenti fidem, dicente ad Petrum domino: “Non tantum septies, sed septuagesies\textsuperscript{1} septies peccanti\textsuperscript{2} in se fratri remittendum.” Admonendi\textsuperscript{3} et revocandi sunt cum summa caritate Bohemi, tamquam fratres et cohaeredes nostri in regno domini nostri Jesu Christi. Quod\textsuperscript{4} si recipiunt admonitiones et in\textsuperscript{5} pactis perseverant, lucrati sumus animas fratrum. Si minus, non est pejor nostra conditio quam ante fuit. Nihil nobis perit; immo vero coram\textsuperscript{6} justissimo Deo et apud mortales commendabitur tua pietas, quae pro reductione gregis errantis nihil omiserit. Durities illorum probo, tua facilitas laudi dabitur.

\textsuperscript{1} septuagesies B, E
\textsuperscript{2} peccati E
\textsuperscript{3} admonendi D, G
\textsuperscript{4} qui D, G
\textsuperscript{5} nec corr. from in F
\textsuperscript{6} vero coram : coram vero E
[65] But even if they had broken their word, they should be forgiven, for the Lord said to Peter that a brother who sinned against him should be forgiven *not just seven times, but seventy time seven times*. The Bohemians should be admonished and invited back with great love, as brothers and joint heirs in the kingdom of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

If they accept our admonishments and observe the agreements, we shall have gained the souls of brothers.

If they do not, then our situation is not worse than before. We lose nothing. But Your Piety will be praised before the just God and among men since you did all you could to bring back the wayward flock. All will scorn their stubbornness and praise your spirit of accommodation.

---

1 Matthew, 18, 22: *Then came Peter unto him and said: Lord, how often shall my brother offend against me, and I forgive him? till seven times? Jesus saith to him: I say not to thee, till seven times; but till seventy times seven times.* (\textit{tunc accedens Petrus ad eum dixit Domine quotiens peccabit in me frater meus et dimittam ei usque septies dicit illi Jesus non dico tibi usque septies sed usque septuagies septies})

2 Matthew, 8, 17