St. John of Capistrano, O.F.M.

AGAINST THE HUSSITES: LETTERS AND REPLIES, 1451–1452

From the Latin printed by F. Walouch (Brno, 1858)

English translation

Contributed to Mind of the Church by a friend of the library who wishes to remain anonymous

---

TABLE OF CONTENTS

About this translation · 3

The Priests of Krom■■íž

I. The Allegations of the Priests of Krom■■íž · 4
II. St John of Capistrano's Letter in Reply to the Priests Living at Krom■■íž · 7

Letters, 1451–1452

Letter of John of Capistrano to the Lord George of Pod■brady · 26
IV. To Ulrich of Rosenberg · 26
V. Copy of the letter of Brother John of Capistrano to Master John of Rokycana · 27
VI. Letter of Rokycana to Capistrano · 30

Reply to John of Rokycana, 1452

Reply to John of Rokycana, part 1 · 37
Reply to John of Rokycana, part 2 · 41
Reply to John of Rokycana, part 3 · 46
Reply to John of Rokycana, part 4 · 51
Reply to John of Rokycana, part 5 · 55
Reply to John of Rokycana, part 6 · 60
Reply to John of Rokycana, part 7 · 64

Letters, 1451–1452

VIII. To the Burgomaster and Council of Znojmo · 66
IX. John Borotín, schismatic, to the priest John of Capistrano · 67

Reply to John Borotín, 1452

Reply to John Borotín, part 1 · 70
Reply to John Borotín, part 2 · 74
Reply to John Borotín, part 3 · 78
Reply to John Borotín, part 4 · 83
Reply to John Borotín, part 5 · 87
Reply to John Borotín, part 6 · 92
Reply to John Borotín, part 7 · 97
Reply to John Borotín, part 8 · 101
Reply to John Borotín, part 9 · 106
Reply to John Borotín, part 10 · 110
Reply to John Borotín, part 11 · 115

About this translation

Translated from the appendix to F. Walouch, *Žiwotopis swatého Jana Kapistrána* (Brno, 1858), pp. 663–895, where the documents are printed in sequence: the allegations of the Hussite priests of Krom■■íž and Capistrano's letter in reply (pp. 663–707); letters of 1451–1452 to George of Pod■brady, Ulrich of Rosenberg and John of Rokycana, Rokycana's letter to Capistrano, and letters to the council of Znojmo and from John Borotín (pp. 707–728, 786–792); Capistrano's reply to Rokycana, written at Cheb and begun on the vigil of the Nativity and concluded on the Saturday after the octave of Epiphany, 1452 (pp. 728–786); and his reply to Borotín (pp. 792–895). They are given here in the order of the edition.

Page 838, missing from the copy first used, has been translated from another copy of the edition. The edition prints the reply to Borotín incomplete: it breaks off on p. 895 (MS Olomouc 2.VI.6).

The Priests of Krom■■íž

I. The Allegations of the Priests of Krom■■íž

(p. 663)

Allegations of the schismatics, who falsely strive to prove that communion of the chalice is necessary for salvation for the lay people, etc.

For the truth of the communion of the holy Eucharist under a twofold species, namely of bread and of wine, as regards the faithful people, proved and set out beforehand by the priests of Krom■■íž (Cremsyer) against the Italian monk now at Olomouc, who fiercely attacks it, condemns it (so it is heard) and brands it heresy, four rules written below are directed after the manner of a tetragon, and a reply in writing is requested from him.

Let the first rule be this: Sacred Scripture is the rule of faith; against it, rightly understood, no authority or reason of any man whatsoever is to be admitted, nor any constitution; neither custom nor observance is valid if it attempts to fight against sacred Scripture. This rule is presupposed as true and manifest of itself. And it is proved by blessed Augustine, *On the One Baptism*, book 2, saying: "Who does not know that the holy canonical Scripture, both of the Old and of the New Testament, is contained within its own fixed limits, and that it is so set before all later letters of bishops that about it there can be no doubt or dispute at all whether whatever stands written in it is true or right?"

Second rule: the practical life of Jesus Christ and of his apostles and of his other followers, the saints approved in the Church, most nearly,

(p. 664)

most truly and most plainly expounds and interprets sacred Scripture, as far as suffices for the salvation of the human race, and this is especially evident in the matter of the sacraments. For the works of Christ, above all the miraculous ones, most evidently prove the faith both of the Old and of the New Law; for which reason the Saviour says in John 10: "The works that I do in the name of my Father, they bear witness of me." And below: "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though you will not believe me, believe the works." Augustine says the same, *On Christian Doctrine*, book IV: "Whatever the grandeur of the diction, the life of the speaker has greater weight." And the doctor Lyra in the moral exposition: "Deeds prove more than words." And Seneca in the twentieth letter to Lucilius says: "Words are rather to be proved by deeds than deeds by words."

Third rule: No exposition or interpretation of sacred Scripture is useful, effective and living unless it be wrought principally by the Holy Spirit. For it is plain that whoever understands sacred Scripture otherwise than the Holy Spirit requires is a heretic, as blessed Jerome says in the letter to the Galatians. Hence those who understand it wrongly and pervert it are called false prophets by Ambrose on Isaiah. And Augustine in the fourth book of the *Confessions* says: "There is no other teacher of truth besides you, O Lord, wherever and from whatever source it has shone forth." The same in the book *On the Trinity*: "However much a man may excel in fluency of speech or in skill of disputing or in sweetness of discourse, in vain does the workman labour at everything from without, unless the Creator works hiddenly within." "For every best gift and every perfect gift is from above, coming down," etc., James 1.

Fourth rule: The four holy doctors of the universal Church, namely Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine and Gregory, and others who are endowed with talent, trained by study, humble in judgment and free from affected vice, more properly and more authentically expound and interpret sacred

(p. 665)

Scripture, especially where they agree in the same thing, than a thousand modern expositors and writers infected with the abomination of the age, with the venom of asps and with simoniacal heresy. For they are set before not only modern expositors but even the Roman pontiffs in the exposition of the sacred Scriptures, as is evident from the second [book] of the Decretals, etc.

Conclusion of the first rule. Since, therefore, communion under both species for the common people is the truth of sacred Scripture set out above, as will appear below, it follows from the first rule that against it no authority or reason of any man whatever is to be admitted, nor any constitution; nor is custom or observance valid if it tries to fight against sacred Scripture. And since the opinion of the monk attacks, indeed brands as heresy, this truth of sacred Scripture, it follows and is proved that it fights against sacred Scripture, and consequently is in no way to be admitted or upheld, etc.

Conclusion of the second rule. Furthermore, since the said truth of communicating the people under both species is the institution and practice of Christ and the apostolic tradition together with the primitive Church, as is evident from the course of the Gospels and from 1 Corinthians 11, it follows from the second rule that the said institution, tradition and practice more truly, more plainly and more nearly expounds and interprets sacred Scripture concerning the said communion than every other contrary exposition and interpretation of the moderns, etc.

Conclusion of the third rule. Moreover, since the said truth of communion under both species, with its exposition and interpretation, namely the practice of Christ, of the apostle and of the primitive Church, was in them infallibly wrought by the Holy Spirit, and it is not established that it has so far been revoked by the same Spirit, it follows from the third rule that it is useful, effective, living and salutary for the Christian people. Granting this, the constitution and custom of anyone to the contrary will be useless and harmful to Christ's faithful, notoriously contrary and repugnant to sacred Scripture, and consequently, by the first rule, in no way to be accepted and upheld, etc.

(p. 666)

Conclusion of the fourth rule. Furthermore, since the truth of the said communion has been sufficiently and plainly explained and interpreted by the aforesaid doctors, and consequently its practice has been attested in many ways to be necessary and salutary for the Christian people, it follows by the fourth rule that their explanation and interpretation is safer than other modern constitutions and customs, more authentic, truer and nearer to sacred Scripture, and consequently to be more embraced and accepted by all Christ's faithful, etc.

Now, that it may be clear that the said truth of sacred Scripture, namely the communion of the Eucharist under both species for the people, has been sufficiently proved and attested by sacred Scripture and by the holy doctors mentioned and other writers to be necessary, useful and salutary for the Christian people, it is evident from what is written below. For Matthew 26 writes: "And while they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke, and gave to his disciples, and said: Take and eat; this is my body. And taking the chalice he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying: Drink all of you of this. For this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins." The same is found in Mark 14 and Luke 22. In John 6 Jesus said to his disciples and to the crowds of the Jews: "Amen, amen I say unto you: Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you." Where the gloss says: "Until now he made no mention of the eating of the sacrament of the altar; and even if it is not known what the manner of giving or eating is, still: Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood," etc. And below, on the words "He that eats," the gloss says: "Certain saints expound this of the eating of the altar, and they say well." Paul: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you. For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until he come." And below: "But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of the chalice," 1 Corinthians 11. Augustine:

(p. 667)

"When the host is broken, while the blood is poured from the chalice into the mouths of the faithful, what else is signified but the immolation of the Lord's body on the cross and the shedding of his blood from his side?" (From the book of Sentences of Prosper, and in the canon *De consecratione*, dist. 2, *Cum frangitur*.) Augustine: "Because we have been freed by the death of the Lord, mindful of this in eating and drinking we signify the flesh and blood which were offered for us." (Book *On the City of God*, and in the canon *De consecratione*, dist. 2, *Quia*.) Augustine, who sets the chalice, that is, the blood of Christ, by itself, as a grace distinct from the table, that is, from the flesh, although neither can flesh be or be received without blood, nor blood without flesh, and there are not two sacraments there but one; yet the flesh is not the blood, nor the blood the flesh, and the bread is converted into the flesh and the wine into the blood and not conversely, and each is received under different species: therefore he here distinguishes the table and the chalice as different graces. (On Psalm 22 in the ordinary gloss.) Jerome: "Those who serve the Eucharist and distribute the blood of the Lord to his people act impiously against the law of Christ, thinking that the words of the one who prays make the Eucharist, and that only the solemn prayer is necessary and not the merits of the priests, of whom it is said: The priest, in whatever blemish he may be, let him not approach to offer oblations to the Lord" (in Sophonias; and in the canon, [causa] 1, [q.] 2, *Sacerdotes*). Gregory: "What the blood of Christ is, you have learnt well, no longer by hearing but by drinking. This blood is put upon both door-posts when it is drawn not only by the mouth of the body but also by the mouth of the heart. For the blood of the lamb is put on both posts when it is received by the mouth for redemption and pondered by an attentive mind for imitation." And below: "In this mystery he dies; his body too is received everywhere, his flesh is divided for the salvation of the people, his blood is poured no longer into the hands of unbelievers but through the mouths of the faithful." (In the Easter homily, and in the canon *De consecratione*, dist. 2, *Quid sit*.) Ambrose: "Because we have been freed by the death of Christ, in eating and drinking the flesh and blood we ought to be mindful

(p. 668)

that we have obtained in this the new testament, which is the new law, which delivers him who obeys it to the heavenly kingdoms. The testament, then, was established with blood, because the blood of Christ is the witness of the divine benefit; hence we receive for the protection of body and soul, because the flesh of Christ is received for the salvation of the body, but the blood for our soul, and was shed. As Moses prefigured, saying: The flesh, he says, shall be offered for your body, but the blood for the soul. And therefore the law commands that blood is not to be eaten." (On 1 Corinthians 11, *Quotiescunque*, etc.)

Thomas Aquinas: "Although the whole Christ is under each species, yet he is not given under each species in vain. For first this serves to represent the passion of Christ, in which the blood was separated apart from the body; hence in the form of the consecration of the blood mention is made of its shedding. Secondly this is fitting to the use of this sacrament, that the body of Christ be shown to the faithful separately as food and the blood of Christ separately as drink. Thirdly, as regards the effect, it is fitting to give it to the faithful under different species, because the body of Christ is offered for the salvation of the body and the blood for the salvation of the soul." (Third part of his *Summa*, q. 76, art. 2.) Nicholas of Lyra: "Drink the wine which I have mingled for you, into my blood under the species of wine, in which water is mixed; for in ancient times the faithful communicated under both species." (On the word of Proverbs 9: "Come, eat.")

Love of brevity leaves aside for the present the other writings of the holy doctors and also of the canons of the Church. But this we think must be added and finally urged as a fourth point: "Other foundation no man can lay but that which is laid," our Lord Jesus Christ. For where Christ is not the foundation, nothing of good work is built upon it. Since, then, Christ, God and man, almighty, all-knowing and all-willing, who in his traditions could neither deceive nor be deceived, is of this communion under both species as regards the laity

(p. 669)

the most provident author, as the synods of Constance and Basel confess together with the primitive Church, which according to Bede is as mother and mistress of the modern Church; and since the same Bede says in the Easter homily that the best rule of life is to imitate the primitive Church in all things: we pronounce boldly, being the more certain and secure, that if any man, nay, as the Apostle says, "if an angel coming from heaven should preach another gospel than that which has been preached," every faithful person ought to say to it, Anathema, and to uphold magnanimously the evangelical and apostolic truth already preached, which, victorious over monks, kings and councils, remains and grows strong for ever, and lives and prevails for ages of ages. Amen.

II. St John of Capistrano's Letter in Reply to the Priests Living at Krom■■íž

Letter in reply of St John of Capistrano to the priests living at Krom■■íž.

For the truth of the most divine Sacrament of the Eucharist under one species only for the Catholic and faithful lay people, instituted, proved and set out not by the priests of Krom■■íž but by the Lord Jesus Christ himself, thoroughly regulated and adorned by the holy Roman and universal Catholic Church according to the rite, observance and custom of the holy Roman and universal Church militant, which is to be kept as law. For it is unworthy enough that anyone, whether of the pontiffs or of the subordinate orders, should reject this rule which he sees the see of blessed Peter both follow and teach, as is most clearly evident in [dist.] 12, c. *Nolite*, etc.; *Ecclesiasticarum*, etc.; *In his rebus*. And through Augustine to the priest Casulanus, saying: "In those matters about which divine Scripture has laid down nothing certain, the custom of the people of God and the institutions of our forebears are to be held as law. And as transgressors of the divine laws, so also despisers of ecclesiastical

(p. 670)

customs are to be restrained." And the same Augustine says in *On the Christian Faith*: "Of the Catholic Church spread throughout the world, whatever is held in it is proved to exist in three ways: either it is the authority of the Scriptures, or universal tradition, or at least a proper particular instruction. By the authority of the Scriptures the whole Catholic Church is bound; by the universal tradition of the forebears, no less the whole; but by private constitutions and particular instructions each [church] subsists and is ruled according to the variety of places, as seemed good to each." And in the book *Against the Manichaeans* the same Augustine says: "It is plain that in a doubtful matter the authority of the Catholic Church avails for faith, which is confirmed from the most firmly founded sees of the Apostles down to the present day by the series of bishops succeeding one another and by the consent of so many peoples." It is therefore most expressly evident that the papal authority, which is commonly called apostolic, most fully [has the power] (since the pope himself, the supreme pontiff, has been called to the fullness of power, the others to a share of the solicitude; 2, q. 6, c. *Qui se scit*, and c. *Decreto nostro*) to judge of causes of faith and of any doubts whatever arising concerning the faith; and to it, as to the mother of all Catholics and as to the supreme power, recourse is had for judgment and for the declaration of truth by Catholics from everywhere (dist. 12, *Sic omnis*; 2 [Decretals], *De libelli oblatione*; 1, q. 3, etc.).

I cannot, therefore, but marvel, O priests of Krom■■íž. I, Brother John of Capistrano, least and unworthy of the Order of Minors, Apostolic Commissary and General Inquisitor of heretical depravity throughout the whole world, appointed by the holy Apostolic See, though undeserving, by Pope Martin V of happy memory, as I show evidently by authentic apostolic letters: [I am the one] whom in a kind of derision you call "the Italian monk," to whom, as one fiercely attacking, condemning and branding as heresy, you say four rules written below are directed "after the manner of a tetragon." You try to insert foreign words, which nevertheless

(p. 671)

(with reverence) you understand very little, nor do you know of what case "tetragoni" is or where it is found. A *tetragona* is a four-angled figure having all its angles right, just as *tetrameter* is said of a verse of four feet, and *tetraptota* of the variety of four cases, and *tetrarch* of one holding a fourth part of a kingdom. Perhaps, like an ape, you think to feign what is not, saying "after the manner of a tetragonium four rules"; had you said *tetragone*, I would have understood that it could have been the genitive or dative singular or the nominative plural. I have said this because you strive to write so elaborately and so pompously, as men of your sort are wont to do for the smoky cloud of temporal vainglory. It is the way of serpentine cunning to roll the tongue and smear its poisoned words with honey.

These are not rules composed or devised by the priests of Krom■■íž; rather, not merely four but ten rules were composed at the holy Council of Constance, if I remember rightly, by the most reverend father and lord in Christ, the lord John de Turrecremata, now most worthy Cardinal Priest of the title of St Sixtus, against the heresies of Wyclif, Hus and Jerome, your fathers, whom you now presume to venerate as saints against the judgment and determination of the holy Council of Constance, which then represented the Catholic Church.

You do not notice the words of the first rule, which says: "Sacred Scripture is the rule of faith, against which, rightly understood," etc. What then if it is understood wrongly and perversely? Certainly it will be necessary to have recourse to some superior for the true understanding, as has been most evidently shown above. And if you note well the words of Augustine, *On the One Baptism*, "Who does not know," etc., he intends only this: that since the content of sacred Scripture, both of the Old and of the New Testament, has been approved and received by holy Church, it is not lawful at all to doubt that whatever is established to be written in it is true and right.

Further, on the word "canonical," when he says: "Who

(p. 672)

does not know the holy canonical Scripture," etc.: for *canon* in Greek is called among the Latins a rule and an approved custom or institution. Hence Augustine said in the same place: "I would not believe the Gospel unless the Church moved me." Canonical sacred Scripture, then, is that which has been regulated, decreed, examined and approved by the holy Roman universal Catholic Church militant. For as Isidore says, *Etymologies* book 6, ch. 16: "*Canon* in Greek is called *regula* (rule) in Latin. And it is called a rule because it leads straight and draws no one aside. Others have said that a rule is so called either because it rules, or because it provides a norm of right living, or because it corrects what is distorted and crooked. The canons of the general Councils began from the times of Constantine. For in the preceding years, with persecutions raging, there was hardly any opportunity of teaching the people. Hence Christendom was split into various heresies, because the bishops were not allowed to meet together except in the time of the aforesaid Emperor. For he gave Christians the freedom to assemble freely. Under him also the holy fathers, assembling from the whole world at the Council of Nicaea, handed down according to the evangelical and apostolic faith the second creed after the Apostles."

Behold, dearest ones, if you will open the eyes of your mind, you will plainly recognize that the authority of Christ remained principally in Peter and accessorily in the other apostles, and is known to have been propagated from Peter and the Apostles themselves into the successors of Peter and the Apostles who enter canonically. Hence the Lord Jesus Christ himself said, John 15: "I am the vine, you the branches. He that abides in me, and I in him, the same bears much fruit; for without me you can do nothing," denoting the union of the members with the head, which is Christ Jesus himself; for which union also he prays with mighty efficacy to the Father on that most sacred night of his last supper, John 17: "Holy Father, keep them in my name whom you have given me, that they may be one, as we also are." And below: "Sanctify them in truth; your word is truth." And below: "And not for

(p. 673)

them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in me, that they all may be one, as you, Father, in me, and I in you, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that you have sent me. And the glory which you have given me, I have given to them, that they may be one, as we also are one: I in them, and you in me, that they may be made perfect in one."

Behold, then, what it means: "Except you eat and except you drink," John 6. Eat, therefore, with us the truth of faith; drink with us the charity of Christ, for God is charity, and he that abides in charity abides in God, and God in him (1 John 4), where he also said: "By this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error. If we love one another, God abides in us, and his charity is perfected in us. And we have known and have believed the charity which God has in us." In such a way also Peter spoke, after Christ had declared to the people with his mouth the words he had said: "Except you eat and except you drink." And below: "He that eats me, the same also shall live by me." Behold, it suffices to eat in the way in which Christ means. "This is," he says, "the bread that came down from heaven," and he did not say: this is the wine, nor did he here make any mention of wine. And he said: "He that eats this bread shall live for ever," and he did not say: he that drinks this wine. Nor, when he said, "Drink you all of this" (Matthew 26), have you read that he put wine or water, milk or honey or balsam or any other liquid whatever into the chalice, but only: "For this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins." He added, however: "But I say to you, I will not drink from henceforth of this fruit of the vine" (Matthew 26). And Mark 14: "And having taken the chalice, giving thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And he said to them: This is the blood of the new testament." And Luke 22: "And having taken the chalice, he gave thanks and said: Take and divide it among you. For I say to you that I will not drink of the fruit of the vine till the kingdom of God come." And above he had said: "For I say to you that from this time I will not eat it, till

(p. 674)

it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." You will say, then, dragging sacred Scripture to your liking with an understanding at once crooked and perverse: therefore from that hour Christ Jesus neither ate nor drank even after his resurrection, but will eat and drink on the day of judgment, because then will be fulfilled "And the kingdom of God shall come." And thus you will judge Jesus Christ himself a liar and a deceiver. For either he ate and drank after the resurrection or not; it is most expressly evident that he ate and drank. Of the eating it is evident in the last chapter of Luke, when he said: "Have you here anything to eat? And they offered him a piece of a broiled fish and a honeycomb. And when he had eaten before them, taking the remains he gave to them." That he drank is proved by the testimony of Peter and of the Evangelist Luke himself, writer of the Acts of the Apostles, ch. 10, where Peter, after the conversion of Cornelius, said of Christ Jesus: "Whom they killed, hanging him upon a tree. Him God raised up the third day and gave him to be made manifest, not to all the people but to witnesses preordained by God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he arose again from the dead." It is evident, therefore, that he ate and drank. And yet the kingdom of God is not yet fulfilled in us; but it was fulfilled in him at the instant in which he rose from the dead. And so the Gospel must agree with the Gospel, and one passage of sacred Scripture be explained by another, etc.

Hear, then, how Christ Jesus himself explained "Except you eat and except you drink": "It is the spirit," he says, "that quickens; the flesh profits nothing. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life. But there are some of you that believe not." Behold, he speaks of faith when he says, "Except you eat and except you drink"; "for Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that did believe, and who he was that would betray him." These are the words of John, "who gives testimony of these things, and we know that his testimony is true." Peter too testifies to this in the same place, who, when Christ had said to the twelve, "Will you also go away?", answered him:

(p. 675)

Simon Peter: "Lord, to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life. And we have believed and have known that you are the Christ, the Son of God." Behold, he understands the words of Christ of faith. Christ also, when he had said, "Labour not for the meat which perishes, but for that which endures unto life everlasting, which the Son of man will give you," [was asked:] "They said therefore to him: What shall we do, that we may work the works of God? Jesus answered and said to them: This is the work of God, that you believe in him whom he has sent." And below: "My Father gives you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is that which comes down from heaven and gives life to the world. I am the bread of life; he that comes to me" (understand: through faith) "shall not hunger, and he that believes in me shall never thirst. But I said to you that you also have seen me, and you believe not." And below: "This is the will of my Father that sent me, that every one who sees the Son and believes in him may have life everlasting, and I will raise him up in the last day. The Jews therefore murmured at him because he had said: I am the bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever."

O blind leaders of the blind! O deaf, unwilling to hear the truth! O lame ones, crawling backwards like the crab, stinging like the scorpion, butchers of souls redeemed by the blood of Christ: eat the living bread, drink the whole Christ, sound and entire. Do not still hold Christ dead, thinking that his blood is not with his body; for the whole Christ Jesus, according to his whole divinity and according to his humanity, with soul, body and blood, full of all his glory, entire and perfect, is really contained under each of the two species, whole in the whole and whole in every part, whole. This is the truest rule, this is canonical sacred Scripture, this is the canon that leads straight and provides the norm of right living, which Gratian also mentions in dist. 3, *Canon*: "For the canons were written at the suggestion of the Holy Spirit"; dist. 10, *Si quis diaconus*; dist. 32, *Erubescant*; 25, q. 1, *Violatores canonum*; *De aetate et qualitate*, c. *Multis*.

