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Abstract

In March 1462, an embassy from King Georg Podiebrad of Bohemia came to Pope Pius II to present the king’s declaration of obedience and to permanently settle the issue of communion under both species, granted to the Bohemians by the Council of Basel through the so-called Bohemian Compacts. Communion under both species was, in itself, a matter of Catholic ritual and not of Catholic dogma. But the Hussite claim that this form of communion had been commanded by the Lord not only for priests but also for the laity and that it was necessary for salvation went straight against the teachings of the Church, as confirmed by the Councils of Konstanz and Basel, and it meant that for centuries the Church, by denying the communion of the chalice to the laypeople, had been sending countless souls to Hell. In his final oration to the Bohemian embassy, the Superioribus diebus of 31 March, the pope stated that the Hussite teachings concerning communion under both species as necessary for salvation were a heresy. He denied the petition for papal confirmation of the Bohemian Compacts made by the Council of Basel on the grounds that the Bohemians had not fulfilled the conditions stipulated by the Compacts. And he refused to grant the right to communicate under both species because of the risks of continued doctrinal error in Bohemia, irreverence for the sacrament (spilling of Christ’s blood), civil unrest, and continued international isolation and wars with the neighbouring countries.

Keywords

Enea Silvio Piccolomini; Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini; Pope Pius II; Bohemian Compacts; Compacts of Prague; Hussite Compacts; Hussitism; Communion under both species; Communion of the chalice; King Georg Poediebrad of Bohemia; King George Podiebrad of Bohemia; The Council of Basel; The Council of Konstanz; Compacts of Basel; Renaissance orations; Renaissance oratory; Renaissance rhetorics; 15th century; 1459

Editor and translator

Michael v. Cotta-Schönberg

Mag. Art. (University of Copenhagen)
Bachelier en Philosophie (Université de Louvain)

Emeritus Deputy Director General / The Royal Library, Copenhagen
Emeritus University Librarian / University of Copenhagen

ORCID identity: 000-0001-8499-4142
e-mail: typsita@gmail.com
NOTE TO THE READER

Changes in this version: two more manuscripts have been collated, and the introduction and the translation have been revised.

In 2007, I undertook a project of publishing the Latin texts with English translations of the orations of Enea Silvio Piccolomini / Pope Pius II. Altogether 76 orations (including papal responses to ambassadorial addresses) are extant today, though more may still be held, presently unrecognized, in libraries and archives.

I am publishing the preliminary edition of both the individual orations and the collected orations in the French digital research archive, HAL Archives.

The reader is advised that I publish – on a yearly basis - new versions of my preliminary editions. It will therefore always be useful to check if a later version than the one the reader may have found previously via the Internet is available in HAL Archives.

I aim at completing - Deo volente - a final edition of all the individual and collected orations in 2020 and will at that time decide upon the form of its ultimate publication.

I shall much appreciate to be notified by readers who discover errors and problems in the text or unrecognized quotations.
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I. INTRODUCTION
1. Context

1.1. Hussite schism

The main tenets of the Hussite schism are contained in the Four Articles of Prague. They were:

- (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.

Hussitism had been condemned by the Church in 1415, at the Council of Konstanz, but militarily and politically the movement was so strong that it became necessary for the Church to find a *modus vivendi*. At the Council in Basel a compromise formula was reached, viz. the Bohemian Compacts, which effectively granted the Bohemians and the Moravians the right to communion under both species.

The Compacts were, according to Heymann, a weakened version of the Four Articles of Prague in which the articles about freedom of preaching and the punishment of mortal sins were accepted in a general way but with more precise definitions of those who should have the right to preach, practically excluding all those not ordained, and of the authorities who should be entitled to proceed against the sinner. The third (now the fourth) article was eventually formulated in a way which would make it impossible to use it as a basis for the further confiscation of Church property. It was the former second article [viz. communion under both species] which did, in every respect, take first place in the new charter. No other issue could, in the minds of the Czech people, compare in importance with the question of the Eucharist.

The compromise between the Council of Basel and the Bohemians in the form of the Compacts did not solve the problems, however: the conflicts between the orthodox catholics

---

1 Pius II: *Commentarii* (Heck), Bk VII, Ch. 15, pp. 458-459; Pastor, pp. 159-160; Voigt IV, 7, pp. 422-501 (building largely on earlier studies by Palacky); Heymann: *George*, pp. 166-169, 177-186, 229-242, 248, 257-280, 317, 338-339; Rainaldus, ad ann. 1462, nos XIV-XVI, pp. 330-331
2 For a history of the Hussite schism, see – among others - the two volumes of George Heymann
3 Or “under both kinds”
4 Heyman: *Zizka*, p. 148
5 Council of Konstanz 1414-1418
6 Heymann: *George*, p. 7
and the Hussites in Bohemia continued, resulting in wars and permanent political unrest and turmoil which made the nation ungovernable for the catholic Habsburg monarchs, and in international isolation of the Bohemian nation.¹

Gradually it became quite clear to all parties that the Hussite issue had not been settled and that it would be necessary to achieve some permanent solution if Bohemia should become reunited with Rome and the nation come under effective royal and Habsburg rule.

**1.2. Situation in 1455-1456 and the oration “Res Bohemicas”**

In 1455/1456 Bishop Piccolomini, as an imperial diplomat acting on behalf of the Habsburg monarchs, Emperor Friedrich III and the very young King Ladislaus of Bohemia, presented his views on the solution of the Hussite schism to his own immediate predecessor as pope, Calixtus III, together with a recommendation of granting the Bohemians and the Moravians the right to communion under both species.²

When 6 years afterwards, in 1462, an embassy from the Bohemian King, now Georg Podiebrad, came to Rome to present the king’s declaration of obedience and to formally petition for papal confirmation or grant of this right, Piccolomini, now Pope Pius II, took the diametrically opposite view of the matter and denied a petition that he had himself recommended 6 years before.

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

**1.3. Developments since 1455**

**1.3.1. Under Calixtus III (1455-1458)**

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

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

---

¹ Voigt, IV, 7, p. 423
² *Oration “Res Bohemicas” of Enea Silvio Piccolomini (1455, Rome)*
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\(^1\) and Aeneas’ great speech to Calixtus III, and especially in the years 1457-1458.\(^2\)

However, in November 1457 King Ladislaus of Bohemia died at the age of eighteen, possibly poisoned\(^3\) at the instigation of Georg Podiebrad or Hussite church leaders like Rokycana.

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

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

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

- to obey the Roman and Catholic Church and the popes,
- to conform to the true faith as professed by the Holy Roman Church,
- to defend the Faith,
- and to make his people abandon all errors, heresies, and teachings contrary to the Catholic Faith and bring it to obedience to and conformity and union with the Holy Roman Church and to restore its rites and forms of worship.\(^4\)

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

After the coronation, Georg would not or could not take effective measures in support of Catholic doctrine and ritual practice. He remained or had to remain a defender of Hussitism, and Pope Calixtus, before he died in 1458, had lost his illusions concerning the willingness or the ability of Podiebrad to contain, weaken, and end the Hussite schism.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) The Imperial Diet of Wiener Neustadt, 1455, February to April
\(^2\) Heymann, p. 165; cf. Voigt, IV, 7, p. 424
\(^3\) As many, including Piccolomini, thought
\(^4\) Voigt, IV, 7, p. 425, 427 ff.; Heymann: George, p. 181
\(^5\) Voigt, IV, 7, p. 431-432
1.3.2. **Under Pius II (1458-1462)**

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

As pope, Piccolomini was no longer a diplomat-fixer of thorny political problems like the Bohemian situation. He was the pope and primary guarantor of the purity of the Faith, a role which he took quite seriously. In the Bohemian matter, he might well accept the conditioned and limited continuance of the practice of communion under both species, which was not in itself a doctrinal matter. But in no way could he condone or appear to tolerate a heresy declaring, as Hussites did, that men could only be saved if they received communion under both species. Firstly, this went directly against established church doctrine. And secondly, it meant that the Church had for hundreds of years been sending the believers to Hell when it denied them the communion under both species, thus fundamentally failing in its primary task: to save the souls of men.

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

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

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

Though he had his doubts concerning the role of Podiebrad in the death of King Ladislau, Pius, in the beginning of his pontificate, still believed – though possibly with some misgivings\(^1\) - that Podiebrad would be an able ruler and a dependable ally for the Papacy in handling the Hussite schism and in organizing a crusade against the Turks.\(^2\)

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

\(^{1}\) Voigt, IV, 7, p. 432, cf. Heymann: George, p. 230

\(^{2}\) Heymann: George, p. 180-181
Throughout 1459 and 1460 Podiebrad continued to “play” the pope and received his support as ruler of Bohemia.¹

But no embassy from Bohemia to the pope was forthcoming² and no offers from Podiebrad neither in terms of the Hussite schism nor in terms of Bohemian participation in the projected crusade against the Turks. On the contrary, the pope received continuous complaints from catholics in Bohemia, and especially from the very important catholic city of Breslau, about the papal support of a proven heretic as King of Bohemia.³

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

Pius sah nun, dass der König ganz andere Entwürfe hegte als die Bekehrung der Hussiten, dass er sich verpflichtet, an die Spitz der antirömischen Partei des Reiches zu treten, dass er im Vertrage mit dem Mainzer die Hebung dieses deutschen Primates, die Basler Decrete, ein gemeinsamens Concil in Deutschland zugesagt. Mochte er da Utraquist und Ketzer bleiben oder nicht, solche Artikel machten ihn zum gefährlichsten Ketzer, zum Feinde des römischen Supremats.⁴

The gloves came off.⁵

In January 1462, a papal envoy came to King Podiebrad to let him know that his relations with Rome had now reached a critical and very serious state.⁶

Podiebrad understood that procrastination and subterfuge would no longer serve, and he soon dispatched a Bohemian embassy to the pope. One of the members of the embassy was the pope’s old friend, Prokop von Rabstein, who had taken part in the earlier direct meetings between Podiebrad, as governor of Bohemia, and Piccolomini, as imperial and papal diplomat.