(p. 676)

Canonical Scripture, therefore, is the name for the Old and New Testament approved by the Church, as is said in the *Summa* and in c. *Noli* and c. *Ego*, where are related the words of Augustine to Jerome in his letter, saying: "I have learnt to give this fear and honour only to those writers who are now called canonical, so that I dare not believe that any of them erred in writing. And if I meet anything in them that seems contrary to truth, I think nothing else than that either the manuscript is faulty or the translator has not grasped it." Behold, then, that sacred Scripture needs a true, authentic and legitimate interpreter, who is the supreme pontiff, guided by the Holy Spirit, who with the council of his cardinals and prelates and Catholic doctors judges and decides concerning a cause of faith, as above. Hence Augustine in the first letter to Jerome said: "As the trustworthiness of the old books is to be examined from the Hebrew volumes, so the truth of the new requires the norm of the Greek language." In the same distinction there is also written the said rule of Augustine which you allege, "Who does not know," etc. So too Innocent, writing to Bishop Decentius, says: "Who does not know or notice that what was handed down to the Roman Church by Peter, prince of the apostles, and is kept until now, ought to be observed by all, and that nothing should be added or introduced which would have to take its authority or example from elsewhere?" And in [dist.] 12 he says: "Holy Pope Callistus says to all the bishops: It is not fitting for a member to depart from the head, but according to the testimony of Scripture let all the members follow the head. Nor is there any doubt to anyone that the Apostolic Church is the mother of all churches, from whose rules it is in no way fitting for you to deviate." And blessed Pope Gregory said: "Let not apostolic precepts be resisted with hard pride, but let what has been commanded by the holy Roman Church and by apostolic authority be fulfilled through obedience unto salvation, if you desire to have true communion with the same holy Church of God, which is the head."

It is not lawful for you, therefore,

(p. 677)

priests of Krom■■íž, to tear the bowels of your true mother and to rend the unity of the seamless tunic of our Lord Jesus Christ. The sacrament of his body and blood is the bond of unity, as Augustine said. "For as one bread is made from many grains and one wine flows together from many grapes, so we, being many, are one body, and every one members one of another in Christ Jesus our Lord," as the Apostle says to the Romans, ch. 12. And Augustine says: "Because the Lord suffered for us, he commended to us in this sacrament his blood and body, which he also made ourselves; for we too have been made his body, and by his mercy we are what we receive" (*De consecratione*, dist. 2, *Quia passus est*). And below: "You came to the water and were moistened and became the Lord's bread; so be one, loving one another, holding one faith, one hope, undivided charity. Heretics, when they receive this, receive a testimony against themselves, because they seek division, while this bread signifies unity. So also the wine was in many grapes and now is one wine; it is one in its sweetness. The chalice is filled after the pressing of the wine-press, and you, after those fasts, after labours, after humility and contrition, have now come in the name of Christ as it were to the chalice, and there you are on the table and in the chalice with us; for together we receive this, together we drink, because together we live." Understand rightly that he speaks of spiritual receiving and drinking, that is, of the union of the mystical body of our Lord Jesus Christ. From this also he said in the sermon on the infants: "Thus our Lord Jesus Christ signified us, and as he willed us to belong to him, he consecrated on the table the mystery of our peace and unity; he who receives the mystery of unity and does not keep the bond of peace receives not a mystery for himself but a testimony against himself. Let no one, therefore, doubt in any way that each of the faithful becomes a partaker of the Lord's body and blood when in baptism he is made a member of Christ, and is not

(p. 678)

estranged from the fellowship of that bread and chalice even if he depart from this world before he eat that bread and drink the chalice; established in the unity of the body of Christ, he will not be deprived of the participation and benefit of that sacrament, since he finds in himself that which the sacrament signifies."

In such a way also is understood what is read in the book of Sentences of Prosper: "When the host is broken, while the blood is poured from the chalice into the mouths of the faithful, what else is signified but the immolation of the Lord's body on the cross and the shedding of his blood from his side?" Understand rightly the sentence of Prosper. Who breaks the host with his hands? Is it not the priest? Therefore it is also into the mouths of the faithful priests that the blood is poured from the chalice. For he intends to express that the mystery of human redemption is represented in memory in this most divine sacrament. And therefore he says: "What else is signified but the immolation of the Lord's body on the cross and the shedding of his blood from his side?" This the Apostle also said, 1 Corinthians 11: "As often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until he come." To denote and represent this, then, it fully suffices that the priests receive this most divine sacrament under both species, namely of bread and of wine. And this was commanded in the holy Council of Toledo, and is found in *De consecratione*, dist. 2, c. *Relatum est nobis quosdam de sacerdotibus*, etc., and in c. *Comperimus autem*. And this is the pure and sincere truth, which whoever rejects condemns himself as a heretic by his own judgment, as the Apostle said in the last chapter to Titus: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition avoid, knowing that he that is such a one is subverted and sins, being condemned by his own judgment."

Keep, then, the sacred canons, O priests of Krom■■íž, for "violators of the canons are not unfittingly seen to blaspheme the Holy Spirit, who, not compelled by necessity but willingly, either do or presume to say something wantonly against those same sacred canons, or freely

(p. 679)

consent to those who wish to do so. For such presumption is manifestly one kind of those who blaspheme the Holy Spirit, since, as has already been touched on, it acts against him by whose command and grace the holy

canons were issued." So said the holy Pope Damasus, and it is the text of the Decretum, 25, q. 1, *Violatores canonum*, etc. For thus Pope Hormisdas said in the same causa and question: "The first salvation is to guard the rule of right faith and in no way to deviate from the constitutions of the fathers." So too according to blessed Augustine: the first heresy among the disciples of Christ arose as it were from the hardness of his saying. For when he said, "Except a man eat," etc., they, not understanding, said to one another, "This saying is hard," and they separated themselves from him, and he remained with the twelve. When those had departed, he instructed those who had remained: "It is the spirit," he said, etc.

The canons, then, are holy and to be observed by all the faithful. For from those canons we unanimously observe holy obedience, ecclesiastical union, discipline and public utility in all the Catholic Christian people truly faithful to Christ, as Joannes Andreae notes on c. *Cum venerabilis*, *De consuetudine*. For that reason the canons are called most sacred and holy (dist. 44, *Dum pervenit*; dist. 27, *Pervenit*; dist. 7, *Sanctorum canonum*). And the Pope and cardinals are called living canons (2, q. 3, c. *Ipsi sunt*). We are debtors, therefore, and you are obliged and bound to observe the canonical rules (9, q. 3, c. *Cum simus*; dist. 19, c. *Si Romanorum*, etc., c. *Si omnis*, etc., c. *Cum vero*, and c. *Nulli*; and dist. 10, c. 1 and 2). The holy Roman Church, therefore, has the right of establishing canons and of furnishing canons with authority, and is not subject to them (25, q. 1). And in the same place it is held that the pope is lord of the canons and can change and correct them, the key, however, not erring concerning the faith, which can never err, as Christ Jesus, the Truth, promised in the abstract to Peter for himself and his successors in office, saying: "To you I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven," establishing his Church upon himself, Christ Jesus, the most firm rock,

(p. 680)

and asserting that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. On which words Cyril said: "As Christ promised, so the Church of Peter, that is, the Church committed to Peter, remains unstained by all seduction, above all prelates and bishops and primates of churches, in its pontiffs, in the fullest faith and authority of Peter; and while the churches of certain others have been put to shame by error, it stops all the mouths of heretics." And thus by the gates of hell heresiarchs and heretics are designated. And this for the first rule and your first, false conclusion.

To the second, which is very intricate, I say and answer that there are many things which holy mother Church has declared even in modern times, and continually declares, beyond those which the Apostles and the holy doctors near to them interpreted, about which it would take long to discourse at present: for example, about the images of the saints, about the sacraments of the churches, about the vestments of priests and of clerics who celebrate and minister, about the manner of celebrating, about the time. For we read: Peter, holding the priestly chair in the regions of the east for four years, first celebrated Mass saying only the Our Father; so then you too should now say it thus, which I do not advise. Christ Jesus after supper communicated this most divine sacrament himself and with his twelve apostles, which today would be wrong, as blessed Augustine says, and is found in c. *Liquido*, *De consecratione*, dist. 2. So too Christ Jesus instituted this sacrament at night-time, as is commonly believed. But today, as blessed Thomas says on the fourth [book] of the *Sentences*, dist. 14, Mass is to be celebrated by day and not at night, because this sacrament belongs to the time of grace, which is signified by day, according to the saying of the Apostle, Romans 13: "The night is passed, and the day is at hand. Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness and put on the armour of light. Let us walk honestly, as in the day." The day, however, is reckoned not only from the rising of the sun, but from when the signs of the sun about to rise begin to be manifested by

(p. 681)

some brightening of the air. In two nights, however, Mass is sung by privilege of those nights, as in the night of the Lord's Nativity, when Christ was born, as is evident in c. *Consuluisti*, *De celebratione missarum*, and dist. 1, c. *Nocte*. For three Masses are celebrated on that day because of the mystery represented by those

three Masses, as the Gloss says on the said c. *Consuluisti*: namely, the state before the law, at night; the state under the law, at dawn; the state of grace, about the third hour, etc. Of these I have written much in our longer treatise against the heresies of the Hussites.

Wherefore your second conclusion is false: that the institution and practice of Christ and the apostolic tradition [require] that the lay people must communicate under both species by necessity of salvation or by Christ's precept, and above all with the most abominable horror that even infants baptized one day before should at once be communicated under both species, which was the heresy of Pelagius and Nestorius, condemned more than a thousand years ago. But you wish to raise it up and renew it; therefore such men are to be judged not only heretics but heresiarchs, as is evident in 24, q. 3, *Qui aliorum*, where the holy Pope Urban says thus: "He who defends the error of others is much more damnable than those who err, because not only does he err, but he also prepares and confirms stumbling-blocks of error for others. Hence, because he is a master of error, he is to be called not only a heretic but even a heresiarch." To which is added the decree of the Lateran Council in c. *Sicut ait beatus Leo*, where the defenders and harbourers of heretics are excommunicated just as the heretics themselves; and in c. *Excommunicamus*; *Credentes*, under the same title. And this for the second rule and your false conclusion.

The third rule fights most expressly against you. For you are those who presume to understand and interpret sacred Scripture otherwise than the sense of the Holy Spirit, by whom the Scripture is, requires, as is evident in 24, q. 3, c. *Haeresis*. From which also your conclusion is evidently false,

(p. 682)

as has been most clearly declared above on your first rule. For the Holy Spirit, from the mouth of his breather Jesus Christ, true Son of God, from whom the Holy Spirit proceeds as from the Father, spoke (John 16) for the explanation of those words, "Except you eat and except you drink," saying: "It is the spirit that quickens; the flesh profits nothing. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life," etc.

Your fourth rule, after the commendation of the four holy doctors, is wholly venomous, when you say, "than those modern expositors and writers infected with the ambition of the age, the venom of asps and simoniacal heresy," and when you yourselves say, "for they are set before not only modern expositors but also the Roman pontiffs in the expositions of the sacred Scriptures." On this you intend to found your fourth, most false conclusion, that they attest communion under both species to be necessary for the Christian people, inasmuch as you intend to extend communion under the twofold species to the lay people: a falsehood you will never for all eternity be able to prove. O most imprudent men, you have the forehead of a harlot, unwilling to blush at so great insolence and arrogance of yours. "For you have taught your tongues to speak lies. You have bent your tongue as a bow of lies and not of truth. They are strengthened upon the earth," says the Lord, "an assembly of transgressors, for they have proceeded from evil to evil, and me they have not known," says the Lord. "For they have taught their tongue to speak lies; they have laboured to commit iniquity. Their tongue is a piercing arrow; it has spoken deceit. With his mouth one speaks peace with his friend, and secretly he lays snares for him. Shall I not visit them for these things, says the Lord, or shall not my soul be revenged on such a nation?" Read Jeremiah ch. 9 and you will find these things marked out against you. Where have you read it in dist. 20 of the Decretum? Turn it over carefully: where will you find that the authorities of the doctors are set before the sentences of the Roman Pontiffs? You will more easily

(p. 683)

find that the four doctors themselves expressed the contrary. For first, Jerome, writing to the holy Pope Damasus, says: "This is the faith, most blessed pope, which we have learnt in the Catholic Church and which we have always held; in which, if anything has perhaps been set down less skilfully or less carefully, we desire to be corrected by you, who hold both the see and the faith of Peter. But if this confession of ours is approved by the judgment of your apostleship, whoever wishes to blame me will prove himself unskilled or

malevolent, or even not Catholic but a heretic." Likewise: "The holy Roman Church, which has always remained immaculate, the Lord providing and the blessed Apostle Peter bringing help, will remain so in the future, and will persist firm and immovable at all times without any assault of heretics." Read 24, q. 1, c. *Haec est fides*, etc. And blessed Ambrose, in the same causa and question, [and] the Master of the Sentences, says: "The ship that has Peter is not troubled; that one is troubled which has Judas." Such is yours. He adds: "Even though many merits of the disciples were sailing there, yet the treachery of the betrayer was still shaking it. Peter was in both; but he who is firm by his own merits is troubled by those of others. Let us beware, then, of the faithless one, let us beware of the betrayer, lest through one we be tossed about. Therefore this ship is not troubled in which providence was sailing, treachery is absent, faith prevails. For how could it be troubled over which he presided in whom is the foundation of the Church? There then is trouble where faith is little; there security where love is perfect. Finally, although others are commanded to let down their nets, yet to Peter alone it is said: Launch out into the deep, that is, into the depth of disputations. For what is so deep as to see the depth of riches, that is, to know the Son of God and to take up the profession of the divine generation? Which, although the human mind cannot fully comprehend by the investigation of reason, yet the fullness of faith embraces it." Behold how solemnly blessed Ambrose exalts the summit of the Apostolic See!

Now hear what Augustine [says], treating on John the words of Christ in Matthew 16, "Whatsoever

(p. 684)

you shall bind," etc. Augustine says: "If this was said to Peter alone, the Church does not do this. But if it is done in the Church, then what are bound on earth are bound also in heaven, and what are loosed on earth are loosed also in heaven; because him whom the Church excommunicates, he is bound in heaven as excommunicated; him whom the Church reconciles, he is loosed in heaven as reconciled. If then Peter does this in the Church, when he received the keys he signified the holy Church. If in the person of Peter the good in the Church were signified, in the person of Judas the wicked in the Church were signified" (24, q. 1, *Quodcunque*). And the same Augustine in the same causa and question says: "Where there is not sound faith there cannot be justice. For the love of neighbour works no evil; if heretics had it, they would not tear apart the body of Christ, which is the Church." Behold how Augustine testifies against you, O priests of Krom■■íž.

Hear now, then, what Gregory says in the *Moralia*, that truth is beheld only from the Catholic Church: "The Lord declares that there is a place with him from which he may be seen. Moses is placed on the rock to contemplate the face of God, because unless one holds the solidity of faith he does not recognize the divine presence; of which solidity the Lord says: Upon this rock I will build my Church. She alone it is through whom the Lord gladly receives sacrifice; she alone who intercedes confidently for the erring. Hence also concerning the victim of the lamb the Lord commands, saying: In one house shall you eat, nor shall you carry of its flesh outside the doors. For it is eaten in one house, because in the one Catholic Church the true victim of the Redeemer is immolated, of whose flesh the divine law forbids carrying anything out of doors, because it forbids giving what is holy to dogs. She alone it is who guards those placed within her by the strong bond of charity. Hence also the water of the flood lifted the ark to higher places, but destroyed all whom it found outside the ark." And this is against you, who do not care to rend the mystical body of Christ.

Now, so that like the blind you may recover your sight for the understanding of the truth, when you say that the expositions of the doctors in

(p. 685)

the expositions of the sacred Scriptures are set before the Roman Pontiffs, understand also what the same Gregory says, dist. 19, c. [*Nulli fas est*]: "It is lawful for no one to will or to be able to transgress the precepts of the Apostolic See or the ministry of our disposition," which your charity ought to follow. "Let him

therefore be laid low by the grief of his ruin, whoever wills to oppose the apostolic decrees, nor let him have a place thereafter among the priests, but let him become a stranger to the holy ministry; nor let anyone afterwards have care of his judgment, for he is not doubted by anyone to be already condemned by the holy and Apostolic Church for his disobedience and presumption."

But that the apostolic authority, that is, of the supreme Pontiff of the holy Roman Church, prevails over the authorities of any doctors whatever, hear and attend, O rebels against the truth of the Holy Spirit, to what Pope Nicholas writes in dist. 19, saying: "If by the decree of the Roman pontiffs the works of other writers are approved or rejected, so that what the Apostolic See approved is held accepted today, and what it rejected is held to be without force up to now: how much more ought those things which it has prescribed at various times for the Catholic faith, for sound doctrines, for the various and manifold necessities of the Church and for the morals of the faithful, to be set forth with all honour, and to be reverently taken up by all, in whatever circumstances, with discretion or dispensation in grace." And Pope Agatho says: "Thus all the sanctions of the Apostolic See are to be received as though confirmed by the divine voice of Peter himself." And Pope Leo said: "Thus our Lord Jesus Christ, Saviour of the human race, so ordained that the truth, which before was contained in the proclamation of the law and the prophets, should go forth through the apostolic trumpet for the salvation of all." And in [dist.] 19, *Ita Dominus*: "The Lord willed the sacrament of this office so to belong to the duty of all the apostles that he placed it principally in the most blessed Peter, the highest of all the Apostles, so that from him as from a kind of head he might pour out his gifts as into the whole body; so that he might understand himself to be a stranger to the divine mystery

(p. 686)

who dared to withdraw from the solidity of Peter. For him, taken up into the fellowship of undivided unity, he willed to be named from what he himself was, the Lord, saying: You are Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, so that the building of the eternal temple, by a wonderful gift of the grace of God, might stand in the solidity of Peter; strengthening this Church also with his own firmness, so that neither human rashness could attack it nor the gates of hell prevail against it. But whoever attempts to break its power, favouring his own desires and not following what he received from the ancients, wills with exceedingly impious presumption to violate this most sacred firmness of this rock, built, as we have said, by God's building."

If you wish to learn the truth, attend: in defining matters not only knowledge is necessary, but also power. Hence Christ, when about to say to Peter, "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth," etc., first said, "To you I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven," giving him in the one the knowledge of discerning between leprosy and leprosy, in the other the power of casting some out of the Church or receiving them. Since, then, every matter reaches its end either in the absolution of the innocent or in the condemnation of the delinquent, and absolution and condemnation require not knowledge only but also the power of those who preside, or are entrusted to them: hence Pope Innocent established or decreed that "as often as a question of faith is debated, I think that all our brothers and fellow bishops ought to refer it only to Peter, that is, to the authority of his name and honour, as your love has now referred it, so that it may benefit all the churches throughout the whole world" (24, q. 1, c. *Quoties*). For what the pope approves, it is not lawful for anyone to reject (dist. 20, c. *Si ille*; dist. 22, *Omnes*; 32, q. [text unclear], *Veniam*). For Pope Hormisdas laid down and decreed to all the bishops established throughout all the provinces, saying: "Let no one [put forward] to me anything else against the authority of the Apostolic See or of the three hundred and eighteen bishops and the rest

(p. 687)

of the canons." For whatever has been said against the definition of those in whom we believe the Holy Spirit has spoken, I do not doubt that to receive it is not only rash but also dangerous, as in the said c. *Si ille*, etc.

You add, moreover, what you finally attempt to bring in, and you offer to prove that communion under both species is, as you intend, necessary and salutary for the lay people, as if you were saying that without it there can be no salvation. And you further allege: "And while they were at supper," Matthew 26. From these words, however, no necessity of communicating under both species is inferred for the lay people, but only for those to whom he said: "Take and eat." And afterwards: "Drink you all of this." And Mark adds in ch. 14: "And they all drank of it"; therefore they fulfilled the command. But they had first been made priests when they all drank of it, which is evident from those words written by Luke alone among the Evangelists, "Do this in commemoration of me" (Luke 22), as all Catholic doctors commonly assert and treat on the fourth [book] of the *Sentences*, dist. 17 and 18.

In like manner, from the second authority which you adduce, "Except you eat and except you drink," no necessity is inferred except for the spiritual eating, to be observed through the faithful union of the soul with Christ Jesus and with his mystical body, as has been shown you. So also for the third, from the words of the Apostle, 1 Corinthians 11: nothing is concluded by way of precept or necessity of salvation for the lay people, except for the representation of the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ. Hence he said to the priests: "As often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until he come." For it is not lay people who show forth and preach the death of the Lord in the Church, but priests; not women but men; not little ones but grown men. Did not the Apostle expressly forbid a woman to preach, 1 Timothy 2:11–12, saying: "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to use authority over the man, but to be in silence"?

(p. 688)

And does not holy mother Church expressly forbid and prohibit under anathema to lay people, of whatever order they are reckoned, the office of preaching? Certainly so, as is evident in c. *Sicut in uno* and in c. *Excommunicamus*. And the Apostle himself to the Romans, ch. 10: "How shall they preach unless they be sent?" Did not the Apostle himself begin his rebuke against the Corinthians themselves by saying: "First of all, I hear that when you come together there are schisms among you," just as you do, worthless priests of Krom■■íž? He adds: "For there must be also heresies, that they also who are approved may be made manifest among you." Mark this against yourselves: "When you come together therefore into one place, it is not now to eat the Lord's supper," and not to drink the blood. And below: "Do I praise you? In this I praise you not." And then he relates the fact, saying: "For I have received of the Lord," etc. He does not, therefore, command, but narrates the institution of the Lord, relating also the command of the Lord to the priests, as to the Apostles alone: "Do this in commemoration of me." And speaking generally and disjunctively: "Whosoever shall eat this bread," as the lay people do, "or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily," as you do and minister. See what follows: "shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord." And below: "For he that eats and drinks unworthily," as you and your raving and bewitched followers do, "eats and drinks judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord." And he did not say here, "not discerning the blood," because in the very body of the Lord are really contained his divinity and his whole humanity, namely soul, body, blood and everything that belongs to the being of man, by assumption, compassion, conjunction, concomitance and union. Proceeding, then, the Apostle adds, because of the abuse and the unworthy reception: "Therefore are there many infirm and weak among you, and many sleep." And below he concludes: "And the rest I will set in order when I come." The Apostle, therefore, commands nothing about communion under both species to be given to lay people, etc.

(p. 689)

To the fourth authority, of Augustine (though it is of St Prosper and not of Augustine), as you allege it: "When [the host] is broken," etc. Except by reference, answer has already been given above that such words refer to the priests, not to the lay people; nor does any such authority conclude anything about necessity of salvation or about a precept of the one who instituted it. The host is broken by the priest, not by a layman, not

by a woman, not by a little child.

Such breaking is done for what the authority says, namely for the signification and memory of the passion and death of the Lord; and it is broken into three parts, as there are three parts of the mystical body of our Lord Jesus Christ, namely of the blessed, of the wayfarers and of those to be purged, as the Master treats on the fourth [book] of the *Sentences*, dist. 12, and *De consecratione*, dist. 2, c. *Triforme*, etc.

To the fifth, "[Because we have been freed] by the death of the Lord": attend to the word he uses, "we signify." The priests, then, are those who, in eating and drinking the flesh and blood of the Lord, recalling his passion, signify and show it forth; nor does Augustine say anything there about the necessity of the communion of lay people under both species, which he himself had rejected against Pelagius and Nestorius, etc.

To the sixth, "Who sets the chalice, that is, the blood of Christ, by itself," etc., the answer is that he announces diversities or divisions of graces, as the Apostle said, 1 Corinthians 12: "Now concerning spiritual things, my brethren, I would not have you ignorant." And below: "There are diversities of graces, but the same Spirit." And nevertheless, when he had enumerated there nine kinds of graces, intending the unity of the mystical body of our Lord Jesus Christ concurring through diverse members, he added: "For as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body, so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body. For the body also is not one member, but many." And so it is most expressly

(p. 690)

evident that he speaks of the union of the mystical body. And if the gloss says that the table and the chalice distinguish different graces, it has nothing to do with the matter of precept or necessity of salvation, as you persuade the blind, the poor, the ignorant. I truly say "the blind, the lame, the paralytic, the crippled and other wretched sick and afflicted," as I have experienced by bodily presence in many who came to me for the benefit of absolution. For [there is] that Psalm 22, namely "The Lord rules me," where the psalmist wrote ten gifts of God, which the ordinary gloss calls ten graces; and after the ninth grace it places the said authority, which does not begin as you put it, but begins: "Not that the psalmist sets the chalice of the blood of Christ by itself as a grace other than the table, that is, than the flesh, although," etc. In this authority it implicitly resolves this question: why the psalmist, in enumerating the said gifts or graces of God, distinguishes the table, that is, the body of Christ, and the chalice, that is, the blood of Christ, or [assigns them] to two graces, that is, two gifts of God, although the species of bread and the species of wine are one total sacrament and not two, and the flesh of Christ cannot by the common law be or be received without the blood and conversely, because the whole Christ is under each species. And in answering it gave three causes for this question. The first is the essential distinction of the body of Christ and his blood, and this it touches when it says: "But because neither is the flesh blood nor the blood flesh." The second cause is the diversity of the conversion, and this it hints at when it adds: "And the bread is converted into the flesh and the wine into the blood, and not conversely." The third is the distinction of the species of bread and wine, and this it names when it adds: "And each is received under different species." From which it is evident that the gloss in this whole authority says nothing about communion under both species being necessary, as you say, for the lay people. And if it says, "Each is received under different species," that is true of the priests, to whose office it belongs to consecrate

(p. 691)

and to receive under both species, for the perfect signification of the sacrament.

To the seventh, "The priests who serve the Eucharist," etc., the answer is that this authority has nothing to do with the matter of the communion of the people under both species, because priests communicating the

people under the species of bread alone truly distribute and minister to them the blood of the Lord, since the body is not without the blood, as has been said; and the words of the author hint no more on this matter. From the words of Jerome it is also hinted that those priests err who think that, to celebrate this sacrifice worthily, the words of consecration with the other prayers and solemnities of the Mass suffice, and that a good life is not also required in the priest: "For those who live badly do not celebrate worthily, but act impiously against the law of our Lord Jesus Christ," according to the said word of the Apostle (1 Corinthians 11:27): "Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread," etc., "shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord," and "eats and drinks judgment to himself." The said words can also rebound against you: that those priests act impiously against the law of Christ who divide the blood of Christ to the peoples, as you do, since in truth the glorified blood of Christ can in no way be divided from the body. And however such an authority is understood, it intends nothing about communion under both species for the lay people, etc.

To the eighth, "What the blood of Christ is," etc.: the text of the said Augustine, when it says, "you have learnt by drinking," if understood actually, refers to the priests. And when it adds, "his blood is poured no longer into the hands of unbelievers but into the mouths of the faithful," the gloss says: namely, to all who consecrate, whether worthily or unworthily. And thus it is evident that he speaks of priests. But when you celebrate, if you are priests according to what you write and hold, then the blood of Christ is not poured into the mouths of the faithful, since you keep neither the faith of Christ nor of holy mother Church, which you promised

(p. 692)

both in baptism and in priestly ordination. We can also resolve this passage otherwise. For in the authorities of the saints one must attend not so much to the rigour of the words as to their mind and intention, as the same Gregory himself said in c. *Praeterea*, *De verborum significatione*: "Moreover," he says, "if it should perhaps fall to you to take my long letter for translation, I ask that it be rendered not word for word but sense for sense, because often, while the propriety of the words is attended to, the sense of the truth is lost." Hilary said: "The understanding of what is said must be taken from the causes of saying it, because the thing is not subject to the speech, but the speech to the thing. For the Gospel consists not in the leaves but in the root of reason and in the sense" (1, q. 1, *Marcion*). For if we attend to the rigour of the words, it is not true that even the priests drink the natural blood of Christ from the chalice, since his natural blood is enclosed in the veins in his glorified body. Gregory's intention, then, is by those terms "drinking" and "drawing" [to mean] sacramental and spiritual reception and acceptance. And in that way the faithful receive the blood of Christ under the species of bread, as has been said, because, as St Thomas said: "The flesh is food, the blood drink; yet Christ remains whole under each species. By the one receiving he is not cut, not broken, not divided; he is received whole," etc.

To the ninth, "Because we have been freed by the death of Christ," etc. It is expressly evident that it must be understood that he speaks of priests, who, in consecrating and receiving, do this by office, to commemorate and perfectly signify the passion of Christ and our perfect redemption in soul and body. For although by the death and passion of Christ we have been freed in soul and body, yet this liberation would not be signified so perfectly by consecration and reception under one species only. And therefore by the priest, to whom the perfect signification belongs, the sacrament is consecrated and

(p. 693)

received under both species, so that by the offering of Christ under the species of bread the liberation of our body may be signified, and under the species of wine the redemption of our soul. And the Master of the Sentences hints at this on the fourth [book], dist. 2 [*sic*], when after the said words of Ambrose he adds: "Yet it is received under both species what avails for both, because the whole Christ is received under each species. But if it were received in one only, it would be signified to avail for the comfort of one only, that is,

the body, not for the protection of both equally." Behold how he speaks of signification, since he does not say, "it would avail for the protection of the one only," but says, "it is signified to avail for the protection of the one only," etc.

To the tenth, "Although the whole Christ is under each species," etc., the answer is that St Thomas [speaks] on the fourth [book] of the *Sentences*, dist. 2 [*sic*], where all Catholic doctors commonly treat this passage on communion under the species of bread alone for the lay people, and attach effective reasons why this was introduced, which I omit here for brevity's sake. It is not, therefore, to be thought so bitterly and impiously that St Thomas wished to contradict himself so expressly and kill himself with his own sword; rather, speaking cautiously, he intends to assign the causes why this most divine sacrament, although the whole Christ is under each species, is not in vain consecrated and received by those celebrating under both species. And he assigns three causes, all of which he intends to refer to a more express signification. Hence he says, first, that this is done to represent the passion of Christ, which consisted in the affliction of the body and the shedding of the blood. The second is for the more express signification of complete spiritual refreshment: for although under the species of bread the blood is also received, yet it is not received there by way of drink; and so, although under the species of wine the body of Christ is also always received, yet not by way of food. And therefore, so that the body may be received by way of food and the blood by way of drink, it is received by the priests under the twofold

(p. 694)

species, so that thus perfect spiritual refreshment may be signified. And although in some churches it used to be given to the deacons and subdeacons ministering in sacred vestments, it does not therefore follow that the blood of Christ should also be ministered and given to the lay people and to women and little children, since it was also expressly forbidden, both at Constance and at Basel, that even subdeacons and deacons should communicate under the species of wine. The third cause St Thomas alleges is to signify most expressly the distinct effects of the sacrament, not, however, to cause them. For although under the species of bread alone the flesh of Christ is offered for the salvation of our body and the blood for the salvation of the soul, yet the signification of this offering for soul and body is not made so expressly when it is received under one species only as when it is received under both. And the gloss teaches this on 1 Corinthians 11, and the Master of the Sentences on the fourth [book], dist. 2 [*sic*], where he says: "Therefore it is celebrated in two species, so that the taking up of soul and flesh by Christ and the liberation of both in us may be signified." But, as has been said, such perfect and complete signification belongs to the priests celebrating, as in c. *Relatum* and in c. *Comperimus*, *De consecratione*, dist. 2, etc.

To the eleventh, "Drink the wine," etc. I wonder at you: what do you get from this authority? Nothing else but that in ancient times the faithful communicated in both species. No one denies this; and yet this introduces no necessity of salvation, nor a precept of Christ. For that same Nicholas of Lyra, on those words of the Lord Jesus, "Except you eat and except you drink," says expressly: "By this it is not to be understood that this sacrament is to be ministered to the faithful under both species, but only that it is to be received in this way by the priest; for although in the primitive Church the people communicated under both species, yet afterwards it was providently ordained that they should not communicate under the species of wine, because of the danger of spilling." Behold, most expressly against you, etc.

(p. 695)

Lastly, after your fashion, you think to embroider [the world] with falsehood, most falsely asserting that Christ Jesus instituted this sacrament to be given to the laity under both species, and that the Council of Constance and of Basel confess this. O your great rashness, O diabolical madness, O most wicked bewitchment! How can your most perverse conscience and your clouded and darkened intellect bear such open lies? Does not the Council of Constance expressly determine that any lay people and priests unwilling

to desist from receiving and ministering under both species should be punished as heretics? The tenor of this decree, under the leaden bull of Pope Martin V of happy memory, I hold in my keeping. And did not the Council of Basel confirm the decrees of the Council of Constance, and issue a new one most expressly against your heresies? It displeases you to be called by this name, but you will not cease from the effect of the name.

You have had my image painted, to my dishonour and contempt, not considering that this, through the divine goodness and mercy, will turn to my reward. Remember that on another occasion, three years have now passed, when people were coming here to hear my sermons, you went out in troops onto the public highway like robbers, with your armed followers, with lances and crossbows, to seize some forty persons or so from Hradišt■ (Radisch), among whom were some priests and deacons and perhaps other clerics; and although they were wholly innocent towards you, with rash daring and poisoned mind, to the reproach of God's truth and the scandal and contempt of the whole Christian people, you imprisoned them, put them in chains and terribly afflicted them with hunger and thirst. Do you not know that all who took part in that capture, whoever gave counsel, help and favour or consent, or in any way were partakers in such a crime, were by the very fact cursed and excommunicated, and are still in that bond, since they could not be absolved by anyone

(p. 696)

without the special grant or commission of the holy Apostolic See? And you priests who counselled these things and ratified them, consented to them and urged them, as is reported, not only fell into the said curse and excommunication, but also, by afterwards celebrating and damnably thrusting yourselves into the divine mysteries and ministries, have been made irregular. And from such irregularity you can be freed only by the authority of the supreme Pontiff, as in c. *Cum aeterni*, *De sententia et re iudicata*, in the Sixth Book; and *De excommunicatione*, 17, q. 4, c. *Si quis suadente diabolo*; and *De sententia excommunicationis*, c. *Parochianos vestros*; and in c. *Cum illorum*, *De sententia excommunicationis*; and in c. *Sacris est canonibus institutum*; and in c. *Si aliquis*, with similar ones, etc.

Come, then, to me for absolution: by the authority of our most holy Lord Pope Nicholas V I am ready to grant the benefit of absolution willingly and freely, both to you and to your Rokycana and to all his and your accomplices, for eternal salvation and the everlasting peace of God, which surpasses all understanding. And lest perhaps you doubt in yourselves whether you are and have been entangled by the very fact in heresies and ecclesiastical censures and excommunications, and remain continually so while your pertinacity and obstinate contumacy endures: turn over carefully and attend to the laws which I shall describe to you below by way of definitive rules useful to you, if you wish to be rightly wise and to behold the light of truth.

The first definitive rule is this: that heresy is a false doctrine contrary to sacred Scripture, defended pertinaciously, chiefly for the sake of gain or of some temporal glory, as Augustine says in *On the Usefulness of Believing*; and blessed Jerome; and it is gathered from 24, q. 3, c. *Inter haeresim*, and c. *Haeresis*, and c. *Haereticus*. But you strive to defend the false doctrine of Wyclif, Hus, Jerome, Matthias, Jakoubek and your Rokycana; therefore you too are such, etc.

The second rule is that one who doubts in the faith

(p. 697)

is an unbeliever, as in c. 1, *Extra*, *De haereticis*: "Nor are they to be believed at all who are ignorant of the faith of the truth." In faith no one ought to doubt, but firmly to believe those things which have been determined by the holy Roman and universal Church, as in c. 1 at the beginning, *De summa Trinitate et fide catholica*. Otherwise he cannot be saved, as St Athanasius says; and it is gathered from dist. 23, c. *Qui episcopus ordinandus est*, and 24, q. 1, c. *Ait Coelestinus papa*, and c. *Aperte*, where Pope Nicholas, writing to the clergy of Constantinople, says: "Openly," he says, "by the authority of our See, [we declare that] no

one, whether bishop or cleric or Christian of any profession, who by Nestorius," etc. But you follow the errors of Nestorius, who also held that communion under both species for the lay people, and even for little children, as you do, falls under necessity of salvation and the precept of Christ and of his Apostles; therefore you too are such as he was, as is evident in the said c. *Ait Coelestinus* at the beginning, where: "If anyone, by Bishop Nestorius or by others who follow him, since they began to preach such things, has been either excommunicated or stripped of the dignity either of bishop or of cleric," etc.

The third rule is that every schismatic is called a heretic (1, q. 1, c. *Si quis, inquit*), where Cyprian the martyr [says] against heretics: "If anyone," he says, "has gone out of the Church by heretical presumption, he is condemned by himself," etc. But you have done so; therefore, etc. For the gloss says there: "Cyprian intends to prove that we ought not to use the sacraments of heretics: first by the authority of the apostle; secondly by the authority of the Lord, by which he forbade the prophet to take food with them; thirdly because heretics, after the manner of apes, have only the image of the sacraments, but do not have true sacraments; fourthly that if the wicked who are in the Church, after a threefold admonition, are compared to heathens and publicans, so that we may not take food with them, much more the heretics who have been cut off, because not only are they themselves punished, but

(p. 698)

also those who favour them and use their sacraments. Fifthly, by the authority of the prophet Hosea, saying that their sacrifices are the bread of mourning." Thus the Gloss. And Jerome on the prophet Haggai speaks thus: "So is every people of the heretics in my sight, says the Lord. Everything they do, whatever they offer me, whether vows, or for welfare, or peace-offerings, or for sin, or holocausts, or alms, or fasts, or chastity of body, shall be defiled in my sight." Take this, Stephen, for yourself and your companions, for the amendment of life, morals and doctrine. And note that the same Jerome says on Amos: "God hates the sacrifices of heretics and casts them from him; and as often as they are gathered in his name, he detests their stench and shuts his nostrils. He speaks, indeed, by a human likeness, so that we may recognize the disposition of God through our own words," as the same Jerome says on Amos, and 24, q. 1, c. *Odi et proieci*, etc.

The fourth rule is that everyone cut off from the unity of the Catholic Church's faith and from the communion of the faithful is called a heretic (24, q. 1). Every Jew, every unbelieving gentile and schismatic is called a heretic. You are in the number of the schismatics, which you most expressly confess in your "Stephanine" letter, full of venom and eternal damnation, addressed to me three years ago now. I grieve greatly that you did not receive my reply to it; yet it was not my fault. May God spare the man who kept it chained under the lock of a most foul (three-year) prison. Recently, however, after your letter addressed to me, when I told the Reverend Lord Bishop-elect how I had left it in the hands of the lord John, his predecessor, the lord Bishop-elect himself, searching diligently among the books of that predecessor, found two copies of my reply, which that man had hidden; which greatly displeases me. Yet your blasphemous and sacrilegious invective against me was not copied with them. Behold, I send it back together with the said old reply,

(p. 699)

in which, however, the invective of John Borotín was copied, who was aiming at the same thing as you. For he presumes, so foully, so rashly and so ignorantly, being blind, to rebuke me because I said that whoever does not obey the Roman Church, that is, the pope, the cardinals, etc., in all things that they command (you should at least have said: things pertaining to faith), however justly and holily he may otherwise have lived, is a heretic and to be assigned to the eternal fires of Gehenna; and you exclaim with poisoned stomach: "Ha, how cruel is this madness!" etc.

I will not pass over this passage so lightly, beyond what you could read above. Read Augustine, *On the Catholic Faith, to Peter*; read in the Decretals, *De haereticis*, c. 3, the canonized authority of the said

Augustine, saying: "Hold most firmly and in no way doubt that every heretic or schismatic will share the burning of eternal fire with the devil and his angels, unless before the end of life he has been restored to Catholic unity and incorporated into the Church." And a little after: "To no man who does not hold the unity of the Catholic Church can baptism, or alms however abundant, or death undergone for the name of Christ, profit unto salvation." See also the same Augustine in the same book, and 1, q. 1, c. *Firmissime*: "Hold most firmly and in no way doubt that those baptized outside the Church, if they do not return to the Church, heap up ruin by their baptism; for so much does the communion of the Church's fellowship avail for salvation that a man is not saved by baptism when it is not given where it ought to be given." And below: "Let us hold unity, dearest brothers; apart from unity, he who works a miracle is nothing," etc. Read, Stephen, what I wrote in the said old reply, although the whole treatise which I afterwards pursued [*sic*] hardly comprises a fourth part of what they then wrote, with whom several copies remained. Note also that, according to Augustine, outside the Catholic Church there is no place of true sacrifice (1, q. 1, *Extra

(p. 700)

catholicam*), where the gloss [says]: "That is, outside the form of the Roman Church." Read also what Pope Pelagius writes, 24, q. 3, c. [*Apostolicae*]: "By the example of apostolic authority we have learnt that the spirits of those who err and lead into error are to be delivered to Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme." Read also what St Gregory wrote to all throughout the Italian and German realm, dist. 81, c. *Si qui sunt presbyteri*, where he concludes: "Therefore whoever asserts that he is a Christian and refuses to obey the Apostolic See incurs the sin of paganism." To which is also added [dist.] 22, *Omnes*, and c. *In memoriam*, dist. 19, with similar ones.

O blind leaders of the blind, why, to your own ignominy, disgrace and ruin, do you presume, like your Rokycana, to draw examples from the Eastern Church and to set it before [the Roman] and to invoke it as mother and mistress of the other Churches, to the heaping up of your damnation? You confess, then, that you too have now assented to their heresies. You adduce, little Stephen the "didascalus," [text unclear: "Guotosolitos" (*sic* in the edition)]; you adduce also Icarus. Why did you not adduce Daedalus with his lament? You tend to the depths, masters of errors, since you were never disciples of truth. You adduce also Donatus, showing yourself a schoolmaster of boys who does not pass on to higher things. Take what is yours and go. Read Isidore, dist. 37, [c.] *Ideo prohibetur*: "Christians are forbidden to read the fictions of the poets because by the delights of fables they excite the mind too much to the incitements of lust. For not only by offering incense do they sacrifice to demons, but also by too willingly taking in their sayings," etc.

The fifth rule is that, taking it even broadly, any excommunicated person is called a heretic if he has persisted in excommunication for at least a year, as in c. *Cum contumacia*, *De haereticis*, in the Sixth Book, where Alexander [IV] says: "Since contumacy, especially in a cause of faith," and below: "because he evades obeying or contumaciously absents himself, if for a year he endures

(p. 701)

with pertinacious mind," namely, the excommunication, "from then on let him be condemned as a heretic." And 11, q. 3, c. *Rursus*, where of one persisting in excommunication for a year [it is said that] thereafter, as to their excommunication, no voice of theirs is to be heard at all. This decree was taken from the Council of Carthage. But you Wycliffites and Hussites and observers of the false doctrines of their followers have remained, hardened in soul, pertinaciously in the major excommunication, whose absolution is reserved to the pope alone in the constitution, not only for a year but for ten, for twenty, for thirty, and now almost for forty years; in that it was decreed in the holy Council of Constance, as I have told you, that those unwilling to desist from communion under both species should be punished as heretics; and heretics are excommunicated by the law itself and by the very fact. Therefore you too are such, etc.

The sixth rule is that everyone who interprets sacred Scripture wrongly and understands it otherwise than the sense of the Holy Spirit, by whom the Scripture is, requires, although he has not withdrawn from the Church, is nevertheless called a heretic, and is among the works of the flesh, choosing what is worse; for heresy in Greek is so called from choice, because each chooses for himself the teaching which he thinks better, as Isidore says, and Jerome on the Epistle to the Galatians. But you both understand sacred Scripture wrongly, as has been shown you, and have withdrawn from the unity of the Church and from obedience to the supreme Pontiff and the other Catholic prelates of the Church. Therefore you cannot escape the charge of heretics or heresies. Schism, indeed, which is a Greek word, means a rending; but in unity there can be no schism; therefore he does not communicate with unity who communicates with schismatics. "They have made parties for themselves, and, separating themselves from that which is one," to use now the words of the Apostle Jude, "they have not the Spirit," said Pope Pelagius, 24, q. 1, c. *Schisma*.

The seventh rule is that whoever begets false

(p. 702)

opinions in the Church is to be judged a heretic, as blessed Augustine says, 24, q. 3, c. *Haereticus est*: "He is a heretic who, for the sake of some temporal advantage, especially of glory and of his own pre-eminence, begets or follows false and new opinions. But he who believes such men is deluded by a certain imagination of truth." But you, whether from greed or lust or your vainglory, wish to be wiser than is fitting, against the saying of the Apostle to the Romans, ch. 12, following false opinions devised and begotten by Wyclif and Hus and Jakoubek and the like, of damned memory, and raised up as if from the dead; therefore you are such as they were, etc.

The eighth rule is that whoever attempts to take away the privilege of the holy Roman Church, handed down by the supreme head of all the churches himself, is to be judged a heretic: "For he violates the faith who acts against her who is the mistress of faith, and he is found contumacious towards her whom he knows to have been set before all the Churches." Hence St Ambrose professes that he follows in all things his mistress, the holy Roman Church (dist. 22, c. *Omnes*). But you strive to take away such a privilege, setting Rokycana before the pope and your faithless sect before the holy Roman Church, which has always remained immaculate, as Jerome said to the holy Pope Damasus, and 24, q. 1, c. *Haec est fides*; likewise *Sancta*. And Pope Eusebius said in the same place: "In the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has always been preserved without stain." Therefore you too are to be judged heretics, etc.

The ninth rule is that whoever transgresses the precepts of the holy Apostolic See, as one despising the authority of the keys, is to be judged a heretic (dist. 19, c. *Nulli*), where the words of St Gregory are written: "Let him be thus a stranger to pontifical offices who will not obey the apostolic precepts." Hence the witness Gregory says there: "It is lawful for no one either to will or to be able to transgress" the precepts of the Apostolic See. The old

(p. 703)

gloss says: "Understand what is said here: that he who says that the Roman Church is not the head of all churches, nor could make canons, is a heretic" (dist. 22, c. 1). "In the New Testament, through Christ the Lord, the priestly authority began from Peter, because to him first the pontificate in the Church of Christ was given," etc. Likewise Pope Pelagius said in the same place: "Although the universal Catholic Church spread throughout the world is the one bridal chamber of Christ, yet the holy Roman Catholic and apostolic Church has been set before the other churches by no synodal constitutions, but obtained the primacy by the evangelical voice of the Lord and Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ." And below, of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, he says: "And they together consecrated the aforesaid Roman Church to Christ the Lord, and by their presence and venerable triumph set it before all cities and the whole world," etc. But you have cast off the yoke of the Lord like sons of Belial; therefore, etc.

The tenth rule is that everyone who does not hold and believe all the articles of the faith, and wavers in the least, is to be judged a heretic, since "whosoever shall offend in one point is become guilty of all" (James 2), and c. 3, *Defleat*, *Extra*, *De regulis iuris*; and in c. 1 and 2, *De summa Trinitate et fide catholica*; and in c. *Ad abolendam*, *De haereticis*; and in the Decretum, c. *Haec est fides*; and in c. *Super quibusdam*, *De verborum significatione*; and in the law *fr.* [so the edition], *C. De haereticis*. But you most expressly err in the tenth article, namely "one holy Catholic and apostolic Church," as in the Nicene Creed, and in the Apostles' Creed, "the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints"; therefore also against the whole faith, and thus heretics. But since heretics cannot be within it: we say that both those who were long ago cast out of the Church and those who were anathematized after this [are heretics]; and below: "Those who likewise feign to confess the sound faith are schismatics," etc.

The eleventh rule is that whoever thinks wrongly

(p. 704)

about the sacraments of the Church is to be judged a heretic, as in the said c. *Ad abolendam*, and in the said c. 1 and 2, *De summa Trinitate*, etc. But you think wrongly about the sacrament of baptism, since you care nothing for the blessing of the fonts according to the rite of the holy Roman Church; you make no account of the holy and blessed oils, either for baptism or for chrism. And so also of the second sacrament, namely confirmation. Thirdly, you think wrongly about the third sacrament, namely the most divine Eucharist, when you hold that it is of necessity of salvation and of Christ's precept that the lay people and little children must communicate under both species, which is most false, as has been shown you and demonstrated more clearly in the fuller treatise; therefore, etc. Fourthly, you think wrongly about the sacrament of penance, since you care nothing for the cases reserved to the supreme Pontiff and the cases reserved to the bishop; and so you altogether despise the authority of the keys; therefore, etc. For this you are judged heretics (2 [Decretals], *De libelli oblatione*, with the other laws alleged above). Fifthly, about the sacrament of extreme unction. Sixthly, about the sacrament of orders, since there are many in your sect who were never priests and presume to thrust themselves into divine things as priests, among whom is your Rokycana, on the full testimony of his associate Bed■ich.

Seventhly, you think most wrongly about matrimony, above all spiritual matrimony, of which the Apostle says to the Ephesians, ch. 5: "This is a great sacrament." For he had said before: "Let women be subject to their husbands as to the Lord, because the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the Church. He is the saviour of his body. Therefore as the Church is subject to Christ, so also let the wives be to their husbands in all things. Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church and delivered himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life." He did not say "by the laver of wine." "That he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it

(p. 705)

should be holy and without blemish." And [below]: "This is a great sacrament; but I speak in Christ and in the Church." But you violate and disfigure the holy bride of Christ, to the reproach, dishonour and contempt of the bridegroom himself, who said: "He that hears you hears me, and he that despises you despises me, and he that despises me despises him that sent me" (Luke 10:16 and Matthew 10:40), and similarly Luke 9, when he said: "Whosoever shall receive this child in my name receives me, and whosoever shall receive me receives him that sent me." He also said, in the last chapter of Matthew: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth," and below: "And behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." But you, "whisperers, detractors, hateful to God, disobedient to parents" (Romans 1:30), despise the bridegroom and the bride like bastard sons, aiming to allege the word of God in the mouth of Christ, understanding falsely and perversely: "Except you eat and except you drink," and "Drink you all of this." Yet he himself

said: "I have yet many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. But when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will teach you all truth" (John 16). Those words he uttered on that last most sacred night of his mortal life for salvation, which you utterly reject. Therefore, unless you come to your senses, evils will come upon you in the last time, as he testifies who said (John 3): "He that has the bride is the bridegroom; but the friend of the bridegroom, who stands and hears him, rejoices with joy because of the bridegroom's voice." And below: "For God does not give the Spirit by measure. The Father loves the Son, and he has given all things into his hand. He that believes in the Son has life everlasting; but he that believes not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him." So also you, brothers. The Archdeacon also treats much of the spiritual matrimony between the prelate and the Church, 7, q. 1, c. *Sicut uxor*.