---

¹ Voigt, IV, 7, pp. 451-2
² Voigt, IV, 7, pi. 452-453
³ Cf. Heymann: George, ch. 10
⁴ Voigt, IV, 7, p. 454; cf. also Heymann: George, ch. 10
⁵ Heymann, pp. 236 ff.
⁶ Voigt, IV, 7, p. 458; cf. also Heymann: George, pp. 232-365 and ch. 12
The embassy reached Rome on 10 March 1462, some days before the arrival of a splendid embassy from the King of France, coming to announce the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges of 1438.  

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

The Bohemian ambassadors were received in two consistories. In the first, Prokop von Rabstein presented the king’s obedience to the pope. Afterwards another member of the embassy, a Hussite priest, ill-advisedly, argued for benefits of the communion under both species as divinely revealed and – indirectly - as necessary for salvation, an argument which the Holy See must consider as completely heretical.

In his *Commentarii*, Pius himself gives the following description of the event:

> About this time ambassadors from Georg, King of Bohemia, came to Rome headed by Procop von Rabstein and Zdenek Kostka, distinguished barons of that Kingdom. Procop had long ago been very well known to the Pope when he was in minor orders. He had been his close friend and his colleague in many embassies when both had been imperial counsellors. Therefore Pius eagerly embraced his old comrade and honored him with no mean gifts, Kostka was one of the King’s few favorites and the companion of his perfidy. Procop had never swerved from the Catholic Faith. With them were two priests who were glib talkers and bold champions of the Hussite madness. They were received with the honor due to ambassadors of a Catholic king and given public audience. Procop proffered obedience in the King’s name. One of the priests with a sonorous voice and headlong delivery asked that the agreements of the Bohemians with the Council of Basle (which they called compacts) be ratified by authority of the Apostolic See. He said that the King earnestly desired this and that the kingdom expected it. Unless it were granted there could be no peace among the Bohemians. He discoursed at length on Communion under both kinds, calling it holy and divine as if without it there were no salvation.

---

1. Cf. *Oration “Per me reges regnant” of Pope Pius II (16 March 1462, Rome)*
2. Voigt, IV, 7, p. 459; Heymann: George, p. 262
3. “cum in minoribus ageret”: when he was young (not: when he was in minor orders!)
4. Wenzel Urbensky, dean of S. Apollinar in Prague, and Wenzel Koranda the Younger
The pope replied that he freely accepted the King’s obedience, confident that it was sincere and complete. He described the one-time condition of the kingdom of Bohemia, how rich, how flourishing, how pious it had been; then how it had fallen away, how the lofty palaces, its noble churches, its splendid monasteries had fallen into ruins and the kingdom had been reduced to poverty and misery. This had been the result of heresies and its withdrawal from the Church of Rome. Certain Bohemians had set themselves up more than was fitting, they had introduced foreign doctrines and had wrested from the priests their temporal goods on the ground that those who were in the service of God might not possess anything. Then they had invented an article called “concerning civil lordship,” which they say is forbidden to priests. They said also that the Word of God was not fettered but all might preach it everywhere; that verily no sins could be tolerated in public office and that no one could be allowed to hold a magistracy who was known to be in the toils of mortal sin. Then too there had come to light the article concerning Communion which they call “under both kinds” and think necessary for salvation, which was not the invention of John Huss or of Jerome, who were burned at Constance, or of some doctor or learned expounder of the law, but this heresy was originated by a school teacher named Jacobellus, when he had read in John, “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood ye have no life in you.” “What are we doing?” he said. “The priests mock us; they close the gates of paradise when they keep the blood from us. They wish to be the only ones to enter into life.” He was listened to by the untaught; the ignorant believed that no one could be saved unless under the species of wine he drank of the cup; and under the teaching and sponsorship of Jacobellus there was composed an article which said, “Communion under both kinds is necessary for salvation,” just the opposite of what was declared to be true in the Council of Basle.

The Pope told also how the compacts had been granted by that same Council, what conditions had been laid down, and how the Bohemians has disregarded the terms imposed on them. Communion under both kinds had been allowed only to those in the kingdom of Bohemia and the margravate of Moravia who had practiced it before and still desired it. But they of their own initiative had given the cup even to infants and compelled those who were unwilling to drink. The priests who had been ordered to pronounce certain words when they administered to the people the Communion under both kinds had disobeyed outright. The agreements had been violated in a thousand ways by the Bohemians. It was idle any longer to give the name of compacts to what had ceased to be

---

1 Pius here reused materials from his oration/memorandum to Pope Calixtus III, the “Res Bohemicas” of 1455
2 I.e. the teachings of the Englishman John Wycliffe
3 John, 6, 53
4 The Hussite teachings referred to by the pope are often called the Four Articles of Prague
in force. Still the King’s request must be discussed in consultation with the brethren. Then the meeting was adjourned.¹

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

After this the envoys were often summoned to the Pope and given audience in the presence of selected cardinals to see if any way could be found by which the kingdom of Bohemia might be brought into agreement with the Church and conform to the rest of Christendom. Procop, being a catholic, never swerved from the path of honor but nothing could persuade the others into it and they insisted that unless the compacts were confirmed it was impossible that the Bohemian people should remain quiet. It was therefore necessary to make a public reply to the demands made in public.²

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

The pope’s final decision was announced to the Bohemians in the very important oration, Superioribus diebus of 31 March.

Pius recounted the events of the day in his Commentarii:

Having called a consistory the Pope took his seat before the tribunal and delivered a speech about the compacts. He showed that in many ways they were obsolete; furthermore that the requests made could not be granted without grave danger. Finally

¹ Pius II: Commentarii (Gragg), Bk. VII, pp. 512-514. See also the report in Rainaldus, Ad ann. 1462, nr. xiv. Rainaldus/Mansi, based on the following sources: Jo. Papien. in comm. l. 6. Gob. l. 7, Cocl. l. 12. Also Heymann, p. 270-275
² Pius II: Commentarii (Gragg), Bk. VII, p. 514
he said that the King at his coronation had sworn to obey the pope of Rome; if he valued his soul he must accept the mandates of the Apostolic See; viz., that he should finally abandon the communion under both kinds and together with his household and all his subjects unite with the Roman and universal Church. If he did not, his kingdom could not stand.

*This speech of the Pope has been published with others. When it ended the consistory also ended.*

After the pope’s oration, an official of the papal court, Antonio Gubbio, publicly announced that the Compacts of the Council of Basel granting communion under both species to the

---

1 Pius II: *Commentarii* (Gragg), Bk. VII, pp. 514-515

2 Cardinal Ammanati Piccolomini, who was present, gave the following summary of the pope's oration (quoted after Rainaldus, ibid.): *Obedientiam recipere se quamquam commune nimis ac diminutam, crediaturam Apostolicam sedem tum demum illos veram absolutamque praestare, cum pulsis erroribus ad ovile Domini Rex regnum reduceret, quod ut mature faciat per professam ea hora obedientiam se arctius imperare: calicem vero, quem tantotere commendassent, illis nec necessarium esse, nec sane esse etiam utilem, definisse Synodum Constantiensem: non licere ab institutis Ecclesiae, quae spiritu Dei regeretur, abire: instituisse autem, ut qui extra sacerdotium essent, calicie abstinerent, quando de communicante turbis effusionis, utrobique periculum est et ad viaticum agrorum sacerdotum longius cum ferente servari difficile potest; tum autem ne indoceta plebs, que sensibus ductur, nisi sub utraque specie non sumi a se totum Christum et integrum crederent: conventorum porro, quae memorarent, modo nullam vim esse, nec licisse illis, quod criderent eorum omnem rationem bipartitam videri permitti, altera, ut qui unionem Romanae sedis servarent, ritumque in caeteris tenerent ecclesiae, sumendi quoque calicis usum haberent: altera vero permitti ut si se re inde ad concilium delata illi nihilomanus desiderio calicis tenebantur, eumque missis legatis petierint indultum iri sacerdotibus suis facultatem illius iis tantum ministrandi, quibus et per aetatem liceret, et sponte sua pie deposcerent, lege perpetua adjecta, ut praefari populus ante calicem debeant, non in pane carnem tantum, neque in vino sanguinem tantum, sed sub singulis totum Christum atque integrum continerit: illos non servasse convenita, synodum, quae abtulisset non induisset: cum ea non servarent, conventorum nullum beneficial esse, quod post ille non indulserit synodus: conventi nihil extare: non induisse autem nos ex conventu appellant, aut Romanam sedem iis moveri oporteat: sed nec commodum pastori Ecclesiae, nec illis videri expediens nova nunc ratione id ipsum permitti: negasse hoc semper priorum pontificum: ab iis in tanta re dissentire non sani esse consili: laturas indigne caeteras gentes, his datam, prohibitas ilius participationem hanc calicis: nationes quietae operaet prelitum non esse nunc commovere: proclive quoque has ad errorem videri, quod ad necessitatem salutis pertinere cum, si concedatur, radis populos nimirum sit crediturum, quam rem potissimum damnet ecclesia: porro autem dividendorum anmorum, et perpetuandi odium communionis perpetuam causam affere: esse in Bohemis parte adhuc sanam nobis conformem hanc dissimiliter ritu nunquam sensuram, conflicturam armis et animis: timendum proinde Domini vocem, desolatum iri quodcumque in se divisum sit regnum: aequius esse vteri sententia novam concede: quam veleram nova, illam totius Ecclesiae probatae consensual, hanc quorandum tantum Bohemorum susceptam judicio, reliqium fidellum repudiatam decreto: circumstare insuper regnum potentissimae plebes Theutones, Hungaros, Polonos, misitaet ille omnes usque futuras, ac mille licet proferatam sedis decreta putaturas versari eas in errore, sicut et nunc quoque existimant: nimia quoque arroganciae Bohemicam gentem damnaturas, quae plus contendere, plus sibi deposceret, quam Christianos reliqua multitudo, jurgia, abdictiones, et pugnas hinc proventuras: inconsultum videri intim atque perpetuus siis hostes conciere, nominisque haereticus sibi inferius: expendisse diligenter haec Romanum Pontificem, inutile quod ab illis poscitur credere, nescire quid petant: dispensatorem se ministeriorum Dei esse, ad pastores opus pertinere gregem dominicum pascere, illumque in viam rectam statuerere non intelligere homines aliquando, quae vera sint bona; paenituisse saep mortales peracti voti atque impetraeti; quod oratores nunc petant ad vitam aeternam non pertinere: fumum quendam atque inanis gloriae ventum quaeri: hortari proinde eae contenti sint sub specie tantum panis corpus Domini sanguinemque assumere: ad salutem id ipsum sufficere, admonente Domino: Ego
Bohemians had been annulled and quashed; that communion under both species was not necessary for salvation; and that the obedience declared by the King of Bohemia would only be considered as genuine when the King together with his whole Kingdom conformed to the Catholic Church.¹

Afterwards, the Bohemian ambassadors promised to relate the pope’s message to their king and, quite circumspectly, requested that a papal envoy be sent back with them to directly convey the papal decision – and conceivably to deflect the king’s foreseeable anger and turn it towards the papal envoy which is what actually happened.²

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

2. Themes

2.1. Doctrinal issue

The doctrinal issue tended to get mixed up with issues of Church ritual and discipline and with other, political issues, but it was clearly the most important of the issues related to the Bohemian schism.