The twelfth rule is that everyone who does not hold and keep what the holy Roman Church holds, keeps and preaches

(p. 706)

is to be judged a heretic (dist. 11, c. *Nolite*, and c. *Si*; c. 1, *De summa Trinitate*, in the Sixth Book). But you do not hold it; therefore, etc.

The thirteenth rule is that everyone who perverts the ecclesiastical sacraments, as a simoniac selling or buying something spiritual or annexed to the spiritual, according to the determination of the four sacred councils, is to be judged a heretic, as in the law *Quicumque, C. De haereticis*, and in c. *Post translationem, Extra, De renuntiatione*. To which is added what is noted in 1, q. 1, etc. But you make no account of the decrees of the sacred councils, whether of those four or of any others, except insofar as you can drag some word to your false and erroneous sense in favour of communion under both species for the lay people; therefore you too are such as has been repeated several times above.

But may almighty God and our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the true light of the world, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" of God, deign to enlighten your minds and your understandings to know the simple truth of the holy orthodox faith; so that, returning to the heart, you may say with the prophet: "Create a clean heart in me, O God, and renew a right spirit within my bowels"; and, coming humbly and devoutly into my presence, showing due reverence and obedience to our most holy Lord Pope Nicholas V and to the holy Roman Church and the holy Apostolic See, you may receive in the Church's accustomed form the benefit of absolution from your heresies, errors, superstitions, excommunications and censures; and, reunited, restored and reincorporated with the mystical and universal body of Christ, you may fight together with us in the truth of the holy Catholic faith in this pilgrim life through grace, and in the future likewise triumph with the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, with the most glorious Virgin Mary, Mother of God, with the holy choirs of angels and with the happy fellowship

(p. 707)

of all the blessed spirits, for ages of ages. Amen.

Brother John of Capistrano, of the Order of Minors of the Observance.

Note in the edition: from the manuscript of the Olomouc library, Ms. 2. VI. 6.

Letters, 1451–1452

Letter of John of Capistrano to the Lord George of Pod■brady

(p. 707)

(Copy from the archive of T■ebo■.)

Magnificent and excellent Lord! With reverent commendation and readiness to serve, saving grace in Christ Jesus, and peace in the light of truth, and everlasting glory! This day letters of the venerable Master John of Rokycana were delivered to me and received with gladness. I have judged it fitting to send a copy of them, with my reply, to your Magnificence, so that your Excellency may clearly know that this is my desire and this my intention, and that I have chosen to bear such great labours for this end, the spreading of the divine glory: that, for the salvation of Christ's faithful, the truth, examined more often, may shine more brightly into the light, and the knowledge of the truth may become more fully and perfectly clear. I therefore entreat, pray and beseech your Dignity to deign to take pains that so great a ministry may reach its happy effect without fury, without turmoil, tranquilly, peacefully and quietly. Let weapons of war cease, let deadly contests be idle, let reproaches be absent, let angers, insults and threats be removed; let truth scatter the frenzy, and let the joys of peace and concord be heaped up. For so great is the good of peace, as blessed Augustine testifies, that even among temporal and earthly things nothing is usually

Note in the edition: from the manuscript of the Olomouc library, Ms. 2. VI. 6 (to the preceding letter). — In the Olomouc codex g. 16, p. 282, the reading is: "let rapine cease, let the truth be examined."

(p. 708)

heard with more delight, nothing desired more eagerly, nothing found better. This the Lord left to his faithful as a most singular and most rich inheritance; and if it is best to cultivate justice in affairs, according to the [saying] of blessed Gregory, the fruit of justice is also sown in peace. Justice is your beginning, as St Cyprian says: [it is] the peace of peoples, the safeguard of the commonwealth, the immunity of the people, the bulwark of the nation, the care of the sick, the joy of men, the temperateness of the air, the calm of the sea, the fruitfulness of the earth, the comfort of the poor, the inheritance of children, and, for the prince himself, the hope of eternal beatitude. I therefore reverently entreat your Excellency to cultivate it, observe it, and cause it to be observed. May your Magnificence fare well unto everlasting joys. From Brno, 20 September 1451.

Brother John of Capistrano, etc.

Note in the edition: the same Olomouc codex reads at this point: "according to the sentence of blessed Gregory. But the fruits of justice are sown in peace, as St Cyprian says: it is the peace of peoples, the safeguard of the fatherland, the immunity of the people, the bulwark of the nation," etc.

IV. To Ulrich of Rosenberg

To the magnificent and excellent Lord, the Lord Ulrich of Rosenberg, his most singular Protector and Preceptor.

Magnificent and excellent Lord, my Lord and most singular Protector and Benefactor, with most humble and due commendation first offered. Today, a day I shall always hold in honour, your Lordship's letter was delivered to me; and how much gladness and delight it brought me I could not express in any manner of speech, since I find you so very ready, so very prepared, to receive me under your protection. For I expected nothing else than what all with one mouth proclaim, praise and extol in you, namely a most Christian name, to

(p. 709)

pass over in silence your other most illustrious and excellent virtues, which are so many and so great that, to confess the truth, they would be hard to tell; and although the other kinds of virtues add the greatest ornament to any prince, yet the glory of the Christian name conquers, surpasses and treads down all. I rejoice greatly that my letter pleased your excellent Lordship; but this filled me with far more incredible joy: that you urge my coming to you to set free so many thousands of perishing souls who daily become the prey and food of Satan's gullet. This you will most surely obtain. For I am at Zwettl [Sv■tlá], and tomorrow, after my preaching is done, I shall set out for Vocytra [*sic*; perhaps Weitra]; there I shall wait until your excellent Lordship sends for me. If your men come to me next Thursday, on the following Friday we shall take the road towards Krumlov. Yet arrange the day at your own discretion; they will always find me most ready to come. But let your Lordship take care that two carts be sent without fail for my companions and my books, since without them we could not set out. I would write more, but we will treat of everything face to face when I am with you, which will be very soon if you do not hesitate to send your men to me as soon as possible. Meanwhile let your excellent Lordship be of great and cheerful heart. For I hope that, by the help of divine grace, we shall obtain what has been denied to others. For our great and exalted God is at hand with his wonderful and astounding works; and let it be no burden to us to assist with human effort and wit.

I have as yet received no letter in reply from my friend Rokycana; I do not know the cause. For I have been informed that he went, unwillingly unless I am mistaken, to the assembly of certain Bohemian barons which is being held near Olomouc. As you could understand from my letters, I have not refused him a disputation, nor shall I refuse it, provided a fitting place is granted and a fair crown of the most learned men. For I know and

(p. 710)

am certain that, because of the obstinacy of his mind, he will sooner be broken than bent. His arguments, reasons and, to speak more truly, cavils, authorities and sayings we shall easily refute; but I would wish judges of both him and me to be present, so that according to their sentence he might acquiesce and consent to my teaching. For I do not intend to chatter with him, as logicians often do, but that everything be determined by fitting and due judges. Every ground for ignorance and fear is removed from me, if they are willing to agree with me about a fitting place and the men to take part in the act; for an act of this kind ought to be held not before common and unlearned men, but before those whose judgement and authority are proven and authentic. But of these things [we shall speak] by word of mouth; in all of them I shall make use of your excellent and most faithful counsel.

Farewell, excellent Lordship, whom may Christ protect for ever; and, as you are doing, receive me under your protection. I heartily congratulate you on the dignity which the Reverend Lord Jodocus, your son, has deservedly obtained, and I give immense thanks to almighty God for having granted it to him. And I pray that He may raise him to higher things, who by his innate goodness and virtue deserves all good things. Again and again farewell, my excellent Protector, and do not delay to send for me quickly, for I have long desired to be with you.

From Zwettl (Sv■tlá), 12 October 1451. In great haste, Of your excellent Lordship the useless servant yet most faithful bedesman, Brother John of Capistrano, least of the Minors.

Note in the edition: Agrees with the original in the T■ebo■ archive of the Most Serene Prince of Schwarzenberg. T■ebo■, 7 July 1759; in witness, Christophorus Vavra, archivist.

V. Copy of the letter of Brother John of Capistrano to Master John of Rokycana

(p. 711)

With longing for your salvation and that of your neighbours, I cannot sufficiently wonder, my Rokycana, at the slowness you have shown in answering my letter, since you challenge me in yours for the defence of the sacred Chalice in such a way that you have not feared to call yourself the leader in that defence. I replied to you on the feast of St Matthew so broadly and at such length that I think nothing said by you was passed over in that reply. But yours, for which I waited twenty-seven days with great longing, were brought to me on the 17th of this month, and very brief ones, so very brief that you seem to have answered almost nothing to the things I had informed you of; nay rather, you wrote, and to tell the truth caused to be written, things which I neither asked nor expected of you. If you had read more diligently and carefully the letter you received in the preceding days, you would surely not have found any reason why you should gather an assembly of barons to advise you, or that they should choose a place for my disputations and fix the day, the manner and the judge, as though I were bound by right itself to obey their sentence. Rather, I had written to you with no small request and petition that you not hesitate to send some of your people to me, with whom I might treat of the manner, place, day and the men to take part in the act, so that our conference, to which you invited and challenged me, might reach the best and most glorious end. This you did not do at all, but most shamefully dragged it out, and imitated the extremes, which you know are vicious, saying that two noble barons had been chosen, namely John of Pernštejn and the other Wenceslas of Boskovice, who would be able to contend and treat with me about these four conditions. And so, passing over in silence the rest, which deserve to be left unsaid,

(p. 712)

you finished your letter in very few words. It made me wonder greatly, since you usurp to yourself an authority that I in no way granted you. For those two barons asked what had been asked of you, namely the place, the day, the manner and the men to take part in the act, to which it was your duty, not theirs, to answer, since you did not deign to send anyone to me with whom I could confer about them. Had those barons come to me, you might be pardoned; but no one ever appeared. I, noting that your slowness threatened great loss of souls, resolved to enter Bohemia, to free so many thousands of perishing souls from the jaws of Satan. And when I had arrived at Krumlov, your letter and that of the barons were delivered to me, one in your mother tongue and the others composed in Latin. Their words were such that, even if they were written by them, I do not fear to say that they proceeded from your mind: "Let the chosen place be at Krumlov, in the castle, with the Lord Henry; let the day be the coming feast of Simon and Jude; let the persons taking part have freedom to be present at the act; those who can understand are not to be excluded" (they would have spoken more correctly had they said that they may be present, but sleep); "let the manner of proceeding be kept entire, so that Rokycana may freely pursue [the case for] communion of the chalice for the common people, deducing it from the Scriptures. And let the judge of our disputation be the one who stood between the holy Council of Basel and the envoys sent from Bohemia and Moravia, namely this: the divine law, the practice of Christ, of the Apostles and of the primitive Church, together with the councils and doctors truly founding themselves on that same most necessary and impartial judge, as admitted in this Council of Basel." So they.

Now do you, setting aside all the old habit of an obstinate mind, turn wholly to me and attend diligently to how indiscreet, how ill-considered and how

(p. 713)

unjust is your judgement and theirs. Let no passion hold you, my Rokycana, as befits a good man. Do you think such a conference so cheap and of such small consequence that it can be held in a rustic and plebeian place? Is it so worthless that it ought to be held and judged by unlearned and ignorant men? Truly, if you look at it rightly, you will understand that this judgement of yours and theirs lacks reason, since a matter of this kind is of such dignity and excellence that it ought to be conducted not among the uncouth but among the

most expert men. Yet I think you undertook to give me such answers against the protest of your conscience. Do you wish to show off your wit, which you professed to be most acute and elegant when you said that you had done so many great things at the Council of Basel, before those whose charge is oxen and sheep? I had the highest hope that you would choose an ancient, renowned and lofty city, as befitted a learned man; but you chose Krumlov, where, apart from the Lord Henry and his noble family, simple unlettered folk, rude and ignorant men, live. Are you afraid, for the defence of the sacred Chalice, for which you did not refuse to undertake so many great labours, to appear before most learned men and to be convicted by them of being a man of an infamous sect? That is a great sign not of skill but of ignorance, to be ascribed to you for ever unless you change your opinion for the better. For those deprived of the light of knowledge usually converse more freely among the ignorant than among the learned, so that, since there is little light in them, they may seem to claim fame or the glory of a name out of a very small matter, and strive to display great riches from a little copper, extolling themselves with the highest praise; and if ever they come upon some learned man, they do not at all fear to accuse him of ignorance, crying out and saying: "He does not know, he is ignorant, unskilled, beaten, a heretic; let his name be blotted from the face of the earth." I do not wish you to be of that man's taste; but take care lest you of your own accord ascribe to yourself such a

(p. 714)

perpetual stain and infamy, since you prefer your teaching to be known among the common people rather than among learned and eminent men. This is plain from your having chosen Krumlov as the place of the disputation, and what kind of men are there has been said above. That place I by no means accept, since it is for me, not you, to choose the place and the judge: for I am Vicar and Apostolic Commissary and general inquisitor of heretical depravity throughout the world, whom you are bound by right itself to obey as you would the Pope, if you profess yourself a Christian. This being so, I propose to you, not rural, rustic, unknown, doubtful and unsafe places, but all the most famous and excellent cities written below, one of which is to be chosen; in each of them flourish most distinguished and flourishing schools in every kind of learning, from which all splendour and all light of doctrine emanates and flows into the Christian people. And since you are not unaware that every cause of faith is to be determined by the supreme Pontiff, I choose first of all our most holy Lord Pope Nicholas V, true successor of Peter and only Vicar of Christ; I choose also all the most reverend cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops and metropolitans of the holy Church of God. I choose likewise Naples, or Siena, Perugia, Florence, Bologna, Ferrara, Padua, Pavia, Turin, Paris, Toulouse, Dole, *Osonium* [Oxford?], *Cantulium* [Cambridge?], Cologne, Erfurt. If these cities seem too remote to you, I choose Kraków or Vienna. But if you desire to come to the matter in earnest, accept at least Cheb (Eger), which I reckon the safest and most suitable place of all in these parts, where, as appointed by letters of the most serene Lord King of the Romans, most holy among Christians, a diet is to be held by the Lord Cardinal of St Peter in Chains, who will discharge the office of Apostolic legate, on the coming feast of St Barbara,

(p. 715)

together with the barons of the renowned kingdom of Bohemia and of Moravia. Therefore, if you decide to accept, I shall go there most willingly. I add something else too: if you seek the opinions and judgement of the kings and princes of the world who claim the Christian name, I propose to you all the most serene and most Christian kings and princes written below, of the Romans, and those of France, England, Hungary and Bohemia, Spain, Aragon, Portugal, Navarre, Poland, Hesse [*sic*], Cyprus; the dukes of Burgundy, Savoy, Milan and Bavaria; all of whom, with innumerable princes, communicate not under both species but under one only. For I propose to you not Krumlov but more illustrious cities and princes. And the judge will be he on whom all the spiritual protection of the Christian religion depends, the supreme and most holy Pontiff Pope Nicholas V, whose office it is to interpret and declare the divine law and the sacred Scriptures, since these are mute and cannot speak, as they are expounded by the most learned men not with an erroneous but

with a sound Catholic understanding.

Yet let there be no longer any hope for you in the Council of Basel, since after your departure from it a decree declaratory of all the Compacts was written, a copy of which I have, and which you know you had and have, unless fire has done its office. What name you have among all the Christian people is known and plain to you; you will understand it more clearly, however, from the letter of the most illustrious King of Poland given to me, a copy of which, attached with points [*sic*], please do not hesitate to read carefully.

I waited twenty-seven days for you to send me your reply, and you appoint me the day of Simon and Jude, which will be seven days from now. You are not thinking rightly, my Rokycana; your steps are directed through erroneous ways; for the day was to be determined immediately after agreement about the place. I was in Moravia for many days awaiting your letter and messengers, but since you informed me of nothing, lest I spend the time in vain,

(p. 716)

I went to Bohemia, which I so greatly desired to visit, and I intend with the utmost labours to enlighten it and imbue it with the Word of God, as far as the ability is granted me from on high. But I still hope, with the divine power assisting, to preach to the great people of Prague, to lead back the strayed to the virtue of the holy Catholic faith, to root out vices and sow virtues, as the office laid on me by our most holy Lord Pope Nicholas V commands, requires and wills, and as Christian charity and zeal for souls compel, animate, provoke and invite me. I will now make an end of speaking, repeating this one thing: if you desire to hold a conference with me, do not be slow to come at the appointed time to Cheb, where the powerful barons of Bohemia and Moravia will be, as public report and rumour has it. If you are willing to do so, inform me by your letter as soon as possible, so that I too may have time to set out there, that is, with a safe-conduct; for I do not trust, since I have seen the letter of Master George, Governor of Prague, directed to the Lord of the Rose [Rosenberg], [saying] that he should in no way receive me. What then would he do if he had me in his hands? Although I am easily persuaded that this was done at your instigation. If indeed you burn altogether to dispute with me, which I too greatly desire, I want a fitting, safe, famous place, worthy of so great a matter, so that the splendour of the truth may be plain to all.

From Krumlov in Bohemia, 18 October 1451.

Brother John of Capistrano, of the Order of Minors.

To the venerable and magnificent John of Rokycana, most beloved to him in the virtue of Christ and in obedience to Holy Mother the Roman Church.

Note in the edition: Agrees with the copy in the archive of the Most Serene Prince of Schwarzenberg. Signed, T■ebo■, 11 July 1759. Christophorus Vavra, archivist.

VI. Letter of Rokycana to Capistrano

(p. 717)

Given on the Friday next after St Martin, which is the day of the Five Holy Brothers, 1451.

To the religious man John of Capistrano, much beloved to him in the truth of the sacred chalice, salvation from the Saviour of all. O that you were wise and would understand, and would provide for your last end! I shall take care, brother, to answer your writings with a threefold sentence, yet with reverence and godly forbearance, for a threefold cord is not easily broken. For you insert in the ink of your letter certain things that are bereft of truth: O that you were wise! You demand other things that are lacking in reason: O that you would understand! And, moreover, things consonant with faith and clear to reason you spurn as to be cast away: O that you would provide for your last end!

Things bereft of truth, brother, are set against you. First, ascribing it to me, you say that I gathered an assembly of barons at Uni■ov. Surely it is plain that you do not have the spirit of prophecy, which, as is said, you boasted of possessing even by foretelling the future, since it was not even a thought of my heart whether, or by whom, a gathering of barons was to be proclaimed at Uni■ov. Next you put: "I cannot sufficiently wonder, my Rokycana, at the slowness you have shown in answering my letter." O my Capistrano, the opposite of your statement will be found true. For when I had received your letter on the Saturday after St Matthew, hearing that same day that a gathering of barons was to be held at Uni■ov, I set out on the road with eager mind, wishing to come near to you, who were at Brno, so that through me the sooner I might conclude with you, by treating of it, about the place, day, manner and persons to take part in the act, as you demanded. But you, having given me your answer on the vigil of St Matthew, took care on the fourth day after to leap out of Brno; and as I was coming from Uni■ov you hurried off suddenly from Znojmo, then further into the parts of Austria, and at last you entered Bohemia,

(p. 718)

and so you have become a wanderer upon the earth. Whither, then, should the barons deputed by the assembly of Uni■ov have gone to seek your presence? Whereas you should have judged it more fitting to await my reply at Brno, which you would have had without any delay. Moreover, being ill informed, you assert that I chose Krumlov as the place of the disputation, though I was not present at the barons' deliberation, nor did I conceive it in my mind when Krumlov was fixed by them as the place of the disputation. Nevertheless I assented to the place and day assigned by the barons for the disputation. And, taking pains to appear there, I had lately, before the feast of Simon, gone out from Prague to the castle of Lichtenburg, eleven of our miles; there, however, receiving your letter saying that you will not appear, I took counsel with wise men and returned to the metropolitan city of Prague. O that you were wise, and would delete what you wrote to the barons, where you say: "Your letter has been delivered, whose sense, since it proceeds from the mind and contrivance of Rokycana himself, I answer at greater length to him."

There remains moreover a word lacking truth, where you say: "Do you wish to show off your wit, which you professed to be most acute and elegant, when you said that you had done so many great things at the Council?" No man living ever heard with his ear that I said such things, in writing or by word. O monk, it is written: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour"; as also at the head of your letter you defame me with a like mouth, saying: "you have not feared to call yourself the leader in the defence of the chalice," which I never wished either to say or to write. I add another word of your writing, but empty of truth: "You are afraid, for the defence of the sacred chalice, to appear before most learned men"; and again: "you do not wish to be heard by most learned men, which is a great sign not of skill but of ignorance." A wonderful thing indeed, never heard of until now, that I should dread to appear before the most learned and should not wish to be heard by them! Such a fear your severity has now written of me with

(p. 719)

bombastic mouth and accustomed detraction, though it was pronounced by the Holy Spirit: "Before thou inquire, blame no man." Yet experience, which is the mistress of things, has taught very many that when most learned men were present in great multitude, very many masters and doctors of the universities, adorned and crowned with every kind of learning, I did not fear for the sacred chalice in the sight of the whole Council of Basel; and should I now fear one monk? At which council, finally, when an abundance of Scriptures had been seen in favour of the communion of the sacred chalice for the people, the fathers and the whole Council of Basel gave place to the truth of the aforesaid chalice and consented.

Of that council you write thus: "Let there be no longer any hope for you in the Council of Basel, since after your departure from it a decree declaratory of all the Compacts was made." If in its proceedings the council took care to observe that which the Bohemians and Moravians, by special caution, had taken care to have

inserted in the Compacts, the declaration would indeed be welcome; for so it is said in the Compacts: "Again the said envoys of the sacred council said that that judge who was named and expressed in the agreements at Cheb was, is and will be judge in all things to be believed and done in the holy Church of God, and that the sacred council intends to proceed according to him in all things, with the grace of the Holy Spirit assisting. But if the aforesaid declaration did not touch the aforesaid judge, the Bohemians and Moravians are in no way bound to submit to it." And you, my monk, writing lately to the noble and magnificent Lord George, the governor, stated that the Compacts were never accepted either by the Lord Eugene, or by the Lord Julian, or by the Council of Basel itself, adding: "If you have anything on this, show it; yet unless I see it in true authentic form I shall not believe it, since I know it can never truly be shown." You are a monk, a religious, but one who lacks religion. O that you were wise! For the Christian religion

(p. 720)

declares: "Without a lie thou shalt fulfil the word of the law." If you had lately appeared at Uni■ov, or secondly at Krumlov, you would have seen with your own eyes, in true authentic form, under the seal of the Council of Basel with its hanging bull, its contents: "We intend and will to observe firmly and effectively all things contained in the said Compacts." That bull I arranged and ordered to be read openly in the presence of the whole assembly of barons and knights at Uni■ov, to the overthrow of your feigned writing. And not undeservedly are you to be called a feigner, because you feign and speak from your own, as you also entangle yourself in your letter, where you say to me: "Your letter, which I awaited twenty-seven days with great longing, was delivered to me on the 27th [*sic*] of this month, and very brief ones, so brief that you seem to have answered me nothing." There was a just and reasonable cause for the brevity: the will of the barons themselves, written and delivered to you, which brought satisfaction to your wish, since you were informed of the day, manner, place and persons to take part, and also of the judge; therefore it was not fitting for me to recapitulate without need.

There are also other things, which however lack reason and understanding. O that you would understand! You choose famous cities, to one of which you invite me, Naples, Perugia, Florence and many others, adding at the end Cheb as well. And you choose as judge the Pope, whose office it is, you say, to interpret and declare the divine law and the sacred Scriptures. O John, John of Capistrano, you do not attend to the natural law proclaiming: "What you would not have done to you, do not to another." Declining Krumlov with a safe-conduct, you say: "I do not trust, since I have seen the letter of the magnificent Lord George directed to the Lord of the Rose, [saying] that he should in no way receive me. What then would he do if he had me in his hands?" On account of one noble, the Lord George, you distrust a safe-conduct, and did not take care to appear in the place assigned, although that aforesaid baron has never

(p. 721)

been heard, when safe-conducts were given by him, to have shown any defect in them to any man or to have done him harm. Understand also the things of your neighbour from yourself. You, then, on account of one man, declined to appear at the place and day appointed; whither do you drag me, where thousands of enemies are present against me? You do not hasten with the equity of charity, but your steps are directed strangely.

Looking to one Pope, Clement, I answer you by him, where he says in the Clementines: "Who indeed would dare, or by what reason should anyone be bound to dare, to undergo the judgement of such a consistory, to place himself in the bosom of enemies, and to offer himself of his own accord to a death to be inflicted by violent injury and not by justice? What is feared by law is avoided by custom; human reason flees what nature abhors. He would therefore be foolish who thought such a citation constrained the person cited; nor ought the faculty of defence, which proceeds from natural law, to be taken away, since not even the emperor may take away those things which are of natural law." Again Pope Nicholas to the Emperor Michael (3, q. [5]): "That suspected persons and enemies ought not to be judges both reason itself dictates and very many

examples prove; for what more welcome and pleasing thing could one give to an enemy than if one committed to him for glory, that is, for judging and punishing, the man whom he perhaps wished to harm? Which the Synod of Constantinople is accordingly known to forbid in the sixth chapter of its canons." In the same chapter Pope Gelasius, a most mighty conqueror of heretics, says: "I ask, I say, where the judgement they put forward can be conducted: among themselves, so that the same men are enemies and witnesses and judges? But not even human affairs should be committed to such a judgement, how much less divine and ecclesiastical ones." Let him who is wise understand. And indeed hence the pious Emperor Justinian is known to have promulgated in his laws: "Let him who thinks a judge suspect be permitted, before the suit is begun, to reject him, so that recourse may be had to another; for it is in a way natural to

(p. 722)

decline the snares of judges and to wish to flee the judgement of enemies." So St John Chrysostom refused to enter the assembly of the council gathered against him. So there, where Gratian concludes: "But the accused is by no means to be brought outside the province." Whence Pope Fabian says (3, q. 6): "Let a cause be tried there where the crime is committed; and let him who has not proved what he objected suffer the penalty he brought." Again Pope Stephen (3, q. 6): "Let the licence of accusing not go beyond the bounds of the provinces; but let every accusation be heard within the province."

Weigh, then: since the crime was committed by you in Moravia and Bohemia, namely when you induce [people] to abjure the sacred chalice, therefore let the cause be tried there, not by summoning me outside Bohemia or Moravia. It would be as if you wished to commit future [deeds] in Bohemia and to answer for them in Padua or Bologna. O that you would understand, my monk!

You choose the Pope as judge; and from the Pope, as you write to me, an office has been laid on you, since he commands, requires and wills that you lead the lords back to the unity of the holy Catholic faith by forbidding communion under both species. Would the Pope then judge otherwise than [according to] the office he has laid on you, as your testimony stands, if it is true? It is judged discordant with reason that so great a supreme Pontiff should send you, a Friar Minor of the Minors, to [sow] discord among the greater, since such is the probity and the ripeness preserved at the Apostolic See that envoys are sent by it not for dissension, which you work, but for the union and concord of nations. As to your saying that the Pope is to be chosen as judge, because it is his to interpret and declare the divine law and the sacred Scriptures: since by your writings I have been driven and pushed to answer concerning the Lord Apostolic, whose authority you put forward, I would in no way wish to derogate from his authority, which is according to the Lord, but to commend the truth that has flowed from that Apostolic See. For

(p. 723)

Pope Urban says (25, q. 1 [*sic*: 3 in the edition]): "There are some who say that the Roman Pontiff has always been permitted to make new laws, which we not only do not deny but strongly affirm. But it must above all be known that he can make new laws in matters where the evangelists said nothing; but where God or his apostles and the fathers of the following age have plainly defined something in their sentences, there the Roman Pontiff cannot give a new law, but rather ought to confirm what has been said, even unto soul and blood. For if he strove, which God forbid, to destroy what the prophets also taught, he would be convicted not of giving a sentence but rather of erring." But far be this from those who by the Spirit of the Lord have best guarded the Church against the snares of wolves. So there. And it is known that the Apostle, 1 Corinthians 11, spoke manifestly of communion in both species: "But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of the chalice."

Now with the third member of my sentence I shall greet you, brother, since you spurn as to be cast away things consonant with faith and clear to reason. O that at least you would provide for your last end! This is precisely when you will not accept as the most truthful and impartial judge the divine law, the practice of

Christ, of the Apostles and of the primitive Church, together with the councils and doctors founding themselves on it. Do you not know that the authority of Scripture is the first and root principle into which must formally be resolved whatever is known in theology by any reasons whatever? For which reason also in the Creed said at Mass, after many things of faith have been set down, there is added of the resurrection of Christ: "And he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures," as if to say: the authority of Scripture is that through which the human mind ought to cleave to such things as are of faith. And Gregory, in Moralia 18, ch. 13, treating Job 28:1, "Silver hath the beginnings of its veins, and gold a place wherein it is refined," tending

(p. 724)

to the same, says: "The preacher prepares himself for the words of true preaching," etc. See in the original. This opinion Dionysius also seems to approve and confirm in the book On the Divine Names. And who those are in whose sayings above all the authority of Scripture consists Augustine discloses in a certain letter to Jerome, saying: "This honour is to be shown only to the apostles and prophets, that whatever they have said is by that very fact believed to be true." Whence, near the end of the book On Seeing God, speaking of the saints Jerome and Ambrose, he says thus: "I did not wish to insert these opinions of such great men for this reason, that I should judge anyone's sense is to be followed as the authority of canonical Scripture." Jerome too says: "If I say anything which I do not prove from one of the two Testaments, let me not be believed," etc. So he. Augustine himself esteems these so highly that he would not compare with them even the holiest fathers, who are held among the chief doctors of the Church after the apostles, except insofar as they strove to adhere to their teaching as to the truth itself.

And since, according to the Apostle, "whatsoever things were written were written for our learning, that through patience and the comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope," it seems that those act against the confidence of our hope who in their sayings abandon the foundations of canonical Scripture; of whom [God] complains through the prophet, saying: "And they have not asked at the mouth of the Lord," that is, the sacred Scriptures. For sacred Scripture, which is the word of God, is our interpreter, mediating between the divine will and human understanding; because the will of God concerning the common law cannot be manifest to the human intellect except as the Word indicates, which, to be our interpreter, came inspired into the mind, woven [*sertum*] through the voice, and lastly made man through the flesh assumed. It remains, therefore, that, holding the immovable firmness of our hope, we should by no means give credence to those who say or teach things unascertained, but to the testimonies of sacred Scripture and

(p. 725)

to their Catholic and pious expositors, holding them serenely as the pure truth itself which we speak of. Hence Augustine, in the aforesaid chapter to Paulina: "Hold with me," he says, "the opinion of the holy man Ambrose, confirmed now not by his authority but by the truth; nor, to be sure, does it please me because the Lord freed me from error chiefly through his mouth and granted me the grace of saving baptism through his ministry, as though I were unduly favouring my reconciler, but because on this matter he himself said what God, who gives the increase, also speaks to one who thinks piously and understands rightly." So he. From which it is openly clear that the barons of Uni■ov offered you a most equitable judge, whom the sacred synod of Basel also accepted, because it is said in Isaiah (8:19): "And when they shall say to you: Seek of pythons and of diviners, who mutter in their enchantments: should not the people seek of their God, for the living from the dead? To the law rather, and to the testimony. And if they speak not according to this word, they shall not have the morning light." So too the Saviour said: "Search the Scriptures, for they give testimony of me." And the Apostle: "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ"; therefore faith by the word of Christ. For sacred Scripture, through Christ and its authors, infinitely exceeds in its authority, firmness and truth the authority of all bishops or other men, however pre-eminent on earth.

O that you were wise and would understand and would provide for your last end, and would not say, when a most equitable, apostolic judge was offered you, that the judgement of the barons and mine is indiscreet, ill-considered and unjust. And look at what you do when, scorning to come to Krumlov, you say: "Do you think that conference so cheap that it ought to be held in a rustic and plebeian place?", and then address me, that I should not be slow to come to Cheb at the appointed time. Is there not a plebeian and rustic place there too?

(p. 726)

Does a school flourish there in every kind of learning, since you proposed only places adorned with studies? And which barons of Bohemia and Moravia will be there? Were not the nobler of both lands present at Krumlov, whose assembly you scorned to visit? You call yourself general inquisitor of heretical depravity in the whole world. Fear lest you alone be drenched in heresy by resisting Catholic truth, since heresy is a false dogma contrary to sacred Scripture, pertinaciously defended. You assert that you visited Bohemia to free so many thousands of souls from the jaws of Satan. It is written: "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because you go round about the sea and the land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, you make him the child of hell twofold more than yourselves." And when you say to me, "what name you have among all the Christian people is known and plain to you," I rejoice, because the Apostle too passed through infamy and good fame, saying: "as deceivers and yet true." For "when they shall speak all that is evil against you, untruly, for my sake, be glad and rejoice." Think of Augustine what you please; only let my conscience not accuse me in the eyes of God.

And so that men's minds may be the more turned aside, you expose yourself to signs and pretended miracles, of which the Apostle, speaking of Antichrist, says: "Whose coming is according to the working of Satan, in signs and lying wonders." And the Saviour: "For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders, insomuch as to deceive, if possible, even the elect." Read Chrysostom, sermon 43; and with your signs you will be greeted by him. Did not the magicians before Pharaoh, and Simon Magus, work great signs? For many will say, as the Saviour testifies: "In thy name we have prophesied, cast out devils and done many miracles"; and he will say to them: "I know you not."

But since you mention the obtaining of a safe-conduct in the barons' letter, etc., look, John, beloved to me in the truth of the holy chalice,

(p. 727)

listen and see: the Compacts for the aforesaid holy chalice for the peoples were made, disposed, ordered and concluded with great labour, together with outlays and expenses, and sealed with the seals of great men, with the voice and consent of Pope Eugene of divine memory, and also with the firm voice and strength of the Council of Basel, with the hanging of the seals of majesty in testimony of the most serene and most illustrious Emperor Sigismund and of the then most illustrious Duke Albert, prince of Austria; and so famously were they brought forth that the fame of those Compacts went out into the world, shone, and is spread abroad. Yet they are not kept; but, as far as lies in you and in your accomplices like you, spiritual and secular, Bohemians also, they are annulled and reckoned as vain. What wise man will any longer wish to believe words and trust pledges, promises of agreements and safe-conducts?

You also, because you glory in the multitude, propose the most Christian kings and princes, namely the King of the Romans, of France, England, Hungary and Bohemia and very many others, all of whom communicate not under both but under one species. You have often heard, I think, that where there is a multitude, there is confusion. And in the Gospel of the Sunday now current: "Many are called, but few are chosen." In the days of Ahab, Elijah was one, and four hundred prophets were found on the king's side. So also in the time of Pope Leo [*sic*], when the Arian heresy flourished, commonly the bishops and the elders of all the people, that is, kings, governors and barons, were on the side of the Arian heretics, and the Christians were few and

hidden, such as Hilary of Poitiers and Bishop Athanasius, who, hidden at Trier in a pit in the earth, kept the Catholic faith and endured. So our Lord Jesus was alone, with a little flock, on the side of virtue and truth, and the whole community of Jerusalem, the magistrates of the temple, the chief priests and elders of the people were on the side of the kingdom of this world. Yet do not think that only the Bohemians and Moravians partake of the draught of the sacred chalice;

(p. 728)

look, with an eye that is not purblind, on the breadth of great spaces and wide lands: the Greeks, for instance, the Ruthenians, Bulgarians, Armenians, Indians and very many others inhabiting vast lands, who communicate under both species; whom Eugene of divine memory also wished to have united and gathered in the bosom of holy Mother Church together with the oft-mentioned communion of the chalice. These things I direct to you in lengthy writing, to satisfy your wish, so that henceforth you may not say of Rokycana, as you did before, "how brief, how very brief, are the letters you write"; and if I am foolish in lengthening it, you, John of Capistrano, my monk, compelled me.

Given on the Friday next after the feast of Martin, which is the day of the Five Holy Brothers.

Master John of Rokycana.

Note in the edition: Olomouc library, Ms. 2. VI. 9.

Reply to John of Rokycana, 1452

Reply to John of Rokycana, part 1

(p. 728)

Letter of reply of the venerable father John of Capistrano to the aforesaid letter of John of Rokycana, would that he were a faithful Christian

Salvation in the Saviour of all the elect, of whose number I desire you to be with fervent expectation. For Christ is not the Saviour of all indiscriminately and absolutely; but from the eternal divine predestination of the elect, from the beginning to the end, he is effectively the Saviour [of the elect], although sufficiently he wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth; and with sufficient will, since he did that whereby all could be saved, the freedom of choice being preserved. I still hold [this hope] of you, if you humbly submit yourself to Catholic truth and to due obedience to our most holy Lord Pope Nicholas V and his canonically entering successors, and to the correction of the most holy Roman and universal Church militant, outside

(p. 729)

which there can be no salvation at all. This I have written back to you by way of greeting.

For the rest, I pray you, let not the passion of anger overcome you if my pipe answers according to the sound of your organ echoed in your letter. If you wound me with your venomous arrows, asserting [that you write] "with reverence, however, and godly forbearance," receive also my salutary darts, so that, bearing one another's burdens, we may together fulfil the law of Christ (Gal. 6).

For as I considered what answer I should give to your letter, two opinions occurred to me, diverse but not adverse. One is that of the Apostle, that the offender be taken out of the midst: "I indeed," he says, "absent in body but present in spirit, have already judged, as though present, him that hath so done, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, you being gathered together and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ. Your glorying is not good. Know you not that a little leaven corrupts the whole lump?" Likewise our Lord Jesus Christ himself says: "Every tree that brings not forth good fruit shall be cut down and cast into the fire." And elsewhere: "If anyone abide not in me, he shall be cast forth as a branch and shall wither, and they shall gather him up and cast him into the fire." And elsewhere: "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." Solomon too says: "A fool receives not the words of prudence, unless thou say those things which are in his heart. The wicked man, when he is come into the depth of sins, contemns; but ignominy and reproach follow him." And below: "The lips of a fool intermeddle with strife, and his mouth provokes quarrels. The mouth of a fool is his destruction, and his lips are the ruin of his soul."

The other is the opinion of the Lord saying: "I will have mercy and not sacrifice; for I came not to call the just, but sinners to repentance." And to Peter asking how often he should forgive one who sins,

(p. 730)

the Lord answered: "I say not to thee till seven times, but till seventy times seven times." And to the disciples asking about the parable of the seed Jesus answered: "To you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God, but to the rest in parables, that seeing they may not see, and hearing may not understand." And to the servants of the householder asking about the cockle and saying (Matt. 13), "Wilt thou that we go and gather it up?", he answered: "No, lest perhaps, gathering up the cockle, you root up the wheat also together with it. Suffer both to grow until the harvest, and in the time of the harvest I will say to the reapers: Gather up first

the cockle and bind it into bundles to burn, but the wheat gather ye into my barn." Explaining these words further on he said: "He that sows the good seed is the Son of man; and the field is the world; and the good seed are the children of the kingdom, and the cockle are the children of the wicked one; and the enemy that sowed them is the devil; but the harvest is the end of the world, and the reapers are the angels. Even as cockle therefore is gathered up and burnt with fire, so shall it be at the end of the world. The Son of man shall send his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all scandals and them that work iniquity, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the just shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." These are the words of Jesus Christ.

Let the weak also hold to the words of that great dweller in the desert and the vast solitude, austere towards himself alone, most kind towards others, Jerome, saying on Jeremiah: "Good rulers, weighing the weakness of others by their own weakness, strive rather through humility and the relief of gentleness to rescue sinners from the snare of error than through severity to push those who are tottering into the pit of perdition." Whence the doctor of the Gentiles: "I became," he says, "weak to the weak, that I might gain the weak"; with which opinion Pope Calixtus most beautifully agrees, saying: "If anyone, whoever he be, has fallen, let us spare him and

(p. 731)

correct him with brotherly affection, as the blessed Apostle says: Brethren, if a man be overtaken in any fault, you who are spiritual instruct such a one in the spirit of meekness." And James says: "Judgement without mercy to him that hath not done mercy." And the same Calixtus says: "The opinion which forbids mercy, brothers, flee not only to hold but even to hear, because mercy is better than all holocausts and sacrifices." Hence also Augustine: "You who are good, tolerate the evil; for Christ too tolerated Judas, though he knew him to be a thief, and sent him to preach and gave him the Eucharist with the others."

Many things could be adduced on either side, which I leave to your investigation. The first opinion set out thunders rigour and harshness; the other tolerates with gentleness. One instructs me to answer a fool according to his folly, lest he seem to himself to be wise; the other forbids me to answer a fool according to his folly, lest I become like him. I will return, then, to blessed Gregory, saying: "True justice has compassion, false justice disdain; although the just too are rightly wont to be indignant with sinners. But it is one thing that is done in the manner of pride, another that is done from zeal for discipline. For the just are indignant, but they do not disdain; whereas those who are wont to be proud of a false justice despise all others, condescend with no mercy to the weak, and the less they believe themselves sinners, the worse sinners they become."

So he. From which, if you understand rightly, you will patiently bear my invective against your proud, boorish, insolent, ignominious and calumnious rebuke, which you have presumed to belch out shamefully with blasphemous, polluted and fetid mouth not only against me but against all true Catholic faithful of Christ, friends of truth and worshippers of God, from the supreme Pontiff down to the lowest Christian, if you desire to obtain eternal salvation. For, as is written in the canon: "If anyone remains involved and defiled in sins that are public,

(p. 732)

I need not speak of the more secret and remote things of God, but rather protest and meet him so that he may cease to sin and amend his acts from vices. But if he thrusts himself forward and provokes us to speak against him as one acting wrongly, we need not listen to him; let us prudently make sport of him. For to answer nothing at all does not seem useful for the sake of the hearers, lest perhaps they think that we decline the contest for lack of an answer, and the faith of those who do not understand our purpose be harmed." Therefore answer a fool, lest he seem to himself to be wise. For a father does not always kiss his son, but

sometimes chastises him, not to kill him but to perfect him. I would wish, as far as I can, to profit all, to harm none, and for salvation's sake rather to be humbly subject than proudly and damnably to be over others. I would wish to gain you, with all your accomplices and followers, for Christ and to lead you back to the state of salvation, by whatever mode of persuasion, whether with sweetness or with sharpness; imitating, according to Solomon's opinion, the mercy of the Lord, who wills not the death of the sinner but rather that he be converted and live, and for that reason scourges someone. Hence Solomon: "My son, reject not the correction of the Lord, and do not faint when thou art chastised by him; for whom the Lord loves he chastises, and as a father in the son he pleases himself." His opinion Paul repeats to the Hebrews, saying: "For think diligently upon him that endured such opposition from sinners against himself, that you be not wearied, fainting in your minds. For you have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin; and you have forgotten the consolation which speaks to you as unto children, saying: My son, neglect not the discipline of the Lord, neither be thou wearied whilst thou art rebuked by him; for whom the Lord loves he chastises, and he scourges every son whom he receives." And in the Apocalypse the Lord says: "Such as I love, I rebuke and chastise. Be zealous therefore and do penance. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches."

(p. 733)

Let it not irk you to lend attentive ears to your wholesome and medicinal instruction: a swollen abscess, once ripened, [must be brought] to the lancet, and if need be, to the cautery of the cutting iron, to be cooked out with burning fire and purged. O that you were wise yourself and understood the truth, that you might do well and provide for your last end, lest you rush into the abyss of hellish torment! For I do not wish you to perish; but for the salvation of your soul I have become a wanderer over these regions of the once renowned kingdom of Bohemia, seized with zeal. It was first a duchy and the bishopric of Prague; afterwards the city was raised to the royal crown and to an archbishopric, adorned by the zeal of a flourishing university, strong in the mastery of all the sciences. I strive for restoration; you, up to now, keep watch for ruin. I do not seek to destroy you, but to gain you. Lift up your eyes round about, delicate city, and see where you have not been laid low by John of Rokycana. Consider, dearest, that better are the wounds of one who loves than the deceitful kisses of one who hates. Hence Augustine to Vincent the Donatist says: "Not everyone who spares is a friend, nor everyone who strikes an enemy." And below: "Who can love us more than God? And yet he does not cease not only to teach us gently but also to frighten us wholesomely, and to the soft fomentations with which he consoles he often adds also the most biting medicine of tribulation." And to Donatus the heretic the same Augustine says what I now say to you, Rokycana: "It displeases you that you are drawn to the salvation of God"; when yet you have drawn many of ours to the pernicious liquor of that damned goose, Hus, roasted at Constance, and of Jerome after him. Why do you rage, John? Why are you proud, earth and ashes? Your ambition for the church of Prague drives you to frenzy; by heretical depravity you will never canonically obtain the archbishopric of Prague. You have intruded yourself, but you have not entered by the door. You have heard what the Lord Jesus says: "He that enters not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbs up another way, the same is a thief and a robber."

(p. 734)

You call me a monk, though you are neither a monk nor a regular, and, as many assert, perhaps neither priest nor presbyter. Would that you were a true and right priest and presbyter! For such a one never fosters heresies; but the holy priest, giving holy things, offering the right way, is governed by wisdom, ruled by the Holy Spirit, lives in Christ, and does not cease by his Catholic admonitions and examples to invite others to live rightly, unto the palm and prize of the Church triumphant. Would that you were such! O that you were wise and would understand and would provide for your last end! You would love me unfailingly as a friend; you would not rashly call me antichrist, nor Muhammad, nor a sacrilegious man, nor proclaim me an enchanter of soothsayers. But what [shall I do]? As Augustine writes to Faustus: the frenzied do not wish to

be bound, the lethargic do not wish to be roused; but the diligence of charity perseveres in binding the frenzied, goading the lethargic, loving both. Both are offended, but both are loved; both are troubled and are indignant as long as they are sick, but both, when healed, give thanks.

Or are you perhaps tormented with grief because I show the peoples the way of salvation? Wake up a little, I beg you, from your lethargy; soften the frenzy of your anger. Hear the Lord rebuking the slothful, who will be silent like dumb dogs that cannot bark, and do not go up against [the enemy] nor set up a wall for the house of the Lord. Hear the Apostle adjuring by the coming of the Lord Jesus to judge the living and the dead. See what he writes to Timothy (2 Tim. 4:2): "Preach the word, be instant in season, out of season; reprove, entreat, rebuke in all patience and doctrine. For there shall be a time when they will not endure sound doctrine, but according to their own desires they will heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears, and will indeed turn away their hearing from the truth, but will be turned unto fables." Would that you and your followers were not of those masters of error who would not be disciples of the truth.

You despise me as a monk. You know what that most learned monk and most splendid doctor Jerome says: "Holy

(p. 735)

rusticity profits only itself; as much as it builds up the Church of Christ by the merit of its life, so much it harms if it does not resist those who destroy." Were not the renowned doctors of the Church monks, Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, Gregory, Basil, Bernard and very many others?

Why do you whisper with polluted mouth, detesting the name of monk, you food of worms, fuel of fire, mass of rottenness, man of sin, son of perdition, chattel of hell, if you do not do true penance and do not submit yourself in due obedience to the holy Roman Church? Why do you presume to despise the name whose authorities you do not fear to overturn to foment your errors? Truly I grieve that you imitate the footsteps of your predecessors, who deprave the understanding of truth and the Catholic and authentic opinions of the divine Scriptures and the holy doctors. Forgive me, if you please: you challenged me to the joust. Bear patiently, then, the blows of the flashing lance. I do not wish to slay you, but to throw you from the saddle, lest you reckon yourself a most unconquered knight, since, as they say, you are wont in your boasting to call yourself a most unconquered heretic. If so, then at last you confessed yourself a heretic; and if, swelling with puffed-up breast, you strove to exalt yourself as most unconquered for vainglory, O that you were wise and would understand and would provide for your last end!

I am driven to answer a fool according to his folly, lest he seem to himself to be wise. The divine voice rouses me, saying (Isa. 58): "Cry, cease not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their wicked doings and the house of Jacob their sins. For they seek me from day to day and desire to know my ways, as a nation that hath done justice and hath not forsaken the judgement of their God. They ask of me the judgements of justice; they are willing to approach to God." But what [does he say] elsewhere? "This people honours me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. And in vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines and commandments of men." See, dearest, lest these things

(p. 736)

be fulfilled of you and your accomplices. Therefore [see] what follows in the original prophecy (Isa. 29): "Therefore behold I will proceed to cause an admiration in this people, by a great and wonderful miracle; for wisdom shall perish from their wise men, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid. Woe to you that are deep of heart, to hide your counsel from the Lord, whose works are in the dark. This thought of yours is perverse: as if the clay should think against the potter, and the work should say to the maker thereof, Thou madest me not; and the thing framed should say to him that fashioned it, Thou understandest not."