The Bohemian heresy did not consist in its desire to have communion under both species, since that was not against dogma and not against the practice of the Early Church as Pius had himself demonstrated in his oration/memorandum “Res Bohemicas” of 1456. And it had not been abolished for reasons of dogma, but out of reverence for the sacrament:

Voigt, IV, 7, p. 466

Pius II: Commentarii (Grapp), Bk. VII, pp. 515

¹sum panis vivus, qui de caelo descendi. Qui manducat hunc panem vivet in aeternum; discipuli Emaus euntes in fractione panis Dominum agnovere: nollent pluris his esse, aut patres eorum sapientia anteire, qui sub una tantum specie Sacamento accepto in Christo mortui sunt, ad notam illorum filiorum esse viam contrariam. Adjungant se igitur non erranti Ecclesiae, in unicaque religione uniant regnum potentissimum olim, post labefactatum, rediturum mox in antiquas opes et gloriam, si doctoribus errorum praeteritis in viam redierint primam, matremque audierint Romanam ecclesiam

²Pius II: Commentarii (Gragg), Bk. VII, pp. 515
Though the communion of the chalice was the practice at one time, it was later, usefully and beneficially, taken away from laymen. This happened out of reverence for the sacrament, because of the risk of spills when many received communion, as well as the difficulty of keeping it when destined for anointing the sick, and the risk of spilling when it must be carried a long distance – something which happens often. And also because the uneducated people should not believe that the body of Christ was only received entirely under both species jointly. [Sect. 5]

The crucial error of the Bohemians was to maintain that this form of communion had been commanded by the Lord and that it applied to all the faithful, including the laypeople, and that it was therefore necessary for salvation:

To claim that the communion of the chalice is necessary for salvation, as did Jacobellus¹ and his followers, is damnable and completely heretical. [Sect. 6]

Such a teaching went straight against the teaching of the Church, as affirmed by two recent ecumenical councils, the Council of Konstanz and the Council of Basel:

Concerning your petition for communion under both species (or of the compacts), We have pondered the words of the speaker. He seemed to be saying that it is a truth somehow revealed by God that also laypeople should have this form of communion, and that it had been approved by the praxis of the early Church, by the authority of Holy Scripture, by the testimonies of the holy doctors, and by the concession or the compacts of the Council of Basel. It is unnecessary to dwell at length on this point since it was sufficiently discussed in the Council of Basel which finally declared that it is not a [divine] precept that laymen and non-officiating clergy should receive communion under both species. Before that, the great Synod of Konstanz had declared it to be unlawful to withdraw from the custom of the Church which is ruled by the Holy Spirit. [Sect. 4]

The Bohemian teaching implied that by denying the communion of the chalice to the laypeople, the Church had for centuries been depriving the laypeople of salvation and sent them to Hell. As the primary goal of the Church was to save souls and send them to Heaven, the Hussite teachings were therefore, absolutely unacceptable to the Church. The pope, therefore, could only exhort the Hussites to

---

¹ Jacob of Mies [Jakoubek ze Stříbra] (1372 – 1429): Bohemian reformer, and colleague of Jan Hus. He studied at Prague, receiving both bachelor’s and the master’s degrees in theology, and became pastor of the Church of St. Michael and an outspoken supporter of Jan Hus. His study of Scripture and the Fathers led him to believe that withholding the chalice in the administration of Holy Communion to the laity went against the Gospel. In 1414, he began to administer the chalice to his parishioners, in spite of the remonstrances of the bishop and the university. His example was quickly followed by other pastors in Prague.
not wish to know more than you should know, and to be more than your fathers who died in Christ, having received communion under one species only. This new rite is an affront to their name and fame: comfort their memory and conform to the rest of Christianity. [Sect. 18]

2.2. Bohemian Compacts

The concession to Bohemia of the communion under both species contained in the Bohemian Compacts was granted by the Council of Basel under a number of conditions. One of the most important conditions was that this form of communion could only be given to those who already had that usage. This meant that it could not be given to the children born after the concession was granted, and therefore the usage would die out in a couple of generations. Another condition was that the Bohemians should accept Church union, obedience to Rome, and conformity in all other matters to the teachings and the practice of the Church.

These essential conditions as well as others had not been fulfilled by the Bohemians, and therefore the concession as such was void:

So, whether you refer to the first or the second part of the Compacts, you have no [grounds for your petition]. For the second part containing the promise was never fulfilled, whether you did not actually present a request, or whether the Council – for reasonable cause – [ultimately] refused to grant what it deemed would be harmful since your priests did not keep [their part of] the agreement. Neither does the first part help you since it only grants the communion of the blood to those who already follow that practice, who accept ecclesiastical union in all other matters than communion. But you never accepted ecclesiastical union and conformity with the Church. Therefore, you could not legitimately receive the concession. [Sect. 9]

The pope concluded:

So, having examined all the compacts and bulls of concession and on the advice of Our brethren, the cardinals, We judge that your priests give communion of the chalice to laymen without having the right to do so, that they deceive the people, that they sin gravely, and that they deserve serious admonishment: unless they repent, they and the people who trust in them will perish. Therefore, We admonish them to correct themselves and to prefer Our clemency rather than Our punishment. This is what We have to say concerning the compacts: in no way do they permit you the communion of the chalice. [Sect. 11]
2.3. Papal grant of communion of the chalice

Even if the pope would not confirm the Compacts made by the Council of Basel, he could himself grant the right of communion of the chalice to the Bohemians.

He chose not do so for the following reasons:

- The risk of continued doctrinal error, viz. the belief that communion under both species was necessary to salvation [sect. 13]

- The risk of irreverence towards the sacrament, i.e. the very reason for which the Church had abolished the communion of the chalice [sect. 14]

- The risk of internal conflicts in Bohemia, between the Hussites having the communion of the chalice and the orthodox catholics (like the very insistent people of Breslau) who wanted to have the same form of communion as the rest of the Church [sect. 15]

- The risk of external wars, i.e. with the Germans, the Poles, and the Hungarians, [sect. 16] such as there had been in former years and which had brought poverty and misery to the once flourishing Bohemian nation

The pope concluded:

So, having carefully considered all that must be considered in this matter, We do not see that granting your petition would benefit your king, or the kingdom, or the people. ... What you request now does not lead to eternal life; what you seek is smoke and the breeze of vainglory. [sect. 17]

3. Date, place, audience, and format

The oration Superioribus diebus was delivered on 31 March 1462 in the Apostolic Palace in Rome.

The audience consisted of the participants in a full public consistory: the cardinals, the Bohemian ambassadors, important curials, and envoys from other powers.

The format was a grand papal oration from the throne.
4. Text

The text of the oration *Superioribus diebus* exists in two versions, an Early Version and a Final version.¹

4.1. Early version

The Early Version is extant in a number of manuscripts, typically humanist *Sammlerhandschriften*.²

4.1.1. Manuscripts

- Görlitz / Milich’sche Bibliothek
  Ch 4, 78, ff. 381v sqq.³

- Leipzig / Universitätssbibliothek
  172⁴
  183⁵
  486⁶

- München / Bayerische Staatsbibliothek
  clm, 215, ff. 237 sqq.⁷

- München / Bayerische Staatsbibliothek
  clm, 10454, ff.166 sqq.⁸

- Nürnberg / Stadtbibliothek
  Cent V App 15, 278v-280v⁹

¹ In the lists below, the texts collated for the present edition have the siglum attached
² The list below is not exhaustive
³ From Kristeller (Digital), foliation approximative
⁴ From Kristeller (Digital), no foliation indicated
⁵ From Kristeller (Digital), no foliation indicated
⁶ From Kristeller (Digital), no foliation indicated
⁷ Cf. Voigt, IV, 7, p. 466
⁸ Cf. Voigt, IV, 7, p. 466
⁹ From Kristeller (Digital), foliation approximative
• **Prag / Statni knihovna**
  I G 34, ff. 106r-112v\(^1\)

• **Regensburg / Bibliothek des Kollegiatsstiftes unserer Lieben Frau zur Alten Kapelle**
  1884\(^2\)

• **Trieste / Bibl. Civica**
  II 5 / ff. 132r-136r

• **Wien / Österreichische Nationalbibliothek**
  Ser. nova, 12709 (=Fidei 9364), ff. 99v-101r (W1)

• **Wien/ Österreichische Nationalbibliothek**
  cod. 4764, ff. 181v – 184v (W2)

• **Wolffenbüttel / Herzog August Bibliothek**
  Cod. Guelf. 299.1 Helmst. (Heinemann-Nr. 332), ff. 41r-42v (X)

• **Wroclaw / Bibl. Uniwersytecka (Rehdigeriana)**
  478, ff. 381v sqq.\(^3\)

### 4.1.2. Editions

• Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz: Mantissa codicis juris gentium diplomatici. Hannover: Freytag, 1700 / Appendix, pp. 159-163 (LE)

### 4.2. Final version

#### 4.2.1. Manuscripts

• **Lucca / Biblioteca Capitolare Feliniana**
  544, ff. 144v-147v (G)

• **Mantova / Biblioteca Communale**
  100 (A-IV-26), ff. 282r-288r

---

\(^1\) Helmrath, p. 316
\(^2\) From Kristeller (Digital), no foliation indicated
\(^3\) From Kristeller (Digital), foliation approximative
4.2.2. *Editions*

The Final Version was published by Mansi, based on the Lucca ms.:


4.3. *Present edition*

*Text*

The Early Version is based on the two manuscripts in Vienna (W1 and W2), the one in Wolffenbüttel (X), and the one edited by Leibniz.