Who ought to understand the words of Christ better: you, John of Rokycana, or Christ himself? In your judgement who is the better interpreter? Is it not he himself? If you confess so, why did you not acquiesce in the most true declaration of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, having said to the unbelieving Jews, "Except you eat," etc., "and except you drink," etc., afterwards said to his faithful: "It is the spirit that quickens; the flesh profits nothing. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life. But there are some of you that believe not." And Peter, understanding this, said: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed and have known that thou art the Son of God." See how clearly the truth is plain, in what sense, with what understanding, with what mind he said: "Except you eat the flesh," etc. On this passage I have published a long treatise. For, as Hilary said: "The understanding of things said must be taken from the causes of the saying, because the thing is not subject to the speech, but the speech to the thing." And therefore he testifies: "Translate not word from word, but sense from sense, because often, while the propriety of the words is attended to, the sense of the truth is lost." And Pope Clement said: "It has been reported to us that certain persons dwelling in your parts oppose the sacred doctrines, and seem to teach as it seems good to them, not according to the traditions of the fathers but according to their own sense. For many, as we have heard, ingenious men of your parts take likelihoods from what they read. And therefore it must be

(p. 737)

diligently observed that when the divine law is read, it be not read or taught according to the power or understanding of one's own wit. For there are many words in the divine Scriptures which can be drawn to whatever sense each has presumed to put under them; but this must not be. For you ought not to seek a foreign or extrinsic and alien sense, so as somehow to confirm it from the authority of the Scriptures; rather you ought to take the sense of truth from the Scriptures themselves. And therefore one must learn the meaning of the Scriptures from him who keeps it as handed down to him by his elders according to the truth, so that he too may fittingly assert what he has rightly received. When anyone has received from the divine Scriptures an entire and firm rule of truth, it will not be absurd if he brings something from common learning and liberal studies, which he perhaps touched in boyhood, to the assertion of true doctrine; yet so that, where he has learned true things, he declines false and feigned ones."

If you are prudent, John, attend diligently to these words, from which you will clearly perceive that it is not lawful for you to pervert the Catholic or right sense of the divine Scriptures by your private and murky wit, against the common understanding of the holy and Catholic doctors, as also against the common understanding of the most holy Roman and universal Church; because, as Jerome testifies, whoever understands sacred Scripture otherwise than the sense of the Holy Spirit, by whom it was written, requires, although he has not departed from the Church, can yet be called a heretic, and is among the works of the flesh, choosing those which are worse. You certainly, John, have heaped these three together: you have perverted Scripture, you have withdrawn from the Church, and you have chosen the worse works of the flesh. See how your threefold, rotten cord is worn through and easily undone.

See whether the definition of the most illustrious doctor Augustine concerns you, who says: "He is a heretic who, for the sake of some temporal advantage, and especially of glory and his own pre-eminence, begets or follows false and new opinions.

Reply to John of Rokycana, part 2

(p. 738)

But he who believes such men is deluded by a certain imagination of truth." Behold again your threefold cord! By your heresies you have thought to usurp the primacy of the most venerable Church of Prague; you have invented new false opinions, ministering communion under both species to little infants, and many other things which for the present I pass over in silence; and you have imitated and followed ancient heresies

of very many years, such as those of Wyclif, John Hus, Jerome and many other ancient heretics, whom you are not ashamed to allege from the Eastern and Greek church; nor do you yet think of springing back from your evil inventions and their consequences and your wicked purposes.

Have you also read what that scatterer of heretics, St Jerome, wrote on the prophet Amos, saying: "The Lord hates the sacrifices of heretics and casts them from him, and as often as they are gathered in his name he detests their stench and shuts his nostrils"? And elsewhere the same Jerome says: "Marcion and Basilides and the other plagues of heretics do not have the divine gospel, because they do not have the Holy Spirit, without whom the gospel becomes human." The Gloss says: "not divine." There follows in the text, by which we are taught: "Let us not think that the gospel is in the words of the Scriptures, but in the sense; not on the surface, but in the marrow; not in the leaves of the words, but in the root of reason." O John, O that you were wise and would understand and would provide for your last end!

It would have been better for you never to have known letters, or [it would have been] a lesser evil, even [for one] stained with heresies; for if you had been deceived by believing heretics, you would not be punished more than a heretic, as Augustine says against the Manichees: "Those in the Church of Christ who savour something morbid and depraved, if, when corrected so as to savour something sound and right, they contumaciously resist and will not amend their pestiferous and deadly dogmas, but persist in defending them, are heretics." But hear what Pope Urban adds: "He who

(p. 739)

defends the error of others is much more damnable than those who err, because not only does he err, but he also prepares and confirms stumbling-blocks of error for others. Whence he who is a master of errors is to be called not only a heretic but even a heresiarch." See, John, what you are doing: you are a master of error, because you refuse to be a disciple of truth. Truly, I say from the heart, I pity you, but much more those whom you have deceived by your most nefarious seductions. For "those who defend their opinion, however false and perverse, with no pertinacious animosity, especially one which they did not bring forth by the audacity of their own presumption but received from parents who had been seduced and had fallen into error, and who seek the truth with careful solicitude, ready to be corrected when they have found it, are by no means to be counted among heretics."

But you, John, not only strive to entangle and harden your followers in errors, but even those who have already been enlightened and reunited to holy Mother Church you have presumed, and laboured with all your strength, by your diabolical suggestions, pernicious counsels and most false seductions, to have called back by violence, prisons and torments into the snare of perdition. O John, if you were rightly wise and understood and provided for your last end, you would surely consider that my prophecy concerning you will rightly be fulfilled: that unless you come to your senses and turn away from your heresies, and bewail your crimes with humble and true penance, and submit yourself to the correction and obedience of our most holy Lord Pope Nicholas V and his canonically entering successors (if indeed you live among men), and also of the most holy Roman and only Catholic Church, truly and effectively, with pious affection and with active effect, not, I say, verbally but really, you will not be able to escape the divine judgement and eternal damnation.

You accuse me of having boasted that I possess the spirit of prophecy by foretelling the future. With your leave, they have lied upon their own head who, whether in writing

(p. 740)

or by word, reported such things to you or to anyone else. But what you deny falsely, I see you truly confess. You deny that you gathered the barons. You deny that what the barons wrote proceeded from your mind and contrivance; to which I referred, namely the contents of the schedule sent to me by the barons in these words: "Four things have been demanded by Master John of Rokycana, namely concerning the place, the day, the

manner and the persons to take part in the act, as we have understood from your letter. Let the place be, as we wished, at Krumlov, with the Lord Henry, in Moravia [*sic*]; the day the coming feast of Simon and Jude; let the persons taking part have freedom to be present, those who can understand, and let them not be excluded. Let the general manner of proceeding be kept, so that Master Rokycana may pursue the communion of the chalice for the people, deducing it from the Scriptures, etc. And let the judge of your disputation be the one who was appointed between the sacred Council of Basel and our envoys from Bohemia and Moravia, namely this: the divine law, the practice of Christ, of the Apostles and of the primitive Church, together with the councils and doctors truly founding themselves on it, to be admitted as the most truthful and impartial judge in this Council of Basel."

Answer me, John: did I write to you, or to the barons, about the place, day, manner and persons to take part in the act? Was it not to you? From whom, then, must I presume this answer proceeded, if not from you? Do they not hold you as their master and guide (would that not an erring one)? Tell me also: did you come to Uni■ov under compulsion, summoned or forced, or willingly and of your own accord? You must confess that it was altogether willingly, since nothing is established of violence, which you also confess in your letter when you say: "setting out on the road with eager mind." Since, then, they hold you as master and guide, they would not have wished to hold an assembly of the blind without you as leader, as indeed they did not.

You also charge me that on the fourth day after the answer I gave you on the vigil of St Matthew I took care to leap out of Brno,

(p. 741)

and hurried to Znojmo, then into the parts of Austria, then entered Bohemia, and became a wanderer upon the earth. Truly, as far as lies in me, seized inwardly with zeal for the salvation of your soul, I have become a wanderer upon the earth. "Turn away thy eyes from me, for they have made me flee away." I would then have waited for you at Brno, had not threatening letters sent by your barons to the people of Brno, and also to the bishop and to the people of Olomouc, urged me with imperative solicitude to withdraw.

For they then suspected, and had legitimate cause for suspicion, that the assembly of barons, with your assistance and crafty cunning, was weaving a siege against Brno. For this reason, considering distinctly and prudently that I had come from Italy into these regions and thence to foreign peoples, not with swords but with the word of God, above all to root out your wicked heresies and your most nefarious errors; not that those most Christian and most Catholic cities feared or fear you and your followers, but in order that they might avoid all danger and all harm, I resolved for the time to withdraw, and alone with the fiery word of truth, against which you have never prevailed nor will prevail with me, to come nearer to meet you, as far as Bohemia, as you have seen, taking my road. Yet I waited at Znojmo for fifteen days and more, and never perceived the least word of reply. I had also promised long before, before I left Vienna, the magnificent Lord of the Rose [Rosenberg] to betake myself to his presence; which I did, not hastily but very slowly, preaching from city to city for very many days. After I arrived in the presence of the said Lord at Krumlov, I received the letters of two barons, who seemed to summon me to take care to appear before you, an incompetent judge, on the feast of Simon and Jude. How fitting it would be that I should go back so great a distance through so many dangers of the roads, judge for yourself, if there is any prudence in you.

Remember, John, the words

(p. 742)

of Christ Jesus our Lord, declaring to his unbelieving persecutors: "You seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you. I speak that which I have seen with my Father; and you do the things that you have seen with your father." And below: "But now you seek to kill me, a man who have spoken the truth to you, which I have heard of God. This Abraham did not. You do the works of your father." And below: "Why do you not

know my speech? Because you cannot hear my word. You are of your father the devil, and the desires of your father you will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and he stood not in the truth, because truth is not in him. When he speaks a lie, he speaks of his own, for he is a liar and the father thereof." And below: "If I say the truth to you, why do you not believe me? He that is of God hears the words of God. Therefore you hear them not, because you are not of God." Not in vain did the Apostle say: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition avoid, knowing that he that is such a one is subverted and sins, being condemned by his own judgement."

See what the canon adds to these words: "They are subverted and held captive by the devil who, rejecting their Creator, seek the help of the devil. And would that these alone had perished in their faithlessness, and had not dragged many with them to the destruction of unbelief; for a countless multitude, deceived by this false opinion, believe these things to be true, and by believing stray from the right faith." And below: "For Satan himself, who transforms himself into an angel of light, when he has seized anyone's mind and subjugated it to himself through unbelief, at once transforms himself into the forms and likenesses of various persons, and, deluding in dreams the mind he holds captive, showing now joyful things, now sad, now welcome persons, now unwelcome, leads it through every byway." Read, John, where these things are written, and attend diligently, lest you hand over to diabolical ministry the minds of your followers held captive

(p. 743)

and alienated from the truth of the faith, leading them through every by-way (*divina* in the edition, perhaps for *devia*) to the torments of hell, you their first chattel and standard-bearer. I would wish, John, that you embraced the reality of your name.

You believe forgers who report that I boasted, as you say, and you will not allow me to believe the trustworthy reports of those Catholics who testify that they heard with their own ears the curses heaped on me by your lying and polluted mouth; though it is written: "We cannot and ought not receive the partner of another's error, or one who withdraws from the path of his own purpose of will, or one who does not obey the sacred rules and constitutions of the fathers; nor do we permit [such] to attack those who believe rightly or obey the sanctions of the holy fathers; because we judge all to be infamous who prevaricate against their faith or the Christian law, or willingly set aside apostolic or regular authority. And why this? Because he cannot be faithful towards men who is unfaithful to God. The testimony of those who are shown to have failed in faith must be weakened [text unclear: 'equali ore (?)' in the edition]. Those are not to be believed who have cast away from themselves the faith of truth. Pagans, therefore, or heretics or Jews cannot accuse Christians or bring a word of defamation against them." Read where these things are written in the canons, and consider what faith and what credence I, or any faithful man, ought to give to your sayings or writings; as indeed none gives it, since your treatises are full of heresies and lies and altogether empty of all truth; because when authors are reproved, their works are likewise reproved.

You accuse me of many things; but, firstly, [you are one who is] to be rejected by any others whatever, always suspect of calumny, and it would not befit me to answer you. Yet lest you seem to yourself to be wise, I will answer the fool according to his folly. You accuse me, saying: "There is moreover a word lacking truth, where you say: Do you wish [to show off] your wit, which you professed to be most acute and elegant," etc.; and you say: "No man living ever heard with his ear that I said such things, in writing or by word."

(p. 744)

And you deny all that follows. But the Holy Spirit quickly compelled your pen, intent beyond your expectation, so that in this same invective of yours you bear witness against yourself, and it is plain that you contradict yourself in the same context. For you write: "Experience, which is the mistress of things, has

taught very many that, when most learned men were present in great multitude, masters and doctors of very many universities adorned and crowned with every kind of learning, I did not fear for the defence of the sacred chalice in the sight of the whole Council of Basel; and should I now fear one monk?" And you boast, asserting most lyingly and falsely: "At which council, finally, when an abundance of Scriptures had been seen in favour of the communion of the sacred chalice for the people, the fathers and the whole Council of Basel gave place to the truth of the aforesaid chalice and consented."

With what presumption, what rashness, with what harlot's brow unblushing do you dare to put forward such things, when even in your presence you were always contradicted, and all your allegations were most solemnly refuted and declared [false], both by Master John of Ragusa of pious memory and by Master John of Palomar and very many other most excellent doctors, both of the sacred page and of both laws, canon and civil, and of the other faculties, as you well know? How do you dare to say that they gave place and consented, when you saw the decree of Basel, and in your letter you even assert the opposite, in what you said in addition: "If in its proceedings the council took care to observe that which the Bohemians and Moravians by special caution had taken care to have inserted in the Compacts, the declaration would indeed be welcome"? And so you seem to charge the council with not having kept its promises, because according to your sense and understanding it did not admit the promised judge. From which you infer that, according to the Compacts, the Bohemians and Moravians are by no means bound to submit to the aforesaid declaration. Tell me,

(p. 745)

teacher, how can my conscience be silent and not answer a fool according to his folly, lest he seem to himself to be wise? Tell me, who ought to determine whether the aforesaid declaration touched the aforesaid judge: you, with your followers disturbed and bewitched and made credulous by you, or the council itself, legitimately gathered in the Holy Spirit, as you have many times asserted? And you are false if you will not submit to the sentence of the council. What force, what strength, what foundation and what stability do you boast of having in the Compacts? Why is your face not confounded, like a thief caught in the act or an adulterer in adultery, before ever you open your mouth to name the Compacts, since you have expressly lived and acted against the Compacts in many things which I shall add below?

Now I turn to what I wrote to the magnificent Lord George. But I see that, just as you take the words of Christ erroneously, "Except you eat," etc., so you take my words erroneously and calumniously. I said and say that they [the Compacts] were never otherwise accepted, confirmed or approved by Eugene of holy memory, or by the Lord Julian of pious memory, or by the Council of Basel itself, except according to the declaration then to be made by the sacred council itself concerning communion under both species for the lay people, as indeed it was made. And again I say: if you have anything after the said declaration, whether of Eugene, of Julian or of the sacred council itself, show it; since I know it can never truly be shown. As I was saying, I say "since I know," because I know that I have with me authentic apostolic letters that uproot your heresies. Answer the fool; submit to the law you yourself have made.

So many times in your letter you despise me as a monk, and ascribe to me that I am a feigner and a liar, as also you arranged and ordered [the bull] to be read in the presence of the whole assembly of barons and knights to the overthrow of my "feigned writing." Again you confess that you are the leader and president of the barons and of the rest of your accomplices

(p. 746)

and followers, which however you denied above. Have you read, master of errors: "As a dog that returns to his vomit, so is the fool that repeats his folly"; and "the fool walking in the way, whereas he himself is a fool, esteems all men fools"; and "the lips of a fool shall throw him down headlong. The beginning of his words is folly, and the end of his talk is a mischievous error. A fool multiplies words"; and "the labour of fools shall

afflict them that know not how to go to the city. Woe to thee, O land, when thy king is a child, and when the princes eat in the morning"? Forgive me, John, forgive me if I touch the marrow of your heart. Read that you may learn; learn that you may know. All men by nature desire to know. And to know is to know a thing through its causes; and the knowledge of truth is the adequation of the thing to the intellect. Would that you were willing to become a disciple of truth; then you would not be a master of error.

Above you wrote that the fathers and the whole Council of Basel, having seen an abundance of Scriptures in favour of the sacred communion of the chalice for the people, according to your deduction, gave place to the truth of the aforesaid chalice and consented. Yet consider, from the decree of the Council of Basel, whether it has not been turned back into your mouth like the vomit of a dog. But now, as if reckoning yourself empty of all truth of the sacred Scriptures, you flee to the Compacts as to a reed shaken by the wind, as a stable prop for your errors, and you confess that the Bohemians and Moravians took care by special caution to have [it] inserted in the Compacts. You confess, then, that the Bohemians and Moravians proceeded craftily with the cautions of the Compacts, as men considering that they needed such cautions, lacking the truth of the sacred Scriptures. For *cautela* is derived from *caveo*, which is to decline, to avoid; hence *cavea* is the same as a place of spectacle; hence too *cavillator* is said of one who jests abusively, biting and mocking, who dodges artfully and searches out cautiously. So you too have done, John: you have dug a pit for yourself and fallen into it. With what shameless face do you presume to make mention of the Compacts, when you have been

Reply to John of Rokycana, part 3

(p. 747)

the public enemy, perverter and destroyer of the Compacts?

Recall, John, whether this was the tenor of your letter addressed by you to the honourable man the Lord Martin, rector of the church at T■ebí■. "To his friend beloved in Christ": this is your superscription. And the beginning of the letter within is this: "To run the way of the commandments of the Lord, beloved in Christ. You write to me inquiring about the communion of little children, whether you ought to continue that communion or abandon it. I answer that we, since we began to practise the aforesaid communion, have practised it and intend, God willing, to persevere in practising it in future, unless we are informed to the contrary by solid writings of the doctors, which we by no means expect to happen. For the aforesaid communion is evangelical truth, founded in the law of the Lord, strengthened by the writings of the doctors, held and taught as dogma in the primitive Church. Wherefore I exhort and ask you not to weigh the incursions and attacks of the adversaries, but with divine help to persevere happily in the often-mentioned communion, even if for that most holy communion you must suffer many losses. For you have not yet resisted our adversaries unto the shedding of blood. Farewell in the Lord. Given at Prague, on the Wednesday next before the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross." And your subscription is this: "Master John of Rokycana, elected to the archbishopric of Prague."

Have you considered, John, father and inventor of lies, how many lies you have heaped up in this letter of yours? Where do you have it that the communion of little children is evangelical truth founded in the law of the Lord, except wrapped up in the archive of your satanic breast? Where have you read that it is strengthened by the writings of the Catholic doctors, I do not say of heretics? Where do you have it that it was held and taught as dogma by the holy Fathers in the primitive Church? At the tail of the letter you also say: "For you have not yet [resisted] unto the shedding

(p. 748)

of blood," etc. Would that you spoke the truth and did not lie! How much innocent blood your accomplices have shed through your diabolical suggestions, pernicious counsels and so damnable persuasions! They did not spare bishops, abbots, priors, provosts, parish priests, presbyters, clerics or laymen; some they beat,

others they killed, others they despoiled, imprisoned, wounded, and whatever evil they could, they did against Christ's innocent little sheep who intended to persevere in Catholic truth. How many of your accomplices, too, deceived by you, have perished by an evil death; what a shedding of blood abounds even more copiously from your own! Yet you have not yet come to the shedding of your own blood. But fear the judgement of God, lest it be nearer to you than you think. Beware lest in the coming divine judgement your blood be shed and licked by dogs. I do not say this by wishing it, nor by prophesying, lest you call me a false prophet, as they say, but to instruct you to pray the Lord that this may not befall you. And if it happens, pray God again that, if not like the blood of innocent Naboth, at least like the blood of penitent Ahab it may be shed with your eternal salvation and be licked by dogs, and not like the blood of most wickedly obstinate Jezebel.

I too pray almighty God and our Lord Jesus, that in his infinite pity and mercy, by which he always punishes less than is deserved and always rewards beyond what is deserved, he may dispose of me as I desire to be fulfilled in you today: namely, that you were converted to the true Catholic faith and to real obedience to our most holy Lord Pope Nicholas V and to the most holy Roman and universal Church militant, from whom I have full faculty to absolve and receive you, if you are willing to abjure. Come then, dearest; return, return, O Sulamitess, return, return, that we may behold thee. Be converted to the Lord thy God. "Be converted to me," says the Lord, "with all

(p. 749)

your heart, in fasting and in weeping and in mourning, and rend your hearts and not your garments. Be converted to the Lord your God, for he is gracious and merciful, patient and rich in mercy, and ready to repent of the evil." And harden not your hearts like Pharaoh, whose end, with all his army, I think you know. For it is written: "A hard heart shall fare evil at the last, and he that loves danger shall perish in it."

Tell me too, my John, whether together with the aforesaid letter sent by you to the aforesaid Lord Martin you also sent the articles written below, namely:

"Articles issued by the masters and clergy of Prague and the lords councillors of the cities of Prague, on the Wednesday before the feast of St Vitus.

The first article: that the Compacts made with the Church be held effectively by all.

The second article: that all preachers affirm that communion of both species is true, useful and salutary.

The third: that no one dare to preach that as much is received under one species as under both, as regards the graces granted or contained, since this is against communion under both species.

The fourth: that no one dare to give [communion] under one species, publicly or secretly.

The fifth: that all parish priests communicate with their own hand under both species.

The sixth: that no one dare in any way to defame those who so communicate, for instance as heretics or schismatics, but that they be held by all as faithful Christians.

The seventh: that all the priests of Prague and the monks be under the obedience of Master P■íbram and Master Prokop; and if anyone will not consent to this, such a one is not to be favoured, but let him see to it that harm does not follow him."

You see how you entangle yourselves and contradict yourselves in the same context and the same sentence. In

(p. 750)

the first article you say that the Compacts made with the Church are to be held effectively by all, and in the others you proclaim the complete opposite. Will you say, John, that I stole this letter of yours by incantations

of demons? Would that you were never an enchanter of demons, as I am not now, but a faithful servant and true worshipper and preacher of Christ Jesus; although, "if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves." For in many things we all offend; but not all who offend are heretics or schismatics.

Did you also offer the aforesaid articles to the most reverend Lord Cardinal of Sant'Angelo, so that he might approve them for you? Which he by no means did, nor ought to have done. Have you considered, John, that the Lord Aleš of Riesenburg, the governor, and the barons, nobles, knights, retainers, the city of Prague and the other cities promised in these words: "First of all, we receive and make ecclesiastical unity, really and effectively, in the unity of the Catholic faith and in conformity with the rite of the universal Church in all other things except the use of communion of both species, according to the series and tenor of the said chapters, and we promise to hold, keep and defend it"? Note the words, mark the mysteries and weigh them: your barons promised really and effectively; not, then, to say in writing with words only, "We receive the unity and rite of the universal Church," while resisting in deed; but it is required that it be really and effectively received, accepted and done; and not only to receive it in writing, but one must hold, keep and defend it, for so it was promised. Then also the words that follow for the second article must be considered, where it is said: "Which [having been done], the said envoys," etc. For above they had promised for all who are on their side that they would receive and accept, etc. Then it is said: "Which having been done," etc. Whence it is clear that the Bohemians and Moravians must first fulfil really, effectively and without defect what is contained in the Compacts, before the council

(p. 751)

gives licence to communicate under both species; as we say in innominate contracts: I give that you may give, I do that you may do. Whether for thirteen, fourteen, fifteen years, more or fewer, since the first treaty of the Compacts, you have kept what is contained in the Compacts, judge for yourselves; but because they were not kept, neither ought the sacred council to have granted such a licence. Hence, after the aforesaid declaratory decree on both species, you have no licence at all.

You know that also in the special chapter which begins "Concerning the matter of the first article," etc., it is expressed more clearly that, "when the said Bohemians and Moravians receive ecclesiastical unity and peace really and effectively, etc., those men and women who have such a use shall communicate, etc., and in the sacred council it will be fully discussed as to the matter 'of precept.'" Thus it is most expressly plain that the sacred council is to be the judge to declare the matter of both species, and after the declaration to grant licence. Hence in the same chapter it is contained that, after the declaration, when it is said, "all things having been maturely treated, if nevertheless they persevere in the desire of having the said communion" (which word, I announce, refers to what precedes, namely to those who had such a use), "and such persons, being of the years of discretion, reverently request it, the sacred council will grant the faculty in the Lord." You see that it speaks of the future. See, then, whether after the declaratory decree you have had any licence, either from the Lord Julian, or from the sacred council under the authority and obedience of Eugene, or from Eugene himself, or from our most holy Lord Pope Nicholas V, to communicate the people under both species: I do not say little infants, as you have done, and universally, whomever you could, by fair means or foul, compelling, imprisoning, beating and doing violence; but even as regards those who had such a use, of whom perhaps few now survive. If you truly and really had it, show it; but, as I said, I say you will

(p. 752)

never show it in truth, unless perhaps it suited you to have recourse to the caution of forgers.

Have you also considered, John, what is contained in the same chapter of yours: "namely, this always being observed, that the priests always tell those so communicating that they must firmly believe that not the flesh only under the species of bread, nor the blood only under the species of wine, but under each species is the whole Christ entire"? Whether you keep this clause, let your conscience, not erroneous but right, judge. If

you intend to bring yourself back to the right judge of truth, note the words "this always being observed," and consider whether it has always been observed by you and your raving priests. Examine your conscience and declare the truth: whether, on the first day of the Compacts at Jihlava, when you communicated your three little women followers, you forewarned them, as you ought; let your conscience judge. "Be not deceived, God is not mocked. For what things a man shall sow, those also shall he reap." Nor does it suffice for the preachers to express these things; but "this always being observed, that the priests always tell those so communicating," etc. The praetor says: Keep agreements; and if you do not keep them, "faith shall be broken to him who breaks faith." For he wholly deserves to lose a privilege who abuses the power granted him. Whether you have abused the licence promised you, but not, as I said, granted after the aforesaid decree, judge for yourselves.

[Judge] whether you have really and effectively held, kept and defended ecclesiastical unity in the unity of the Catholic faith and in conformity with the rite of the universal Church; whether you have held, kept and defended the teaching of the universal Church, the decrees and decretals of the holy Roman Church; whether you have feared excommunications and any ecclesiastical censures; whether you have taken care about the cases reserved to the Apostolic See; whether you have restored the goods of the Church; whether you have had or have an archbishop instituted and confirmed by the supreme Pontiff and the most holy Roman Church; whether you have parish

(p. 753)

priests and curates according to the institution of the holy Roman Church; whether you have kept peace with the whole Christian people; whether the priests and people of Krom■■íž [rightly] detained the priests and laymen of Hradišt■, whom, as they wished to come to my presence on the royal and public highway, your accomplices and sons of iniquity, like robbers and brigands, violently seized, in contempt and disparagement of the Catholic truth of Christ Jesus our Lord, to the reproach of the Roman Church and to the detriment of the justice, dignity and authority of the sacred royal majesty, and to the disgrace, insult and contempt of the honour of the once renowned kingdom of Bohemia? Have you considered the prejudice and damnation of those who seized and detained them, since by the very fact they incurred the sentence of major excommunication, together with all who counselled, favoured and consented, who could have prevented it, and with all who helped and shared in the crime with them; and that priests who after such a bond damnably thrust themselves into the divine offices at once incurred the mark of irregularity? Read where you will find these things, and learn the Catholic truth; for in your Compacts you will read that such and similar things were neither promised nor permitted, much less granted.

Consider also whether those are of the true faith who have slain bishops, presbyters or clerics with savage cruelty; whether any obedience, reverence, devotion, charity or affection has been shown by your accomplices to the most holy Roman Church. Read what blessed Gregory said: "It is lawful for no one to will or to be able to transgress the precepts of the Apostolic See or the ministry of our disposition, which your charity must follow. Let him therefore be laid low by the grief of his ruin, whoever has willed to go against the apostolic decrees; and let him have no place among the priests, but be made an exile from the holy ministry; nor let anyone afterwards take care of his judgement, since he is not doubted by anyone to have been condemned by the holy and apostolic Church for his disobedience

(p. 754)

and presumption; and let him be a stranger to the divine and pontifical offices who would not obey the apostolic precepts." Consider, John, whether this sentence of excommunication evidently involves you and your accomplices.

Time fails us to recount, point by point, everything that is against you. The declaration of the sacred council having been made, that lay faithful or clerics communicating and not consecrating are not bound by the

Lord's precept to receive the sacrament of the Eucharist under both species; and that one should communicate according to the ordinance or observance of the Church; and that under each species is the whole Christ entire; and that the praiseworthy custom of communicating the lay people under one species, reasonably introduced by the Church and the holy fathers and observed hitherto for a very long time, commended now for a long time by doctors of the Church having great skill in law, in the sacred Scriptures and in the canons, is to be held as law, nor is it lawful for anyone to reprove it or to change it otherwise without the authority of the Church. So concludes, and sings with the jubilation of truth, the solemn decree of the sacred Council of Basel. See, then, what remains to you of your Compacts for our purpose.

You have seen what was decreed at Constance by the sacred council in the decree which begins "Since in certain parts of the world," to which the Council of Basel also most holily and catholicly conformed itself. In which decree of Constance it is added: "Wherefore to say that to observe this custom or law is sacrilegious or unlawful must be judged erroneous; and those pertinaciously asserting the opposite of the foregoing," namely of all that is contained in the said decree, "are to be restrained as heretics and punished accordingly by the diocesans or by the inquisitors of heretical depravity, according to the canonical sanctions salutarily devised against heretics and their favourers."

You know also that our most holy Lord Pope Nicholas

(p. 755)

V, in these recent days just past, through his special messenger, for the eternal salvation of you and your followers, and out of the pious kindness of his will and his innate clemency, with his own hand and from his sure knowledge, sent such a bull in these words, namely:

"Nicholas, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to his beloved son John of Capistrano, professed of the Order of Friars Minor, greeting and apostolic blessing. Since we have understood that you, in the kingdom of Bohemia and the duchy of Moravia and the parts adjoining, with the divine Spirit assisting you, labour vigilantly and profit usefully among the people by sermons and preaching, so that the devotion of all Christ's faithful who flock to you to hear the word of God may be increased, and that they may see themselves more richly filled with the gift of heavenly grace: we grant to your devotion, by the tenor of these presents, full and free faculty, as often as it seems expedient to you, by the mercy of almighty God and of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul and by our authority, mercifully to relax three years and as many quarantines of the penances enjoined on all and each of Christ's faithful who happen to be present for the time at your preaching, at the celebration of Masses and at the divine offices, being truly penitent and confessed, and to grant and pronounce [these indulgences] to them; and also, as often as need be, in the forum of conscience only, by our authority, to absolve in the accustomed form of the Church all and each persons of either sex who have communicated under both species and, involved in other errors, heresies and superstition, have withdrawn from the rite and unity of holy Church, if, having opened the eyes of their understanding and been enlightened by sacred Scripture and your teaching, they are willing, having left and abjured the aforesaid errors, heresy and superstition before you, to be reconciled, reunited and incorporated from darkness to the light of truth with this Roman Church and the Apostolic See, from any sentences of excommunication, suspension and interdict and other ecclesiastical sentences, censures and penalties, even of heresy, promulgated against them whether by law or by man;

(p. 756)

and, by the same authority, to dispense with each of the same persons, and especially spiritual or regular persons, over any irregularity they may have contracted, while so bound by such sentences and penalties, by celebrating the divine offices or meddling in them, yet not in contempt of the keys, so that they may freely and lawfully minister in the orders they have received, having first, however, been suspended by you from their exercise for such a time as seems good to you; and by the said authority to abolish from the same

persons every stain or mark of disability and infamy contracted by them on occasion of the foregoing; and also to restore and reinstate fully and entirely the same persons to their former honour, fame and status in which they were before the foregoing happened. Given," etc.

How do you feel, John? If you feel well, beware of the summit of thorns [*a pun: sentis, "you feel" / "of thorns"*]. But if ill, remember to learn to say farewell. Call in physicians for the cure of your sick heart, and have your pulse and temples felt and the inward signs looked at, [to see] whether perhaps your disease is infecting, contagious and creeping like a cancer, [and] how you might receive the remedy of health. If you expect the work of medicine, you must uncover the wound. For what is good for the sick man the physician knows better than the patient. Submit yourself, then, to the medicine of skilled physicians, if you do not wish to perish of your languor. And even if you were stinking in the tomb, swarming with worms, while life is still your companion, if you are willing to come to your senses from the sleep of eternal death, our pious and merciful Lord Jesus Christ will snatch you from the jaws of death: "Rise, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall enlighten thee."

You said: "We intend and will to observe firmly and effectively all things contained in the said Compacts." How truly you have spoken, the reckoning of the past makes the future known. If it holds today, let it be done today. If you wish to begin today, submit yourself today to the obedience

Reply to John of Rokycana, part 4

(p. 757)

and judgement of our most holy Lord Pope Nicholas V and of the most holy Roman Church. And come to me as to the general inquisitor of heretical depravity and the true and lawful commissary of our same most holy Lord, as is most evidently plain from the authentic and solemn apostolic letters of Martin, Eugene and Nicholas of happy memory, which I hold with me now in my own hands. Come in act to abjure; humble your soul; acknowledge your errors; act truly and effectively; become a master of true religion, and you yourself a monk and a true and Catholic regular; for all true things agree, while false things joined together disagree. Come for absolution; for if I see you truly penitent, I will most willingly impart the benefit of absolution piously and mercifully, since holy Mother Church never closes her bosom to one who returns. Be reconciled with your kindly mother, lest you be the son of a viper, devouring its mother's bowels, against whom [the Church] the gates of hell shall never prevail.

I do not care to repeat the words of the letter I sent you, but I reply to your writings. For you wrote: "There are also other things, which lack reason and understanding. O that you would understand! You choose famous cities." And below: "You choose a judge, and the Pope." You rebuke me because I do not attend to the natural law, "What you would not have done to you," namely when I induce [people] to abjure the sacred chalice; "therefore let the cause be tried in your [land]." You have already confessed that I was in Moravia and in Bohemia, and yet you did not take care to come to me. Would that you had come to abjure; would that even today you would come to abjure and receive the unity of the Church; truly I would receive you as a dearest friend with a pious and kindly presence. And by the same reasoning you often repeat, as if you had never seen anything else: "O that you were wise, O that you would understand, O that you would provide for your last end!" And I say what the Holy Spirit taught: "Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he seem to himself to be wise." There it is said [to you]: O you who are neither monk nor regular!

You say

(p. 758)

also: "You choose the Pope as judge." I have sought and seek nothing else than to treat, preserve, maintain, increase and enlarge the union and concord of the nations under due obedience and reverence to the supreme

prelate and to holy Mother Church, according to the saying of the Saviour: "There shall be one fold and one shepherd." You, then, are the one who intends and nourishes dissension and the continued rending of the Saviour's seamless tunic. I have already said that whatever you write is against you. You allege Pope Urban, and add what the Apostle said about communion of both species: "But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of the chalice." And you do not consider how with your own blade you cut the nose off your face. Did the little infants prove themselves, whom by your deceitful doctrine you prescribed to be communicated under both species, and whom you urged your other damned priests to communicate?

You threaten me moreover with the third series of your salutation: "O that you would provide for your last end!" This, [you say], is precisely when you will not accept as most truthful and impartial judge the divine law, etc. I ask you: who set before you the divine law and the other things you named, as to how far they are true, if not holy Mother Church, without whose authority, acceptance, confirmation and approval whatever is written or alleged is despised with the same ease with which it is approved? Hence Augustine said against Faustus the heretic: "I would not believe the gospel, unless the Church had approved it to me, or unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me." You ask me whether I know that the authority of Scripture is the first and root principle, and you allege the tenth [article] of the Creed: "And he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." Yet you do not ask yourself who authorized the Creed, who validated the authority of Scripture. If you are willing to confess the truth, you will answer with me: "The Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son, granted this authority to the most faithful bride of Christ." The Lord Jesus himself too

(p. 759)

said to his disciples on the same [night of his] death, after the Last Supper (John 16): "I have yet many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. But when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will teach you all truth." Read there and in the following chapter about the unity of the Church, and you will be well able to consider where and in what state your soul, straying, stands.

Say, then, humbly: "I have gone astray like a sheep that is lost; seek thy servant." Say also with the prodigal son: "How many hired servants in my father's house abound with bread, and I here perish with hunger! I will arise and will go to my father and say to him: Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee; I am not now worthy to be called thy son; make me as one of thy hired servants." And quickly the Father of mercies and God of all consolation will run to meet you through his minister, the true vicar of Jesus Christ and successor of Peter, embracing your neck and kissing you by the infusion of his grace and the expulsion of your guilt; and he will put on you the first robe of Catholic truth and give you a ring, so that, returning to your mother, you may keep the true faith as a lawful and ratified bride all the time of your life in sincere chastity; and you will shoe your feet in the preparation of the gospel of peace, so that you guard yourself diligently not only from mortal but also from venial [sins]; and you will feast on the fatted calf, returning humbly to justice in heart. And with your mouth let the confession of truth be to you unto salvation. Confess, I say, that the fatted calf is Christ Jesus, keeping the fat bread, yielding dainties to kings, never consecrated without blood after his resurrection. And therefore, if you are willing to confess the truth, you will assert with us in a clear voice that the whole Christ is contained under each species.

Have you, by the authority of your father, changed into the Bohemian tongue the text which holy Mother Church sings: "Under different species, signs only and not things, lie hidden things sublime. Bread is food, blood is drink; yet Christ remains whole under each species. By the receiver not cut, not broken,

(p. 760)

not divided, he is received entire. One receives, a thousand receive; as much as these, so much that one; nor, received, is he consumed"?

But your third article says that no one is to dare to preach that as much is received under one species as under both. See what follows: "The good receive, the wicked receive, yet with unequal lot, of life or of destruction. Death to the wicked, life to the good; see how, of a like receiving, unlike is the outcome." Attend, John, and consider diligently, lest the communion of you and yours under both species, against the rite, observance and determination of the most holy Roman and universal Church, turn to your destruction, unto death and eternal damnation.

Read what follows: "When at last the sacrament is broken, waver not, but remember that there is as much in the fragment as is covered in the whole." Do you understand the most clear truth? Humble yourselves, then, under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in the time of visitation, "through the bowels of the mercy of our God, in which the Orient from on high hath visited us, to enlighten them that sit in the shadow of death, to direct our feet into the way of peace." And the word of the Lord will be in you, saying: "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you; not as the world gives" its feigned and defiled concord; but our Lord Jesus Christ gives us an ordered peace, so that due obedience is kept by each, rendering each to each; true according to Catholic truth, and pure and sincere. For, as the Apostle says: "The end of the commandment is charity from a pure heart and a good conscience and an unfeigned faith." And the same says: "The peace of God, which surpasses all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in Christ Jesus our Lord." And he adds: "For the rest, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever modest, whatsoever just, whatsoever holy, whatsoever lovely, whatsoever of good fame, if there be any virtue, if any praise of discipline, think on these things. The things which you have both learned and

(p. 761)

received and heard and seen in me, these do ye; and the God of peace shall be with you."

Embrace, then, this peace; let us enter upon it, let us keep it; return to it; let us feast as sons under paternal obedience, and rejoice together at your conversion and true and effective penance, as the Lord says: "There shall be joy in heaven before the angels of God upon one sinner that does penance, more than upon ninety-nine just who need not penance." But if you will not do so, it will be imputed to you unto ruin. Do you think, John, to persevere in evil and obstinate rebellion and to escape the judgement of God? "Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and patience and longsuffering? Knowest thou not that the benignity of God leads thee to penance? But according to thy hardness and impenitent heart, thou treasurest up to thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the just judgement of God, who will render to every man according to his works."

You presume to gloss: "And he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." And you do not understand according to which Scriptures, whether past or present, old or recent, whether perhaps it was written elsewhere before the Nicene Creed was composed. And if you find it so, who authorized those Scriptures? Was it not the Holy Spirit, through the authority granted to holy Church? For Paul had first said: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." Do you perhaps think that Paul gave the authority of testimony to his own writings, or rather that he brought the old Scriptures as testimony to the truth? Search the Scriptures, John; the Scriptures, I say, received and approved by holy Church. You have already wasted the time of your life up to now turning over parchments and perverting the understanding of the Holy Spirit in the sacred and Catholic Scriptures to foment the Hussite heresies. O that you were wise and would understand and would provide for your last end! Would that you had never known letters, so that you would not have bound so many souls

(p. 762)

of rude and simple persons with the chain of the devil!

Do you know what a symbol [creed] is? *Symbolon* in Greek [means] council, or sign, or counsel. Symbols are properly so called when a contribution or agreement from different persons is put together into one symbol. Or it is interpreted as a sign or token. For the apostles, departing to evangelize, set it down as a sign or token of their preaching, as Papias says, understanding it of the Apostles' Creed. And he adds: "It contains the confession of the Trinity and the unity of the Church and the sacrament of all Christian dogma." Are you, John, a Christian or a pagan, a Catholic or a heretic and schismatic, faithful or unfaithful? Would that you became a good, right, true and faithful Christian, and recognized that the Apostles' Creed, expressly, in the manner in which they composed it, is not contained in such ordered sequence either in the New or in the Old Testament, although we can extract it from various and diverse places of the sacred page received by the Church. If you confess yourself a Christian, you must confess one holy Catholic and apostolic Church. If you confess this, as you are bound, confess also that you are a member of the mystical body of our Lord Christ, and owe service, deference and humble obedience to the true visible and ministerial head of yourself and of the other Christians, the lawful and Catholic Pope Nicholas V, most singular vicar of our Lord Jesus Christ, the most principal mystical and invisible head; since it is not lawful for the members to depart from the head. Perhaps you presume to say that you are the head of the heresy of the Rokycanists, since you despise, disparage, trample and scorn every true Catholic power. Your head, therefore, entangled in so many errors, is rotten, frenzied, epileptic, and cut off from the company of Catholics as useless.

How much faith, then, should I have in the creeds, had the Church not handed them to me? First the Apostles' [Creed], as the Church holds; second the Council of Nicaea; third Athanasius explained both more clearly;

(p. 763)

and fourth Pope Innocent III in the general Lateran Council, as is contained in the chapter *Firmiter*, *De summa Trinitate et fide catholica*. Read where in . . . [a gap in the edition]: "There is one universal Church of the faithful, outside which no one at all is saved." So also Augustine said: "Hold most firmly and in no way doubt that every heretic or schismatic will share the burning of eternal fire with the devil and his angels, unless before the end of his life he has been restored to Catholic truth and incorporated into the Church." And a little after: "To no man who does not hold the unity of the Catholic Church can baptism, or alms however copious, or death undergone for the name of Christ, profit unto salvation"; as in the chapter *Firmissime*, *Extra*, *De haereticis*; to the same effect [Decretum C.] 1, q. 1, c. *Firmissime*, and c. *Teneamus*, with all the following chapters up to the chapter *Extra ecclesiam catholicam*, because "there is no place of true sacrifice [outside it]." See in the chapter *Manifestissimum est*: "Through most cruel and monstrous madness in the see of Alexandria" (would that it were not in the church of Prague!) "all the light of the heavenly sacraments has been extinguished, the offering of the sacrifice has been cut off, the hallowing of the chrism has failed; all the mysteries have withdrawn themselves from the parricidal hands of the impious."

And Cyprian, whom you also alleged for yourself, says against you: "If anyone goes out from the Church by heretical presumption, he is condemned by himself." Receive, therefore, him against whom you chose to receive [him] for yourself. For it is a rule of law that whatever law anyone establishes against another, he himself should be subject to the same law. You allege Gregory, you allege Dionysius, you allege Augustine too, saying: "This honour is to be shown only to the apostles and prophets, that whatever they have said is by that very fact believed to be true." If you take Augustine's words so peevishly and stripped of their bark, "only to the apostles, prophets," etc., then the evangelists who were not apostles, such as Mark and Luke, are not to be believed. And so out of your own mouth I judge you, wicked servant. If you are not bound to believe Luke,

(p. 764)

where else in the Gospels will you find: "Do this in commemoration of me"? And so all your windy and dusty contrivance is scattered. Tell me, insolently and puffed up with pride (read Gregory, Augustine and

Dionysius and any other canonized Catholic doctors whatever): where do they teach you to refuse the judgement of the most holy Roman and universal Church in all things pertaining to the decision of Catholic truth?

O most wicked presumption! Truly you were created to cover up abominable malice and his guile. For you are of those of whom St Thomas said in the *Contra Gentiles*: "There are some men who presume so much on their own wit that they think they can measure the whole nature of things by their intellect, judging that alone to be true which seems so to them, and that false which does not seem so to them; whence they embrace their opinions, views and sects with such love that they will not even think of, look at or hear the contrary." Of whom Solomon says: "A fool receives not the words of prudence, unless thou say those things which are in his heart." And the Apostle says: "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and injustice of those men that detain the truth of God in injustice." And below: "But they became vain in their thoughts, and their foolish heart was darkened. For, professing themselves to be wise, they became fools; who changed the truth of God into a lie." Therefore all such are deservedly to be punished as foolish and rash. Whence the laws rise up against such men, avenging the injury done to truth, as in the chapter *Vergentis*; [and] *Si adversus vos terra consurgeret*; and in the chapter *Ad abolendam*; and in the chapter *Excommunicamus*, first and second, *Extra*, *De haereticis*; and in the chapter *Cum ser*.; and in the chapter *Accusatus*; and in the chapter *Quicumque*; and in the chapter *Super eo*, and throughout the same title in the Sixth Book. And other laws of the empire are manfully and steadfastly armed against the aforesaid heretics for the judgement of vengeance, that they may be rooted out and extinguished from the earth, if they will not

(p. 765)

be converted to Catholic truth, as in the law *Quicumque*, *C. De haereticis*, and in the constitutions of the Emperor Frederick.

Or are you ignorant that whenever the question of faith is aired, it must be referred to none but Peter, that is, to the honour and authority of his name? You know also that Augustine says: "I would not believe the gospel," etc. Did not Jerome also say: "This is the faith which we have learned in the Catholic Church and have always held; in which, if anything has been set down less skilfully or with too little care, we desire to be corrected by you, who hold both the see and the faith of Peter. But if this our confession is approved by the judgement of your apostolate, whoever wishes to blame me will prove himself unskilled, or malevolent, or even not Catholic but a heretic"? Again: "The holy Roman Church, which has always remained immaculate, the Lord providing and blessed Peter bringing help, will remain in future without any insult of heretics," that is, any prevailing one, as the Gloss says, "and will persist firm and immovable at all times." Read [Decretum C.] 24, q. 1, throughout, and the whole cause and all three questions.

See also what Augustine writes to Boniface, giving the example that Maximus, bishop of Bagai (*magiorum* in the edition), sought help from the Christian emperor against the enemies of the Church; and that if he had omitted to do so, his patience would not have been praiseworthy, but his negligence deservedly blameworthy. Read also what he wrote to Henricus [*sic*]: "Our Christians, against the unlawful and private violences of your people, which even you who do such things lament and groan over, seek vengeance from the ordained powers, not to persecute men but to defend themselves," says the Gloss; nay, heretics may even be attacked, as in *Extra*, *De haereticis*, c. *Vergentis*; and below, q. 5, c. *Si audieris*. See also what he wrote against Petilian: "For the members of Christ, against those who rage and resist you, whoever in the Church are of that mind which Peter then had when he drew the sword for the name of Christ." And below: "You arm yourselves against the Catholic Church, that is, against the body of Christ;

Reply to John of Rokycana, part 5

(p. 766)

but these are such as Peter, who fought even bodily for the body of Christ, that is, for the Church." Read [C.] 23, q. 3, c. *Maximus*, with the following, and q. 4, c. *Putas neminem*, where you will also find the words of Augustine against Vincent the Donatist. Read also what the same says on John, namely when God wills to stir up the powers against heretics, against schismatics, against scatterers of the Church, against those who blow upon Christ, against blasphemers: "Let not the blasphemers be counted, because God calls that Hagar be beaten by Sarah," that is, by the Church. Did not Augustine also say against [Faustus]: "It is plain that in a doubtful matter of faith the authority of the Catholic Church avails, which is confirmed from the most firmly founded sees of the apostles down to the present day by the series of bishops succeeding one another and by the consent of so many peoples"? Where the Gloss on the words "of the Catholic Church" says: "the Roman, to which recourse is had in doubts." And second, *De libelli [oblatione]*. And so the apostolic laws are to be kept, and so the laws of Peter (dist. 19). So all mean to say that the authority of the Pope descends from the authority of Christ handed to Peter, as we say that the tribunal of Christ and of the Pope is one, as in the chapter *Non putamus*, *De consuetudine*, Sixth Book; and Hostiensis always notes it, in the chapter *Quinto*, *De translatione praelatorum*.

To all that you adduced above, whether the authorities of Gregory, Dionysius, Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose or any others whatever, or even of the Apostle saying, "Whatsoever things were written were written for our learning," etc., you have already been answered: since all the validity and strength both of sacred Scripture and of the sayings of the holy doctors proceeds from the acceptance and confirmation of the holy and universal Roman Church itself, the Holy Spirit inspiring, authorizing and ruling. For this reason violators of the canons are said to blaspheme the Holy Spirit, from whom the holy canons are said to have emanated. For the Roman Church itself is called the mother of faith

(p. 767)

(dist. 22, c. 1), where it says thus: "The Roman Church instituted all [dignities], whether the eminence of any patriarch, or the primacies of metropolitans or the chairs of archbishops, or the dignity of churches of whatever order. But that [Church] he alone founded and raised upon the rock of the faith then newly arising, who committed to blessed Peter, key-bearer of eternal life, the rights of the earthly and at the same time of the heavenly empire. For not any earthly sentence, but that Word by which heaven and earth were constructed, through which finally the elements were founded, founded the Roman Church. It therefore enjoys the privilege of him by whose authority it is supported. Whence there is no doubt that whoever takes away from any church its right does injustice; but whoever strives to take away the privilege of the Roman Church, handed down by the supreme head of all churches himself, without doubt falls into heresy; and while the former is called unjust, the latter is to be called a heretic. For he violates the faith who acts against her who is the mother of faith, and he is found contumacious towards him who is known to have set her before all churches."