The Final Version is based on the five manuscripts listed above with the siglum.

The Chis. J.VIII. 284 (A) has been chosen 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.

Identified quotations are given in italics.

---

1 Stamped numbering of folios in the lower right corner of the recto folios
Pagination:

Pagination is from Chis. J.VIII. 284 (A) (red) and from the Lucca 544 (G) (red).

Textual apparatus:

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

The variants common to the manuscripts W1, W2, X, and the LE, i.e. the Early Version, are given in fat types. Variants common to D and G are colour-coded in red.

Orthography and punctuation:

Standard variations from contemporary lexical practice are not indicated in the textual apparatus. For such variants, the reader is referred to those orthographical profiles of the manuscripts which are 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, or expressions which would seem unnatural or senseless to modern readers.\(^2\)

Unless otherwise stated, translations of quotations from classical authors are from the Loeb Classical Library (Digital). Translations of quotations from the Bible are from the Douay-Reims translation of the Vulgate into English. In the case of quotations from the synoptic gospels, normally only the reference to Matthew is given.

---

\(^1\) To be published in 2017

\(^2\) On the principles of translation used, see *Introduction to the Orations of Enea Silvio Piccolomini / Pope Pius II*, to be published in 2017
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II. TEXT AND TRANSLATION
Responsio Pii II Pontificis Maximi data oratoribus regis Bohemiae, Romae, in consistorio publico

[1] {146v} {144v} Superioribus diebus, cum audivissemus vos, oratores carissimi filii nostri, regis Bohemiae illustri, quamvis aliqua ex tempore diximus, responsionem tamen solidam et efficacem cum fratrum consilio faciendam in aliud tempus reservavimus, quam {147r} in praesentiarum a nobis intelligetis. Hortamur, ut omnia cum caritate accipiatis, quia tamquam pater in caritate non ficta loquimur. Duo exposuistis in hoc ipso auditorio. Nam et oboedientiam nomine regio praestistis nobis et apostolicae sedi, et usum communionis eucharistiae sub utraque specie regno Bohemiae et marchionatui Moraviae concedi petivistis.
1. Introduction

[1] Ambassadors of Our dear son, the Illustrious King of Bohemia,

when We heard you, some days ago, We replied directly,\(^1\) adding that We would defer Our proper and considered response until We had discussed it with Our brethren.\(^2\) This reply you will hear now. We exhort you to accept it all in love since We shall be speaking, as a father, \emph{in unfeigned charity}.\(^3\)

Two things you set forth in this assembly: in the name of your king you declared obedience to Us and the Apostolic See, and you petitioned that the use of the eucharistic communion under both species be granted to Kingdom of Bohemia and the Margravate of Moravia.

---

\(^1\) “ex tempore”. Cf. the report in Rainaldus mentioned above, Introduction, sect. 1.3.2.

\(^2\) The College of Cardinals

\(^3\) 2. Corinthians, 6, 6
[2] Circa primum dicimus\(^1\) multa\(^2\) nobis exposita esse\(^3\) in laudem regis et per imperatoris oratorem\(^4\), et per dilectum filium Procopium\(^5\) equitem\(^6\), qui\(^7\) unus\(^8\) est\(^9\) ex vobis. Nam is multis\(^10\) verbis seorsum\(^11\) nobis sincerum regis animum et optimum ejus propositum ad benemerendum de\(^12\) sancta\(^13\) sede apostolica\(^14\) commendavit\(^15\). Laudamus regem\(^16\), qui\(^17\) portam domini videtur inquirere, per quam justi intrant, et sine qua non patet iter in\(^18\) caelum. Qui non intrat (145r) per ostium, fur est et latro. Ostium autem in\(^19\) ovile domini\(^20\) est ipsa sedes\(^21\) apostolica, cui sunt traditae claves regni cælorum. Sapit igitur regia\(^22\) sublimitas, quae\(^23\) verum\(^24\) ostium quaerit, et vera pascua, et verum pastorem, et nos, licet immeritos, tamquam Jesu\(^25\) Christi vicarium sua honorat\(^27\) oboedientia, et primæ sedi\(^28\) caput submittit\(^29\).

\(^{1}\) didicimus LE
\(^{2}\) omit. W1
\(^{3}\) exposita esse : esse exposita LE
\(^{4}\) imperatoris oratorem : oratorem imperatoris W1, W2, X, LE
\(^{5}\) N W1
\(^{6}\) de Rabstein add. LE
\(^{7}\) omit. W1
\(^{8}\) unum W1
\(^{9}\) omit. W1
\(^{10}\) multum W2
\(^{11}\) seorsim LE
\(^{12}\) die W2
\(^{13}\) omit. W1
\(^{14}\) sede apostolica : sedi apostolicae W2
\(^{15}\) commendat X
\(^{16}\) laudamus regem : laudandus W1
\(^{17}\) quia X
\(^{18}\) patet inter in : non itur ad LE
\(^{19}\) omit. W2
\(^{20}\) omit. W2, LE
\(^{21}\) fides W1
\(^{22}\) regis W2
\(^{23}\) qui LE
\(^{24}\) veram W1; rerum LE
\(^{25}\) ut W1
\(^{26}\) omit. LE
\(^{27}\) honoreet W1; honoravit W2
\(^{28}\) suum add. W1
\(^{29}\) caput submittit : submittit caput LE
2. Declaration of obedience

[2] Concerning the first point, much was said in praise of the king both by the emperor’s ambassador¹ and by Our beloved son, the knight Prokop,² who is one of your number. Separately, he has said much to commend the king’s³ sincere disposition towards Us and his good intentions to be of service⁴ to the Apostolic See. We praise the king who seeks the gate of the Lord,⁵ which the just pass through, and without which there is no way to Heaven. *He that entereth not by the door, the same is a thief and a robber.*⁶ The entrance to the Lord’s flock is the Apostolic See which has been given the keys to the Kingdom of Heaven. His Royal Highness is wise, indeed, since he seeks the true gate, the true pasture, and the true shepherd, and since, with his [declaration of] obedience, he honours Us - though unworthy - as the Vicar of Jesus Christ, and bows to the First See.

¹ The emperor’s ambassador is not otherwise mentioned
² Prokop von Rabstein [Rabenstein] (ca. 1420 – 1472): Bohemian noble. From 1453 to 1468 Chancellor of Bohemia. In their younger years, Piccolomini and Prokop were colleagues in the Imperial Chancery and became friends
³ Georg Podiebrad (1420 – 1471): Regent of Bohemia during the minority of Kings Ladislaus the Posthumous. King of Bohemia from 1458 to his death
⁴ “ad benemerendum”
⁵ Cf. Matthew, 7, 13
⁶ John, 10, 1
3] Verum quia regnum Bohemiae olim sub Romanae ecclesiae et antecessorum nostrorum oboedientia integra fuit\(^1\), et ritum eumdem tenuit circa divina sacramenta, et postea pars magna\(^2\) regni\(^3\) et\(^4\) marchionatus ab oboedientia\(^5\) recessit et ritum novum\(^6\) invenit\(^7\), quem ignoraverunt patres eorum, et multi excessus intercesserunt\(^8\), qui adhuc non parva in parte\(^9\) durant, non potest dici sufficiens regis oboedientia, nisi novitates\(^{10}\) tollantur\(^{11}\), et omnia reducantur\(^{12}\) ad\(^{13}\) pristinam vivendi normam. Quod\(^{14}\) si vult rex suae oboedientiae et suo debito satisfacere\(^{15}\), omnia tollat\(^{16}\) de regno suo necesse est\(^{17}\), quae sunt innovata contra mandata nostrorum\(^{18}\) praedecessorum et contra ritum universalis ecclesiae\(^{19}\)\(^{20}\); et ita nos\(^{21}\) sibi praecipimus\(^{22}\) in virtute oboedientiae nobis praestitae. Quod si fecerit, dicemus regem ipsum\(^{23}\) veram et sufficientem oboedientiam praestitisse\(^{24}\) eumque condignis\(^{25}\) et honoribus\(^{26}\) et favoribus prosequemur\(^{27}\). Alioquin cum regum\(^{30}\) proprium sit ecclesiam tueri, et Romanis pontificibus reverenter assistere, et eorum parere mandatis, non satis esset\(^{31}\) verbo ac\(^{32}\) scriptis oboedientiam praestitisse non sequentibus operibus. Haec ad oboedientiam regis.

---

\(^1\) integra fuit : fuit integrum
\(^2\) pars magna : magna pars
\(^3\) Bohemiae \textit{add.} W1
\(^4\) ac \textit{W1}
\(^5\) ecclesia \textit{W1}
\(^6\) ritum novum : novum ritum \textit{LE}
\(^7\) in \textit{add.} X
\(^8\) interventerunt \textit{W2; omit.} \textit{LE}
\(^9\) parva in parte : in parte parva \textit{LE}
\(^10\) novitatem \textit{LE}
\(^11\) tollant \textit{LE}
\(^12\) reducant \textit{LE}
\(^13\) in \textit{W1, LE}
\(^14\) igitur \textit{W1}
\(^15\) ut \textit{del. A; ut add. W1, X, LE; tunc add. W2}
\(^16\) tollant \textit{W1}
\(^17\) necesse est \textit{omit. W2, X, LE}
\(^18\) meorum \textit{W2}
\(^19\) necesse est \textit{add. W2, X, LE}
\(^20\) quae sunt ... ecclesiae \textit{omit. A, B, C, , D, G, W1}
\(^21\) \textit{omit. LE}
\(^22\) ita nos : nos ita \textit{W1}
\(^23\) \textit{omit. C; praecipite LE}
\(^24\) ipsam \textit{W2}
\(^25\) oboedientiam praestitisse : exhibuisse reverentiam \textit{W1}
\(^26\) dignis \textit{W1}
\(^27\) \textit{omit. W1, W2}
\(^28\) honoribus : laudibus \textit{W1}
\(^29\) prosequeur \textit{W2, X}
\(^30\) regi \textit{W1; regem W2}
\(^31\) est \textit{LE}
\(^32\) et W1; et in W2; aut \textit{LE}
Formerly, the Kingdom of Bohemia was in complete obedience to the Roman Church and to Our predecessors and kept the common rituals concerning the divine sacraments. Later, a large part of the kingdom and of the margravate left the obedience and invented a new rite, unknown to their fathers. Many other transgressions occurred that are, to a great extent, still lasting. The obedience of the king cannot be said to be complete unless these novelties are abolished and all is brought back to the former norm of life. So, if the king desires to fulfil his obedience and his obligations, he must remove all those innovations from his kingdom that are contrary to the instructions of our predecessors and the rite of the Universal Church. This is what We command by virtue of the obedience to Us declared [by the king]. If he does that, We shall say that the king’s declaration of obedience is true and satisfactory, and We shall grant him honours and favours that are worthy of him. As it is the particular charge of kings to protect the Church, to reverently assist the Roman pontiffs, and to obey their commands, it is not enough to declare obedience in words and writings if they are not followed up by actions. [We shall say] no more concerning the king’s declaration of obedience.
Ad petitionem vero communionis utriusque speciei sive compactatorum consideravimus verba proponentis, qui communionem ipsum etiam quoad laicos veritatem divinitus quodammodo revelatam visus est appellare, approbando eam per praxim ecclesiae primitivae, per auctoritatem sacrae scripturae, per testimonia sanctorum doctorum, et per concessionem sive compactata concilii Basiliensis. Circa hoc est necesse multum immorari, nam satis hic articulus in Basiliensi concilio discussus est, et tandem fuit definitum non esse communio sub utraque specie quoad laicos et non conficientes de praecepto. Denique magnus synodus Constantiensis prius definierat, quia non licet a consuetudine ecclesiae, quae regitur a spiritu sancto, recedere; et in illis concilii abunde considerata fuit praxis ecclesiae primitivae et

\[\text{communicationis A, B, C, D, G, W1} \]
\[\text{compactatoris W1; concessionem add. W2, LE; concessionis add. W2, X} \]
\[\text{consideramus W1, W2, X, LE} \]
\[\text{ipsam etiam : etiam ipsum W2, LE} \]
\[\text{veritatem ... revelatam omit. W1} \]
\[\text{aperire W1} \]
\[\text{eam per praxim : per praxin eam LE} \]
\[\text{praxim ecclesiae primitivae : primitive ecclesie praxim W1} \]
\[\text{sacrae scripturae : scripturae sacrae W1} \]
\[\text{sive W1; ac X} \]
\[\text{confessionem W1} \]
\[\text{per add. LE} \]
\[\text{concilii et passim W1, X} \]
\[\text{hec W1} \]
\[\text{omit. X} \]
\[\text{omit. X} \]
\[\text{eciam non X; morari LE} \]
\[\text{is W1} \]
\[\text{Basiliensi concilio : consilio Basiliensi W1, X; concilio Basiliensi W2, LE} \]
\[\text{discussus est : est discussus LE} \]
\[\text{definitum LE} \]
\[\text{communicandum W1} \]
\[\text{omit. X} \]
\[\text{deinde LE} \]
\[\text{magnus W2} \]
\[\text{definierat LE} \]
\[\text{prius definierat : diffinierat prius W1} \]
\[\text{quod W2} \]
\[\text{oporet W1} \]
\[\text{regitur a spiritu sancto : a spiritu sancto regitur LE} \]
\[\text{con W1} \]
\[\text{aliunde W2} \]
\[\text{ecclesiae primitivae : primatum ecclesiae W1; primitivae ecclesiae LE} \]
\[\text{ac W1} \]
3. Bohemian petition for either a confirmation of the Bohemian Compacts or a papal grant of communion under both species

3.1. Teaching of the Church

[4] Concerning your petition for communion under both species (or for [the confirmation of] the compacts), We have pondered the words of the speaker.\(^8\) He seemed to be saying that it is a truth somehow revealed by God that also laypeople should have this form of communion, and that it had been approved by the praxis of the early Church, by the authority of Holy Scripture, by the testimonies of the holy doctors, and by the concession or the compacts of the Council of Basel. It is unnecessary to dwell at length on this point since it was sufficiently discussed in the Council of Basel which finally declared that it is not a [divine] precept that laymen and non-officiating [clergy] should receive communion under both species. Before that, the great Synod of Konstanz\(^9\) had declared it to be unlawful to withdraw from the custom of the Church which is ruled by the Holy Spirit. Both these councils amply considered the practice of the primitive church and the authority of Holy Scripture, and they took due note of the statements of doctors, saints, and scholars.

---

\(^1\) *omit. B, C; auctoritates W1*
\(^2\) sacrarum auctoritas : auctoritas sacrarum W2
\(^3\) auctoritas litterarum : litterarum auctoritas LE
\(^4\) quod W2, LE
\(^5\) et W1, W2
\(^6\) et W1; *omit. X*
\(^7\) asseverunt W2
\(^8\) One of the Hussite priests being part of the embassy
\(^9\) Council of Konstanz (1414-1418): ended the Great Western Schism and elected a new Roman pope, Martinus V
[5] Nam omnes fere 1 uno ore loquuntur, quod 2 non est 3 populus sub utraque specie communicandus, quamvis aliquando id 4 5 factum fuerit. Nam postea utiliter et salubritier sublata est 7 laicis communio 8 calicis 9 ob 10 reverentiam sacramenti, propter periculum effusionis in multitudine communicantium, et propter difficultatem conservationis, si pro viatico infirmorum reservaretur, nec non etiam 11 effusionis 12, si ut saepius oportet, ad non 13 parum etiam 14 distantes 15 deferretur 16. Tum vero ne rudis populus existimaret 17 Christi corpus 18 non integre recipi, nisi sub utraque specie 19. Quod vero de compactatis adducitur paulo post absolvemus. Manifestum autem 20 est 21, quia 22 post generalem ecclesiae consuetudinem subtrahentem 23 laicis communionem 24 calicis, nulli fas est populum 25 sub utraque specie communicare, nisi vel generale concilium vel Romanus pontifex indulserit. Ac 26 proptera 27 nec 28 veritas appellanda est 29 30 talis 31 consuetudo neque 32 utilis 33 neque 34 salubris 35 judicanda, quae absque sufficienti 36 auctoritate introducta est.

---

1 vero W2
2 et W2
3 omit. LE
4 omit. W2
5 aliquando id : id aliquando LE
6 fuit LE
7 omit. LE
8 communere X
9 communio calicis : communicatio predicta W1
10 ad W1
11 omit. LE
12 effusionem W1, LE
13 omit. W1, W2, X, LE
14 omit. C
15 distans LE
16 referretur W1; differetur W2, X
17 estimaret W1
18 Christi corpus : corpus Christi W1
19 nisi sub ... specie omit. W1
20 enim W2
21 autem est : est autem W1
22 quod W1, W2
23 subtrahendam LE
24 communicationem W1
25 omit. LE
26 at B
27 praeterea LE
28 ne X
29 omit. W1
30 appellanda est : est appellanda W2
31 communionis add. W1
32 nec W2
33 est add. LE
34 aut W1, W2, X, LE
35 salubriter X
36 sufficiente LE
Almost all of them declare, as with one voice, that the people should not have communion under both species. Though the communion of the chalice was the practice at one time, it was later, usefully and beneficially, taken away from laymen. This happened out of reverence for the sacrament, because of the risk of spills when many received communion, as well as the difficulty of keeping it when destined for anointing the sick, and the risk of spilling when it must be carried a long distance – something which happens often. And also because the uneducated people should not believe that the body of Christ was only fully received under both species jointly. As for the claims concerning the compacts, We shall be dealing with them shortly. At any rate it is clear that since it became the general custom of the Church to omit the communion of the chalice for laymen, it is unlawful for the people to receive communion under both species unless a General Council or a Roman Pontiff grants it. Therefore the custom [of communication under both species] must not be considered [a matter of revealed] truth, nor useful, nor beneficial, since it has been introduced without sufficient authority.
[6] Illud autem damnabile est\(^1\) et\(^2\) prorsus\(^3\) haereticum appellandum\(^4\), si quis asserat\(^5\) talem\(^6\) communionem\(^7\) ad salutem esse necessarium, sicut Jacobellus putavit, et qui eum secuti sunt. Magna hominis illius praesumptio vel potius temeritas\(^8\), qui solis\(^9\) imbutus\(^10\) grammaticae\(^11\) disciplinis\(^12\), quibus pueros instituebat\(^13\), ausus est sacros et\(^14\) abstrusos\(^16\) evangelii sensus attingere et\(^17\) ad suum ingenium arcana filii Dei verba interpretari. Non est grammaticorum aut dialecticorum secreta divini codicis reserare, theologorum est\(^18\) et sacrae paginae professorum ista cognitio, et\(^19\) eorum quibus\(^20\) data est scientiae\(^21\) clavis\(^22\), quae aperit et nemo claudit, claudit et nemo aperit. Eunuchus ille in Actibus Apostolorum, qui ex Aethiopia venerat in Jerusalem, cum legeret Isaiam, interrogatus ab apostolo Philippo {148r} an intelligeret, quae legeret: et quomodo, inquit\(^23\), possum intelligere, nisi exponatur\(^24\)? [cont.]

---

1 damnabile est : est damnnabile W1
2 ac W1
3 omit. W1
4 judicandum et appelandum W1; judicandum W2, X, LE
5 asserit G, W1, LE
6 talium LE
7 communicationem W1
8 magna hominis ... vel potius terneritas omit. LE
9 solum LE
10 est add. LE
11 grammaticis W1; grammatica LE
12 disciplina LE
13 qui LE
14 instruebat W2, LE
15 omit. W1, W2
16 add. in marg. A; omit. W1, W2, X, LE
17 omit. LE
18 omit. B, W1
19 culilibet add. W1
20 omit. W1
21 scientia LE
22 scientiae clavis : clavis scientiae W1
23 omit. X
24 a te add. LE
To claim that the communion of the chalice is necessary for salvation, as did Jacobellus¹ and his followers, is damnable and completely heretical. Great is the presumption or rather the audacity of this man. Though he had only studied the disciplines of grammar, which he taught to boys, he dared to dabble in the holy and difficult senses of the Gospel, and to interpret the arcane words of the Son of God according to his own mind. But it is not the task of grammarians or dialecticians to expound the divine secrets of Scripture. That science is reserved for the theologians, the biblical scholars, and those who have been given the key to the knowledge that opens, and none shall shut: and shuts, and none shall open.² When, in the Acts of the Apostles, the eunuch who had come from Ethiopia to Jerusalem was reading Isaiah, he was asked by the Apostle Philip if he understood what he was reading. He answered: And how can I, unless some man shew me?³ [cont.]

¹ Jacob of Mies
² Isaiah, 22, 22: And I will lay the key of the house of David upon his shoulder: and he shall open, and none shall shut: and he shall shut, and none shall open (Et dabo clavem domus David super humerum ejus; et aperiet, et non erit qui claudat; et claudet, et non erit qui aperiat)
³ Acts, 8, 31: Et quomodo possum, si non aliquis ostenderit mihi?
[6 cont.] At Jacobellus absque expositore\(^1\), absque doctore\(^2\) ausus est docere, quae non\(^3\) didicit, et absque calicis bibitione\(^4\) salvari neminem\(^5\) asseverare\(^6\) propter verba salvatoris\(^7\) apud Johannem dicentis \(^8\): *Nisi manducaveritis \(^9\) carnum filii hominis et biberitis ejus sanguinem, non habebatis \(^10\) vitam in vobis \(^11\)*, verborum\(^12\) tantum et litterarum adnotans sonum, mentem\(^13\) praeteriens haud\(^14\) gnarus\(^15\)\(^16\) quod spiritus est, qui vivificat, caro autem \(^{146r}\) non prodest quidquam, neque advertens\(^17\) quod in eodem\(^18\) loco paulo post, cum scandalizati essent de tali\(^19\) sermone aliqui: *Verba mea\(^20\)*, inquit dominus\(^21\), *spiritus et vita sunt*: propter quod manifeste declarat, quia de spirituali manducatione ac\(^22\) bibitione locutus fuerat\(^23\), potius\(^24\) quam de sacramentali, cum\(^25\) et\(^26\) nondum\(^27\) esset\(^28\) institutum eucharistiae sacramentum.

---

\(^1\) expositione X DG?
\(^2\) absque doctore omit. X
\(^3\) numquam W1
\(^4\) calicis bibitione : bibitione calicis LE
\(^5\) salvari neminem : neminem salvari W1, W2
\(^6\) debere asserebat W1; asserere LE
\(^7\) Christi seu salvatoris W2
\(^8\) asserentis W1
\(^9\) manducatis W2
\(^10\) habetis LE
\(^11\) carnum ... in vobis : etc. W2
\(^12\) verbum LE
\(^13\) omit. W1
\(^14\) aut W1
\(^15\) gnarus W1
\(^16\) haud gnarus : nesciens LE
\(^17\) advertens B; advertendum est X
\(^18\) in eodem : eodem in W2
\(^19\) domini add. LE
\(^20\) omit. LE
\(^21\) omit. W2
\(^22\) et W2, X, LE
\(^23\) fuerit X
\(^24\) prius C
\(^25\) tantum W1
\(^26\) omit. W2
\(^27\) nondum : dum W1
\(^28\) esse W2
But without any instructor and teacher, Jacobellus dared to teach what he had not learnt, and to claim that nobody may be saved without drinking from the chalice, because of the Saviour’s words to John: *Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you.* But Jacobellus only took note of the sound of the words and letters, but not of their meaning. He did not know that it is the spirit which gives life, whereas the flesh as such benefits nobody. And he failed to note what follows shortly afterwards, when some were scandalized at such talk: *my words are spirit and life,* says the Lord. Thus the Lord clearly states that he had been talking about eating and drinking in the spiritual sense rather than the sacramental, since the sacrament of the Eucharist had not yet been instituted.

---

1 John, 6, 54
2 i.e. the literal sense
3 i.e. in the biblical text
4 John, 6, 64: *verba quae ego locutus sum vobis, spiritus et vita sunt*
Et ita beatus Augustinus et alii quamplures sancti doctores ejus evangeli lectionem exponunt, qui revelatis oculis mirabilia consideraverunt de lege domini et sua doctrina sanctam ecclesiam illuminarunt. Et licet dominus in ultima cena sub specie panis et vini communicaverit, quando id sacramentum institutit, et similiter apostolos in suam commemorationem facere jusserit, non tamen idcirco populis communio calicis mandata est. Apostolis tantum id fuit, qui tum sacerdotes constituti fuerunt, et ad conficientes pertinet sub utraque specie Christum assumere, et ejus mortem repraesentare, non ad laicos. Et haec veritas est in duobus conciliis generalibus declarata.

---

1 complures X
2 ejusdem W1, W2
3 considerarent X; considerarunt LE
4 illuminaverunt W1, W2; illuminarent X
5 illud W2
6 omit. X
7 omit. W1
8 communicatio W1
9 tamen W1, X
10 omit. LE
11 id dictum : indicta W1
12 tunc W1, LE; cum W2, X
13 instituti W1
14 fuerant W2
15 constiuti fuerunt : fuerunt instituti LE
16 sub utraque specie Christum : Christum sub utraque specie W1
17 sumere W1
18 est W1
19 omit. LE
20 veritas est : est veritas W2
21 illa LE
22 omit. W2, LE
23 conciliis generalibus : generalibus conciliis A, D
This is how that Gospel text was interpreted by Saint Augustine and many other holy doctors who pondered the wonders of divine law in the light of revelation¹ and illumined the Holy Church with their teaching. It is true that when, during the Last Supper, the Lord instituted the Sacrament of the Eucharist, He gave communion under the species of bread and wine and told his apostles to do likewise, in commemoration of Him: still He did not command that the [common] people [should receive] the communion of the chalice. This He said only to the apostles, whom He had then made priests, and His words only concern those priests who perform [the transubstantiation²]³ and re-enact His death, not laypeople. This truth has now been declared by two general councils.

¹ “revelatis oculis”
² I.e. the transformation of bread and wine into Christ’s flesh and blood
³ “conficientes”
[8] Restat nunc ut petitioni vestrae respondeamus de communione\(^1\), quam cupitis. Nos\(^2\) sane regem vestrum, barones vestros, et\(^3\) populares omnes\(^4\) regni Bohemiae\(^5\) in domino diligimus et\(^6\) pro filiis habemus, dum Romanam ecclesiam loco matris habuerint et ei tamquam magistrae\(^7\) obtemperaverint. Magnus et misericors deus, cujus vices indigni gerimus in terra, homines pro liberis habet, eisque non omnia, quae petunt, sed utilia pro jucundis concedit. Ita et nos facere oportet erga\(^8\) vos Bohemos, qui pro\(^9\) laicis communionem\(^10\) calicis\(^11\) desideratis et compactata concilii Basiliensis adducitis, quibus\(^12\) id\(^13\) vobis concessum existimatis. Satisfaciendum est\(^14\) huic partii ne decipiamini et falsa pro veris capiatis\(^15\). Vidimus transsumpta compactatorum, quae nobis obtulistis, quibus diligenter inspectis non invenimus, quod illorum vigore communicare possitis\(^16\) laicos\(^17\) sub utraque specie.

\(^{1}\) communicacione W1, LE

\(^{2}\) nunc W1

\(^{3}\) omit. X

\(^{4}\) omit. W1

\(^{5}\) regni Bohemiae omit. W2

\(^{6}\) omit. LE

\(^{7}\) integrae LE

\(^{8}\) ergo W2

\(^{9}\) omit. X

\(^{10}\) communicationem W1

\(^{11}\) omit. LE

\(^{12}\) quod W1

\(^{13}\) est LE

\(^{14}\) esse LE

\(^{15}\) accipiatis W1, W2, X; recipiatis LE

\(^{16}\) possit LE

\(^{17}\) laicus LE
3.2. Pope’s denial of the petition for papal confirmation of the Bohemian compacts

[8] It now remains to answer your petition concerning the communion you desire. We do love your king, your barons, and all the people of the Kingdom of Bohemia in the Lord, and We do consider them as Our sons as long as they consider the Roman Church as their mother and obey her as their teacher. The great and merciful God, whose Vicar on Earth We are, though unworthy, treats men as his children, and he does not give them all they wish, but only that which benefits them, not that which pleases them. We must do the same towards you Bohemians when you request the communion of the chalice for laymen and appeal to the Compacts of the Council of Basel which you believe has given you this right. We must now address this issue so that you may not deceive yourselves and hold false things as true.

We have seen the transcripts of the Compacts which you have brought to Us, and, having studied them carefully, We do not find that they authorize you to give communion under both species to laymen.
Compactatorum enim {148v} bipartita ratio est. Altera permittit et indulget, ut qui unionem recipiunt ecclesiasticam et pacem realiter et cum effectu, et in omnibus alius quam in usu communionis utriusque speciei fidei et ritui universalis ecclesiae conformes essent, et usum talis haberent, possint communicare sub utraque specie in regno Bohemiae et marchionatu Moraviae. Altera promissionis est, dicens quod facta in concilio discussione super articulo communionis, nihilominus si perseveraverint in desiderio habendi {146v} talem communionem et id per legatos indicaverint, concilium facultatem largiertur sacerdotibus communicandi eas personas, quae in annis utrumque speciei fidei et ritui universalis ecclesiae conformes essent, et usum talis habent, possint communicare sub utraque specie in regno Bohemiae et marchionatu Moraviae. Altera promissionis est, dicens quod facta in concilio discussione super articulo communionis, nihilominus si perseveraverint in desiderio habendi {146v} talem communionem et id per legatos indicaverint, concilium facultatem largiertur sacerdotibus communicandi eas personas, quae in annis utrumque speciei fidei et ritui universalis ecclesiae conformes essent, et usum talis habent, possint communicare sub utraque specie in regno Bohemiae et marchionatu Moraviae. Altera promissionis est, dicens quod facta in concilio discussione super articulo communionis, nihilominus si perseveraverint in desiderio habendi {146v} talem communionem et id per legatos indicaverint, concilium facultatem largiertur sacerdotibus communicandi eas personas, quae in annis utrumque speciei fidei et ritui universalis ecclesiae conformes essent, et usum talis habent, possint communicare sub utraque specie in regno Bohemiae et marchionatu Moraviae. Altera promissionis est, dicens quod facta in concilio discussione super articulo communionis, nihilominus si perseveraverint in desiderio habendi {146v} talem communionem et id per legatos indicaverint, concilium facultatem largiertur sacerdotibus communicandi eas personas, quae in annis utrumque speciei fidei et ritui universalis ecclesiae conformes essent, et usum talis habent, possint communicare sub utraque specie in regno Bohemiae et marchionatu Moraviae. Altera promissionis est, dicens quod facta in concilio discussione super articulo communionis, nihilominus si perseveraverint in desiderio habendi {146v} talem communionem et id per legatos indicaverint, concilium facultatem largiertur sacerdotibus communicandi eas personas, quae in annis utrumque speciei fidei et ritui universalis ecclesiae conformes essent, et usum talis habent, possint communicare sub utraque specie in regno Bohemiae et marchionatu Moraviae. Altera promissionis est, dicens quod facta in concilio discussione super articulo communionis, nihilominus si perseveraverint in desiderio habendi {146v} talem communionem et id per legatos indicaverint, concilium facultatem largiertur sacerdotibus communicandi eas personas, quae in annis utrumque speciei fidei et ritui universalis ecclesiae conformes essent, et usum talis habent, possint communicare sub utraque specie in regno Bohemiae et marchionatu Moraviae.
3.2.1. *Sense of the Compacts*

[9] The text of the compacts has two parts.

In the first, it allows and grants that all those [persons] in the Kingdom of Bohemia and the Margravate of Moravia who sincerely and effectively embrace ecclesiastical union and peace and who already follow this practice may receive communion under both species. It is the condition that in all other matters than the communion under both species they conform to the Faith and rites of the Church.

In the second, it says that if, after a discussion in the Council\(^1\) concerning the issue of communion, the Bohemians still want to have such communion and formally state this through their legates, then the Council will grant their priests the right to give [this form of] communion to those persons who have reached the age of reason and who ask for it with reverence and devotion. It adds the following: the priests who give communion must always firmly believe and tell [the communicants] that it is not just the flesh which is present in the species of bread, and the blood which is present in the species of the blood, but that the whole Christ is present in each species. However, it is not documented that the Council afterwards actually granted this right. [cont.]

\(^1\) The Council of Basel
[9 cont.] So, whether you refer to the first or the second part of the Compacts, you have no grounds for your petition. For the second part containing the promise was never fulfilled, whether you did not actually present a request, or whether the Council – for reasonable cause – [ultimately] refused to grant what it deemed would be harmful since your priests did not keep [their part of] the agreement. Neither does the first part help you since it only grants the communion of the blood to those who already follow that practice and who accept ecclesiastical union in all other matters than communion. But you never accepted ecclesiastical union and conformity with the Church. Therefore, you could not legitimately receive the concession.
[10] Quod autem unio nem et conformitatem non fueritis amplexi quod ex moribus vestris. Nam sacerdotes vestri non instituuntur ad titulum beneficii, ut moris est in aliis regnis, per episcopos et habentes potestatem, nec servaverunt umquam mandata concilii, quibus praecipient erat, ut tantum habentes usum communicarent; sed pueros et dementes communicaverunt, et nolentes communicare sub utraque specie, noluerunt sepelire, et alii modis coegerunt, et multis in rebus universalis ecclesiae abjecerunt, et major pars vestrum usum communionis calicis accepit post compactata, quod minime licuit. Non est igitur, quod de compactatis gloriemini. Nec illud vos juvat, quod oratores concilii mandaverunt archiepiscopo Pragensi, Olumicensi, et Latolimibensi pro tempore existentibus, ac presbyteris, ad quos pertineret, ut populum sub utraque specie requisiti communicarent juxta conventa. Nam id factum est vigore concessionis, cujus fecistis vos indignos, ut ante diximus.

1 quod autem : cum
2 complexi W1; complexi sive complexati LE
3 in W1
4 moribus vestris : vestris moribus W1
5 in LE
6 per episcopos : et episcopatibus LE
7 habentibus X
8 non LE
9 praecautum LE
10 rationis add. LE
11 add. discretionis W1
12 habentes usum : usum habentibus rationis W2
13 communicarent X
14 volentes X
15 noluistis X
16 multum X
17 modis W1
18 omit. W1
19 et major … communionis : majorem usum vestra communio LE
20 omit. W2
21 omit. C
22 quod add. W2
23 illud vos : vos id X
24 Lutholivisbensi W1; Leitomibensi X; Lytomericensi episcopis LE
25 pertinet C, W1, LE
26 capta W1
27 illud W1, W2, X
3.2.2. Bohemian non-compliance with the Compacts

[10] That you have not accepted union and conformity is evident from your actual practice. Your priests are not appointed to the title of the benefice by bishops or others who have that power, as is the custom in other kingdoms. And you have never kept the commands of the council which ordered you to give the communion [of the chalice] only to those who already followed that practice.¹ Instead you have given this communion both to children and to the insane. And those who did not want communion under both species were refused burial and coerced in other ways, and in many areas they rejected the rite of the Universal Church. And after the Compacts [were issued], the majority of you[r people] received the communion of the chalice which was certainly not allowed. [In conclusion,] you have no reason to pride yourselves in the Compacts. It does not help you[r cause] that the orators of the council mandated the present bishops of Prague, Olmütz, and Leitomischl as well as the priests concerned to give people communion under both species, when required to, according to the agreement. For this was done by virtue of the concession which, because of your own actions, you could not legitimately receive, as already explained.

¹ The next part of the sentence containing “pueros et dementes” makes it possible that a “rationis” has fallen out of the text as transmitted in the manuscripts. In that case the translation would be “to those who had the use of reason”
[11] Inspectis\textsuperscript{1} igitur compactatis omnibus\textsuperscript{2} et bullis concessis, judicamus de consilio\textsuperscript{3} fratrum nostrorum cardinalium sacerdotes vestros absque ulla potestate\textsuperscript{4} laicalem populum ad communionem calicis admittere\textsuperscript{5}, decipere plebes\textsuperscript{6}, et graviter peccare, dignosque gravi animadversione, et nisi resipuerint, se ac\textsuperscript{7} populum sibi \{147r\} credentem\textsuperscript{8} perditum ire\textsuperscript{9}; quos admonemus, ut se corrigrant, et nostra potius\textsuperscript{10} clementia quam ultione uti velint. Haec ad compactata, quae calicis communionem\textsuperscript{11} minime vobis permettunt\textsuperscript{12}.

\textsuperscript{1} perfectis W1
\textsuperscript{2} omit. W1, LE
\textsuperscript{3} concilio X
\textsuperscript{4} ulla potestate : potestate ulla W1
\textsuperscript{5} admittentes W1
\textsuperscript{6} plebem LE
\textsuperscript{7} et W1
\textsuperscript{8} concreditum LE
\textsuperscript{9} iri X
\textsuperscript{10} omit. LE
\textsuperscript{11} calicis communionem : communicationem calicis W1
\textsuperscript{12} permittit X
3.2.3. Pope’s judgment

[11] So, having examined all the Compacts and bulls of concession and on the advice of Our brethren, the cardinals, We judge that your priests give the communion of the chalice to laymen without having the right to do so, that they deceive the people, that they sin gravely, and that they deserve serious admonishment: unless they repent, they and the people who trust them will perish. Therefore, We admonish them to correct themselves and to prefer Our clemency rather than Our punishment.

This is [what We have to say] concerning the Compacts: in no way do they permit you the communion of the chalice.
Sed cupitis, ut apostolica sedes\textsuperscript{1} eam\textsuperscript{2} vobis\textsuperscript{3} indulgeat. Faceremus\textsuperscript{4} id libenti\textsuperscript{5} animo, si et vobis utile et nobis decorum\textsuperscript{6} esset, at\textsuperscript{7} neutrum hic est. Nam quomodo id nos\textsuperscript{8} \&\textsuperscript{9} concedamus, quod nostri praedecessores semper\textsuperscript{10} concedendum esse\textsuperscript{11} negaverunt\textsuperscript{12}? Indigne id\textsuperscript{13} ferrent aliae nationes et adversus nos murmurarent\textsuperscript{14}, quas\textsuperscript{15} non expedit scandalizare. Vobis autem concessio\textsuperscript{16} ipsa\textsuperscript{17} et regno vestro multis de causis damnosa\textsuperscript{18} esset\textsuperscript{19}, sicut noxius est ipse usus\textsuperscript{20}, quem servatis.
3.3. Pope’s denial of the petition for papal grant of communion under both species

[12] But now you desire that the Apostolic See should grant you this communion. We should do so willingly if it would be to your benefit and Our honour, but it is neither. How can We grant what Our predecessors always refused? The other nations, which ought not be given cause for scandal, would not accept it and they would protest against Us. For many reasons such a grant would be harmful to you and to your kingdom, just like the practice you follow is damaging.
3.3.1. Risk of doctrinal error

[13] For just as you once commonly believed that the communion of the chalice was necessary for salvation, the people would easily fall into the same error if it was now allowed by apostolic concession, and especially so if your priests did not act as bidden when they gave communion. Even now you claim that communion under both species is useful and beneficial and that it has been revealed by God.¹ This claim would easily lead to belief in its necessity, so to avoid that error it is necessary to forbid the people to drink from the chalice.

¹ Pius here refers to the assertions made by a Hussite delegate during the first reception of the ambassadors, cf. Introduction, sect. 1.3.2.
[14] Ad id urget\(^1\) debita sacramento\(^2\) reverentia, ne in populi frequentia calix domini\(^3\) male tractetur\(^4\), et pretiosissimus Christi sanguis\(^5\) (quod saepe factum est\(^6\)) effundatur\(^7\) in terram\(^8\).

[15] Huc\(^9\) accedit quod maxima\(^10\) pars Bohemorum et Moravorum\(^11\) ritum vestrum abhorret, et numquam ad illum posset\(^12\) \(^13\) inclinari. Quod\(^14\) si vobis indulgetur\(^15\), quod petitis, numquam\(^16\) inter vos esset\(^17\) unio\(^18\). Semper durarent inter vos\(^19\) schismata essetque vobis omni tempore timendum domini verbum quia omne regnum in se divisum desolabitur. Aequius\(^20\) igitur est et facilius, ut vos novum ritum et\(^21\) minime approbatum relinquatis, et illis conformemini\(^22\), quam illi vobis cedentes\(^23\) \(^24\) antiquum et laudabilem usum rejiciant\(^25\), ut sit pax inter vos, et id\(^26\) ipsum sapiatis\(^27\) omnes, et\(^28\) vivatis tamquam fratres.

\(^1\) ad id urget : additurque 
\(^2\) sacramenti \(W_1\), \(W_2\), \(X\)
\(^3\) alioquin \(LE\)
\(^4\) tractatur \(X\); tractaretur \(LE\)
\(^5\) Christi sanguis : sanguis Christi \(LE\)
\(^6\) quod saepe factum est \(omit.\) \(B\)
\(^7\) effunderetur \(LE\)
\(^8\) terra \(W_1\)
\(^9\) hinc \(W_1\)
\(^10\) magna \(W_1\)
\(^11\) Moravianorum \(LE\)
\(^12\) possit \(W_2\), \(X\); poscit \(LE\)
\(^13\) ad illum posset : posset ad illum \(C\), \(W_1\)
\(^14\) \(omit.\) \(W_2\)
\(^15\) indulgetur \(W_1\)
\(^16\) minime \(W_1\)
\(^17\) erit \(W_1\); \(omit.\) \(LE\)
\(^18\) sed \(add.\) \(W_1\)
\(^19\) durarent inter vos : inter vos durarent \(W_1\), \(LE\)
\(^20\) conveniens \(W_1\)
\(^21\) etiam \(W_1\)
\(^22\) conformamini \(W_1\)
\(^23\) quam ... cedentes : qui vobis accedentes \(LE\)
\(^24\) credentes \(W_2\), \(X\)
\(^25\) \(omit.\) \(W_2\); recitant \(LE\)
\(^26\) \(omit.\) \(G\)
\(^27\) sapietis \(X\); sapiant \(LE\)
\(^28\) sic \(add.\) \(LE\)
3.3.2. *Risk of irreverence towards the sacrament*

[14] Also the reverence due to the sacrament must be considered: the chalice of the Lord must not be handled irreverently in the thronging of people, and the precious Blood of Christ must not be spilt on the ground, has happened so often.

3.3.3. *Risk of internal conflicts*

[15] To this should be added that a very large part of the Bohemians and the Moravians abhors your rite and can never be moved to [adopt] it. If We granted your petition, there would never be unity among you: the divisions among you would continue, and you would always have to fear the word of the Lord saying: *Every kingdom divided against itself shall be made desolate.*¹ Therefore it is both more just and more easy that you abandon the new rite that has in no way been approved, and conform to the other [Christians] rather than that they should conform to you and abandon their old and praiseworthy practice: thus, there may be peace among you, you will share the common beliefs, and you will live like brothers.

---

¹ Matthew, 12, 25
[16] Postremo, si hoc\textsuperscript{1} indulgeremus\textsuperscript{2}, quod quaeritis, offenderemus\textsuperscript{3} omnes vicinos \{149v\} vestros\textsuperscript{4}, Theutones, Hungaros, Polonos\textsuperscript{5}, eosque perpetuo vobis\textsuperscript{6} infensos\textsuperscript{7} redderemus\textsuperscript{8, 9}. Nam videntes vos\textsuperscript{10} alium ritum habere, sicut hodie faciunt\textsuperscript{11}, semper reputarent vos errare. Et quamvis mille extarent indulta nostra, tamen appellarent vos\textsuperscript{12} parum fideles et\textsuperscript{13} nimis arrogantes, \{147v\} qui\textsuperscript{14} plus velletis sapere quam ceteri Christiani. Nec possent vobiscum\textsuperscript{15} pacifice loqui, et nunc ab istis\textsuperscript{16}, nunc ab illis molestaremini\textsuperscript{17}, habentes et\textsuperscript{18} in regno infensos et extra regnum\textsuperscript{19}.

\footnotesize
\begin{enumerate}[1]
\item si hoc : quod si\ LE
\item indulgemus W1, LE
\item offendemus LE
\item nostros LE
\item Bohemos C
\item omit. W2
\item offensos W1, X
\item omit. W2
\item perpetuo ... redderemus : infensos perpetuo redderemus nobis LE
\item omit. LE
\item omit. LE
\item omit. LE
\item vos add. LE
\item quia W1
\item vobis X
\item et add. X
\item vileserent nostri LE
\item omit. C; eos LE
\item infensos et extra regnum : et extra regnum infensos W1
\end{enumerate}
3.3.4.  **Risk of external wars**

[16] Finally, if We granted your request, We would offend all your neighbours, the Germans, the Hungarians, and the Poles and make them your permanent enemies. For, seeing you having another rite, as they do today, they would always believe you to be in error. And even if there were a thousand letters of permission from Us, they would still say that you have too little faith and too much arrogance, and that you believe you know better than the other Christians. They would not be able to speak peacefully with you, and you would be molested sometimes by one party and sometimes by another, having enemies both inside and outside the kingdom.
3.3.5. Pope’s judgment

[17] So, having carefully considered all that must be considered in this matter, We do not see that granting your petition would benefit your king, the kingdom, or the people. The words of the Lord to the sons of Zebedaeus apply to you, too: *You know not what you ask.*\(^1\) It is Us who are *the dispensers of the ministries of God.*\(^2\) Ours is the charge to guard the sheep and to lead the flock of the Lord to the road of salvation. We must imitate the supreme family father who never heeds those who ask for harmful things, but directs everything for the best. Not all understand what is truly good, and therefore many people have regretted it when their wishes were fulfilled. What you request now does not lead to eternal life; what you seek is smoke and the breeze of vainglory.

---

\(^1\) Matthew, 20, 22

\(^2\) 1. Corinthians, 4, 1: *Sic nos existimet homo ut ministros Christi, et dispensatores mysteriorum Dei.* NB: the NT has “mysteriorum”, but the text used by Pius has “ministeriorum” (or there has been an error in the transmission of the text of the oration)
Nos\textsuperscript{1} vestrarum animarum\textsuperscript{2} salutem optamus, atque\textsuperscript{3} idcirco negamus ea, quae sunt illi contraria, hortamurque\textsuperscript{4} sub specie panis corpus et sanguinem domini accipere\textsuperscript{5} contenti sitis, quod satis est ad salutem,\textsuperscript{6} dicente domino in eodem qui supra allegatus est loco: Ego sum panis vivus, qui de caelo descend. Qui manducat hunc panem, vivet in aeternum. Nec velitis pluris\textsuperscript{7} esse quam illi discipuli, qui euntes in Emmaus cognoverunt dominum in fractione panis. Nolite\textsuperscript{8} plus sapere quam oporteat\textsuperscript{9} 10 sapere\textsuperscript{11} et pluris\textsuperscript{12} esse, quam fuerunt patres vestri, qui communicantes sub una specie in Christo\textsuperscript{13} mortui sunt. Et non bene congruit\textsuperscript{14} eorum nominem et famae hic\textsuperscript{15} novus ritus. Consolemini eorum memoriam et\textsuperscript{16} conformemini\textsuperscript{17} reliquae Christianitati, quia\textsuperscript{18} turpis est pars, quae suo non convenit universo. Quippe si relictum ritum novo ad pristinam consuetudinem redieritis, unietur\textsuperscript{19} et in seipso et cum vicinis regnum vestrum et pristinae opes cum pristina pace glorique redibunt, eritisque in hoc saeculo felices, et\textsuperscript{21} in alio beati praestante domino nostro Jesu Christo, cui est honor et imperium\textsuperscript{22} per infinita saeculorum saecula.\textsuperscript{23} 24

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{1}{non LE}\footnote{2}{vestrarum animarum : animarum vestrarum W2, X, LE}\footnote{3}{idcirco saepe homines ... optamus atque omit. W1}\footnote{4}{ut add. W1}\footnote{5}{suscipere W1}\footnote{6}{optamus atque ... ad salutem omit. LE}\footnote{7}{plures W2}\footnote{8}{pluris esse ... panis nolite omit. LE}\footnote{9}{oportet W2, X}\footnote{10}{quam oporteat sapere omit. LE}\footnote{11}{oporteat sapere : oportet W1}\footnote{12}{plures W2}\footnote{13}{domino LE}\footnote{14}{convenit W1}\footnote{15}{hujusmodi W1}\footnote{16}{consolemini ... memoriam et omit. W1; consolamini eorum memoria LE}\footnote{17}{conformamini LE}\footnote{18}{omit. W1}\footnote{19}{vivetur C; vivetis [conveniet] LE}\footnote{20}{omit. W2}\footnote{21}{omit. X}\footnote{22}{honor et imperium : gloria et honor imperiumque LE}\footnote{23}{saeculorum saecula : secula seculorum W1, W2, X, LE}\footnote{24}{Amen add. D, G, W1, W2, X}
\end{footnotesize}
[18] We desire the salvation of your souls, and therefore We refuse to grant that which militates against it. We exhort you to be satisfied with receiving the Lord’s body and blood under the species of bread [alone]. It is sufficient for salvation, as says the Lord in the same text quoted above: *I am the living bread which came down from heaven.*¹ *He that eateth this bread, shall live for ever.*² Do not wish to be greater than those disciples who, going to Emmaus, recognized the Lord in the breaking of the bread. Do not wish to know more than you should know, and to be more than your fathers who died in Christ having received communion under one species only. This new rite is an affront to their name and fame: comfort their memory, and conform to the rest of Christianity: it is shameful for a part to be in disharmony with the whole. If you abandon your new rite and return to the old custom, your kingdom will be united both internally and with its neighbours, and your former wealth will return together with your former peace and glory. You will be happy in this world, and you will be blessed in the next, as granted by Our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom is the honour and the power through the infinite ages of ages.

¹ John, 6, 41 and 6, 51
² John, 6, 59: *This is the bread that came down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead. He that eateth this bread, shall live for ever. (Hic est panis qui de caelo descendit. Non sicut manducarunt patres vestri manna, et mortui sunt. Qui manducat hunc panem, vivet in aeternum)*