See, then, John, and judge your own case, whether you are to be judged a heretic, since you kick against the holy Roman Church. This you also show evidently in your apparent signet, since under a horse's shoe you have trodden down a heavenly star. It is a sign, then, that you, as one deprived of the light from above, have by your sight suppressed heaven under your feet into the outer darkness, or rather that you are subverted and damned to the eternal torments of hell. It is the sentence of the Apostle writing to Titus, chapter 3: "But avoid foolish questions and genealogies and contentions and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain." And he adds: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition avoid, knowing that he that is such a one is subverted and sins, being condemned by his own judgement."

But you, John, since not only once or twice but many and many times, on multiplied occasions and days, years and months, you were admonished, corrected, instructed and taught with much humanity,

(p. 768)

charity and kindness by the Council of Basel to desist and cease from your errors, both at the Council of Basel and in very many other places by legates and apostolic commissaries, and lastly now by me myself on repeated occasions: if even now you refuse to abjure your heresies, nothing else remains but that you be punished as a heresiarch, not merely as a heretic; and if not by men, at least by divine judgement, by the edge of the sword and the arrow of the thunderbolt, you will be torn and plunged into the depth. For the holy Roman Church does not refuse the Holy Spirit as judge, but is ruled by him and discerns by his distinction. But you deny the Holy Spirit who also rules the same Church; therefore you cannot be a friend of truth, because, as Ambrose testifies, all truth, by whomever spoken, is from the Holy Spirit. And the Lord himself says: "I am the way, the truth and the life; no man comes to the Father but by me." But you, John, take care to come neither to the Father, nor to the Son, nor to the Holy Spirit, nor to the first truth, which is God, as you assert; but rather, leaning on your insolent and erroneous conscience and obstinate, you withdraw with obstinate mind from the clear light of truth and strive daily to go further away; therefore divine salvation is far from you, because you have not attempted to seek out the justifications of God either in the holy Scriptures or in the teachings of the Catholic doctors.

Would that even today you were willing to acquiesce in the truth; truly you would be united with me and incorporated into the most holy mother, the Roman and universal Church militant, unto the end and the Jerusalem of everlasting triumphant glory. The Council of Basel accepted the aforesaid judge; I too in like manner always accept him. Would that you likewise accepted him, and acquiesced in the decrees of the Councils of Constance and Basel, and submitted yourself humbly and devoutly to the commands and institutions of our most holy Lord Pope Nicholas V, as a true and obedient son, really and effectively, and so came of your own accord to abjure; and so you would understand how the sacred Scriptures

(p. 769)

bear witness of Christ, and how faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ. Would that you were thus wise, would that you thus understood, would that you thus provided for your last end, as Christ teaches you to understand his truth, saying: "The words that I have spoken are spirit and life. But there are some of you that believe not." Which words Peter, the true interpreter, declared excellently when he said: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. We have believed and have known that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." See, then, that Christ said of formed faith: "Except you eat and except you drink," etc. So also he said: "If you believe not that I am he, you shall die in your sins." And so the words of Christ there are to be taken of spiritual receiving, since they cannot properly be taken of sacramental receiving; for he instituted the most divine sacrament of the Eucharist not then but after his Last Supper, under two species, namely of bread and wine, which are indeed sacramental accidents, on which the efficacy of so great a sacrament does not depend, but on the thing contained, namely Christ Jesus. Since he is contained whole under each species, no more truth or efficacy or grace is conferred by this sacrament, as far as it is of itself, on those who receive it under two species than under one only. And to this tends the authority of Ambrose and of the other doctors who attribute diverse effects to this sacrament as signified under diverse species, and not to this, that the efficacy of this sacrament is less under one species than under two. Which the Lord himself is read to have noted (John 6): after he said, "He that eats my flesh and drinks my blood has everlasting life," he consequently added, "He that eats this bread shall live for ever." And so "except you eat and except you drink" must be understood of incorporation with Christ through faith and charity. For "without faith it is impossible to please God," as the Apostle says (Heb. 11). And without charity

(p. 770)

forming faith, actually in adults and habitually in little ones, salvation never could be nor will be, as the same Apostle testifies (1 Cor. 13): "If I should deliver my body to be burned and have not charity, it profits me nothing." The word "eat" regards faith, while "drink" regards charity. Whence Hugh of St Victor says in the book of *Opuscula*: "Our God is food and drink: food when he is received, namely through the knowledge of

faith; drink when he is received through love."

That the text "except you eat and except you drink" is to be understood principally of spiritual and not sacramental eating we can understand manifestly from many reasons and arguments; yet for brevity's sake I seek [only] six.

First, from this: that at the time when Christ said "except you eat and except you drink," this most divine sacrament had not been instituted, nor expressly preached; whence it could not be a precept, either explicitly or implicitly, because it did not yet exist; for that which is treated of must first exist in the nature of the word. Nor is the reason of law to be sought before the person (*C. De iure*, l. *Quidam referunt*, first so). And to a college that does not yet exist no privilege is given (Decretum, dist. 2 [?], c. *Ad audientiam*); nor is a rescript given for future suits (*Extra, De rescriptis*, last chapter); nor can that be called true which never was (*De poenitentia*, dist. 3, c. [not named in the edition], at the end); nor dead, what never lived (32, q. 2, *Quod vero*). As also with letters and witnesses, what does not yet exist cannot be broken (*Dig., De iniusto rupto*, l. *Nam etsi sub condicione*), with many like [texts].

Secondly, it is plain that it was not a precept from this: that many attained the life of grace without eating the sacrament, before Christ said those words. This is most expressly plain of the thief who hung on the cross at the right hand of Christ, who neither communicated under

(p. 771)

both species nor was even baptized with formal baptism. Yet he communicated spiritually, believing the truth about Christ Jesus; he was reborn by the baptism of the Spirit and was saved, uttering with his mouth unto salvation what he believed with his heart unto justice, saying: "Remember me, Lord, when thou shalt come into thy kingdom" (Luke 23). But like you is Judas, who communicated under both species sacramentally only, and not spiritually, on the preceding night; and after that, as the following day dawned, seeing that he was condemned, moved by useless repentance he brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the priests, and went and hanged himself with a halter (Matt. 27). And in Acts 1 Peter said of Judas: "And he indeed has possessed a field of the reward of iniquity, and being hanged burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out." See that the like does not happen to you, at least as to eternal damnation. For it is better to be companion to the thief than to Judas. For to the former the Lord said: "Amen I say to thee, this day thou shalt be with me in paradise" (Luke 23). But of the latter, namely Judas, after he had declared his aforesaid words, "except you eat and except you drink," and Peter had understood them in a Catholic sense for himself and his faithful, Jesus said to them on the mountain: "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" And who that one is, John himself at once declares, expressly adding: "Now he meant Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon; for this same was about to betray him, whereas he was one of the twelve." Note the words, John, and mark the mysteries.

Truly, John, I pity you and those seduced by you, and I gladly keep the teaching of Christ, who says: "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you." I love you in heart unto eternal salvation; I do you good in deed, instructing you with the pen; and with my mouth, and in mind and spirit, I certainly pray for you, that the divine wisdom may enlighten your minds to the knowledge of Jesus Christ and of Catholic truth.

You have also read of St Emerentiana, virgin and martyr, the foster-sister of Agnes

(p. 772)

the virgin, who was not reborn by formal baptism nor communicated under any species of the sacrament, and yet is a canonized holy virgin and martyr of Christ, because she was stoned in reproach of Christ; whose feast is celebrated most solemnly in the City. I am silent about many other holy martyrs who were not yet baptized and did not communicate sacramentally, such as all the philosophers, with the commander [*sic*] Porphyry and

his companions, truly converted at the spectacle of St Catherine and martyred for Christ. So also of many holy confessors who never communicated under both species: St Benedict, who was not a priest; and the glorious confessor of Christ, our seraphic patriarch Francis, who out of his humility would not be made a priest, and would not even communicate under both species, but, communicating under one only, out of reverence for the most holy blood of Christ would not, after communion, rinse his mouth with pure wine from the chalice in which the blood of Christ is consecrated, but with a particular and special chalice, which is preserved even today in memory of the said saint among the relics and treasures in the sacristy of the holy convent of St Francis at Assisi. This chalice many supreme Pontiffs, most reverend Lords Cardinals and great prelates and princes have most devoutly looked upon, among them also our most holy Lord Pope Nicholas V with some of his cardinals, one of whom was the Lord John, Cardinal of Sant'Angelo, who in past years personally visited and admonished you, and in the church of Prague, with many seeing and standing by, communicated under one species only. And he himself told me this with his own mouth. I pass over many others for the sake of brevity.

Thirdly, it is plain from the sense of the text of the aforesaid sixth chapter, the whole of which does not seem able to be rightly understood of sacramental eating. Whence the solemn doctor Zachary of Besançon [Chrysopolitanus], in the book called *One out of Four*, speaking of that text, "except you eat,"

(p. 773)

etc., says: "Some doctors refer some of the preceding things incidentally to the sacrament of the altar, but none in continuous exposition." So he. And in truth there seems to be no cause of this except that the course of that text cannot intelligibly be understood of sacramental eating. That is to be called the principal understanding of the letter which is found more in accord with the end of the whole chapter, and such is the spiritual understanding. Hence the Apostle says (2 Cor. 3): "And such confidence we have through Christ towards God; not that we are sufficient to think anything of ourselves, as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is from God, who also has made us fit ministers of the new testament, not in the letter but in the spirit. For the letter kills, but the spirit quickens." And the Lord himself, in declaring these words of his, "Except you eat," etc., said: "It is the spirit that quickens; the flesh profits nothing." For, as blessed Augustine says in the book of the *Eighty-three Questions*, q. 69: "The circumstances of the Scriptures are wont to illuminate the substance of the truth." For which reason this rule must be diligently noted in the words of Christ, because by it we often weigh whether the words of Christ are said properly or figuratively; as when he said, "I am the true vine, and you the branches," he spoke not properly but by similitude, whence he added: "He that abides in me and I in him, the same bears much fruit." So also from what precedes and follows we understand that he spoke properly when he said: "This is my body, which shall be given for you; do this in commemoration of me." This he said to the twelve apostles, whom he then instituted priests, as the Catholic doctors commonly say and as I have deduced at length in the treatise *On the Natural and Sacramental Blood of Christ*; and the doctor of the four [books of] Sentences, distinctions 17 and 18.

Fourthly, it is plain from the expositions and declarations of our Lord Jesus Christ himself, as has been touched on above, than which no one can be more secure; who,

(p. 774)

interpreting and declaring from what precedes and follows how his words "Except you eat," etc., were to be understood, showed it. For when, [after] the miracle of the loaves, he had walked on the sea with dry feet, he said to the crowds following him: "Amen, amen I say to you, you seek me, not because you have seen miracles, but because you did eat of the loaves and were filled. Labour not for the meat which perishes, but for that which endures unto life everlasting, which the Son of man will give you." And below: "This is the work of God, that you believe in him whom he hath sent." See, there he declares of what food he was speaking, namely of true faith formed by charity. And when they asked for a sign, alleging the manna as

bread given from heaven, Jesus answered: "Amen, amen I say to you, Moses gave you not bread from heaven, but my Father gives you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is that which comes down from heaven and gives life to the world," that is, to believers from the beginning to the end of the world. And when they had said, "Lord, give us always this bread," Jesus answered: "I am the bread of life; he that comes to me," namely by faith, "shall not hunger, and he that believes in me shall never thirst. But I said unto you that you also have seen me, and you believe not." And below: "And this is the will of my Father that sent me, that every one who sees the Son and believes in him may have life everlasting, and I will raise him up in the last day." And below: "Amen, amen I say unto you: he that believes in me has everlasting life. I am the bread of life." And below: "This is the bread which comes down from heaven, that if any man eat of it he may not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world." And when they said and strove among themselves, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?", etc. You see how often in what precedes the light of truth expressed it, the Lord Jesus Christ saying his mind about faith and

Reply to John of Rokycana, part 6

(p. 775)

recalling bread, with absolutely no mention made of wine. And when he said, "Except you eat and except you drink," note especially what he added, declaring his words, namely: "For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him." That this is Christ's exposition of the aforesaid words Augustine testifies in the same place, and the ordinary Gloss, saying thus: "Finally he now expounds how what he speaks of comes about, and what it is to eat his body and drink his blood: He that eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me and I in him. This is to eat that food and drink that drink: to abide in Christ and to have him abiding in oneself. And by this, he who does not abide in Christ, and in whom Christ does not abide, without doubt does not eat his flesh nor drink his blood, even if he eats and drinks the sacrament of so great a thing to his judgement." So Augustine. So also Paul understood it (1 Cor. 11): "For he that eats and drinks unworthily eats and drinks judgement to himself, not discerning," that is, distinguishing, "the body of the Lord"; and he did not say "not discerning the blood," rightly perceiving that the blood of Christ can by no means be separated [from the body], as I have also treated at greater length, as I said above.

Fifthly, it is plain in the same place from the aforesaid confession and answer of Peter: "Lord, to whom shall we go?" Where it is to be noted that Peter, recognizing the truth of faith and confessing for the Catholic Church, did not say, "We are ready, or prompt and willing, to eat your flesh and drink your blood in your sacrament to be instituted by you at the last"; but, understanding that Christ was speaking of spiritual eating, which is to be incorporated into Christ by true faith formed by charity, he said: "And we have believed and have known that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Where he confesses both natures together, namely the divine and the human,

(p. 776)

and preaches them together, and equally intimates that they are to be believed and confessed, to those then present and to posterity who would believe; which Christ himself had also preached before Peter [*sic*: "Paulum"] in the same chapter, saying: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven." Hence blessed Augustine, commending and admiring Peter's answer, says: "How well the flesh of Christ tasted in Peter's mouth!" See, John, how clear a faith: that the Holy Spirit revealed, not to you but to Peter, the Catholic truth and the sound understanding of the words of Christ, that here he did not speak of sacramental eating, which had not yet been instituted, but of spiritual [eating] according to right faith, which from the beginning of the world was necessary for all the elect and will be continually until the end of the age, without which true faith there can be no salvation.

In like manner the Holy Spirit revealed to Peter the knowledge of the truth about the Lord Jesus Christ himself, true God and man, when he asked: "Whom do men say that the Son of man is?" And when the apostles answered, "Some John the Baptist," etc., he added: "But whom do you say that I am?" Simon Peter answered and said: "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God." And Jesus answering said to him: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee: that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." These things were said not to you, John, but to Peter. You are not the one to whom the Holy Spirit revealed his truth, to whom Christ Jesus handed his power; but Peter is the dispenser and distributor of the divine mysteries to all the mystical members of Christ; Peter [was appointed] by Christ for the Church, so that the whole Church might receive information and instruction from Peter himself, to whom he committed the rights of the earthly and at the same time of the heavenly

(p. 777)

empire, as I have said elsewhere. In the place of Peter succeeded the supreme Pontiffs of the holy Roman Church, who, with the Holy Spirit ruling and instructing, most solemnly distinguished the ecclesiastical dignities, so that some are called simply priests, others archpriests, others bishops, others archbishops or metropolitans, others primates, others patriarchs, others supreme pontiffs; which distinction took its beginning from Christ himself, who instituted the twelve apostles as greater priests and the seventy-two disciples as lesser priests. But he chose Peter as supreme priest, since he gave him, before all and for all, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and gave him the name Peter from himself, the rock [*text corrupt in the edition*]; and he testified that he had prayed specially for his faith, and, so that he might confirm the others, he added, saying: "I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy faith fail not; and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren." Following this same form the apostles ordained bishops and presbyters in each city. We read that Levites were ordained by the apostles, the greatest of whom was blessed Stephen; subdeacons and acolytes the Church established for herself in the course of time. Read where these things are written, and submit your head to the Catholic truth which the Holy Spirit has intimated to the holy Church of God in successive and continuous times.

Sixthly: this same, namely that "except you eat and except you drink" does not include a precept of sacramental communion but is to be understood of spiritual [communion], is plain and shown by the authorities of almost all the doctors of holy Mother Church and by the determinations of the masters of the sacred page who are reckoned chief in the schools of the theologians: such as Jerome in the letter on the Epistle to the Ephesians, Augustine on John, Ambrose in the book *On Paradise*, Bernard in the exposition of the psalm, and what the Master [of the Sentences] has in the fourth [book], distinctions 8 and 9, where St Thomas, Alexander of

(p. 778)

Hales, Bonaventure, Richard of Middleton, John Scotus, Albert the Great, Peter of Tarentaise, Peter of La Palud, and commonly almost all Catholic doctors assert and affirm this same thing.

Therefore, supposing but not granting that those words, "except you eat," etc., were incidentally drawn to an understanding of sacramental eating, the most discreet custom of the holy Roman and universal Church of communicating the lay people under one species only would still not be removed. For granted that they were understood of the sacramental [eating], it would not therefore follow that it is a precept, or of necessity of salvation for each of the faithful, to take it under a double species; since, as the whole Christ is contained under each species, and the body is not without the blood, one taking this sacrament under the species of bread, just as he communicates in the body of Christ, so communicates also in the blood, as blessed Thomas

says. Nay more, the old chancellor says in his *Summa* that one so communicating in the body is to be said not only to communicate in the blood but also to drink it. This was also said by Peter of Tarentaise, who was supreme pontiff, of the Order of Preachers, and by Bertrand de la Tour of the Order of Minors, who was a cardinal.

Nor does the authority of Pope Innocent III, violated and not soundly understood, stand in the way, in the treatise *On the Office of the Mass*, when he said: "The blood is not drunk while the body is eaten, nor is his body eaten while the blood is drunk, although the whole is taken under each species." For, as was said above, the circumstances of the Scriptures illuminate the substance of the truth. Since he says, "although the whole is taken under each species," and said above, "the blood is not drunk and the body is not eaten," etc., it must be soundly understood, according to his mind, that when the priest takes the body he does not at the same time also take the chalice, because he first takes the body and afterwards takes the chalice. And therefore the said words must be distinguished, according to what Peter of Tarentaise himself says: "To eat and to drink of

(p. 779)

this sacrament happens in two ways: namely either in reality and by express sign, or in reality only." If we understand it in the first way, what Innocent says in the first words is true, namely that in reality and by express sign, that is, appropriate to his speech, "what is taken" is to take the body by itself and to drink the blood by itself in the chalice under the species of wine. If we understand the words in the second way, namely to drink in reality only, it must soundly be said that the blood is drunk even under the species of bread, since the blood of Christ is truly contained under that species, which is the drink of the soul, and not the visible species itself; and so Innocent understands the following words when he says: "although the whole is taken under each species." Nor does that authority make any mention of the species of wine.

Nor does it stand in the way if it be objected that Christ said, "Drink ye all of this" (Matt. 26); since, supposing that this word were held as a precept and not as narrative, it is to be referred only to those then communicating in the body of Christ, who were advised by Christ's mouth that each should so take his part of the chalice that all might drink of it. Whence in Luke 22 we read that the Lord, having given the chalice, said to the apostles: "Divide it among you"; and in Mark 14 we read: "And they all drank of it." And the twelve apostles communicating with Christ faithfully fulfilled it, in so far as it was a precept; faithfully, I say, Judas excepted, although he communicated sacramentally but not spiritually. And so, to the purpose, the authority alleged avails you nothing against the rite of holy Mother Church. Nay, the said Lord Bertrand, in his postil on the Gospels, treating the aforesaid authority, asks why the Lord said rather "Drink ye all of this" than "Eat ye all of this," when it seems it should have been said the contrary way, since all secular or lay people take the body and not the blood because of the danger of spilling. And he answers that the Lord, foreseeing that this sacrament was to be taken by many under one species only, namely bread, to the confusion

(p. 780)

of heretics, lest it be believed that by this the blood was taken less, since it is taken not under the species of wine but of bread, said, "Drink ye all of this," because all who take Christ under the species of bread drink the blood also, since the body is not without blood. And the added "of this" is not referred to the whole blood taken, but to the chalice, of which all drank. So he. The same is said by Master Nicholas of Lyra, the excellent postillator of the Bible, in the exposition of the aforesaid authority of Matthew 26.

Nor does that of Luke 22, "Do this in commemoration of me," oppose our custom, as is expressed in the interlinear Gloss; nor is it intimated by these words that [the sacrament] is to be dispensed under both species to the rest of Christ's faithful. For Christ said those words after the consecration and delivery of his most sacred body to those twelve, whom, as was said above, he therein instituted priests. And Luke does not say that after the delivery of the chalice he repeated the words "Do this," intimating thereby that not all of Christ's faithful indiscriminately ought to be priests. Paul, however (1 Cor. 11), repeats it after the chalice;

yet neither in his words is there found a precept of Christ, or a necessity of salvation, of communicating the people under both species; since neither Peter, nor Paul, nor any other apostle, nor any other Catholic doctor presumed to affirm this communion, [namely] that the lay people are bound by Christ's precept and by necessity of salvation to communicate under both species. And therefore all the frustrating arguments of yourself and your predecessors, or of those who now adhere to you, can in no way stand against Catholic truth and the authority, rite and most honourable and just custom of the holy Roman and universal Church, observed in a Catholic manner through the course of so many years.

You add, finally, that I despised Krumlov, etc. You likewise despise Cheb as a plebeian and rustic place, adding: "Is there a school flourishing there in every kind

(p. 781)

of science?" It is a marvellous thing to behold your madness and rash presumption. You flee and refuse the judgement of the Pope, the cardinals, all the Catholic prelates of the holy Church of God, kings and princes, and all the universities of every science; and you throw it at Cheb that it is no school of the sciences, where it was publicly proclaimed that a diet was to be held on the feast of Barbara under the presidency of the most reverend Lord Cardinal of San Pietro in Vincoli, most worthy apostolic legate, with the assembly of princes and barons, etc. What if it had been so? It had been excellently provided, by me too, that you should have had there a supply of venerable and most reverend masters in the sacred page, and excellent doctors of both laws, and masters of arts and bachelors, who would discern your vanities and my truths.

You subjoin that I, an inquisitor of heretical depravity, ought to fear lest I alone be steeped in heresy by resisting Catholic truth. Read Zechariah, chapter 2: "O, O, flee from the land of the north, says the Lord, for I have scattered you into the four winds of heaven, says the Lord." O, o, o, the foolish and insane madness of Rokycana! He is a heresiarch, resisting Catholic truth, pertinaciously defending a false dogma contrary to sacred Scripture; and he presumes to warn me, the judge of his heresies, lest I alone be steeped in heresy. Thus you imitate the ways of apes, as Cyprian says in the letter against heretics, among whom there is no hope and a false faith, where all things are done by lying; adding: "For the heretic, after the manner of apes, which, though they are not men, imitate the human form, claims for himself the face and authority and truth of the Catholic Church, though he himself is not in the Church; he blesses, though he is cursed by God; he promises life, though he is dead; a blasphemer, he invokes the Lord; profane, he ministers the priesthood; sacrilegious, he sets up an altar. To all these is added this evil too, that the priest of the devil dares

(p. 782)

to make the Eucharist." So he. Read it against yourself, John; for I answer a fool according to his folly, lest he seem wise to himself.

Finally you throw at me that I make a proselyte a son of hell, etc. First, it is of the nature of the ape: what is yours you try to put upon another, and what is another's you strive to usurp for yourself. It is yours to make sons of hell; it is mine to labour diligently to call back the sons of a foolish father from his pernicious fury, whom he busies himself to cast with cruel death into the burning fire. Secondly, you do indeed what is proper to heretics; for a certain gloss on the Canticles says that heretics are wont to threaten about the future and about hell, so that they may be believed (24, q. 1, *Schisma*), where you read "proselyte," etc. [*reference unclear*]. And what follows, read it against yourself and against your sons, whom you begot with poisonous seed and nourish with the milk of asps. What precedes is against you, and what accompanies and what follows. What precedes indeed: "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because you shut the kingdom of heaven against men; for you yourselves do not enter in, and those that are going in you suffer not to enter." This is true, John; for this you shall receive the greater judgement, and you make a proselyte a child of hell twofold more than yourselves. See what accompanies, against you, who visit and imprison with impious piety, that you may pervert them from the path of the truth of the Catholic faith; and you make your

spies go round sea and land, copies of whose letters directed to you I hold in my keeping. Believe me, John, what follows: "Woe to you, blind guides." And below: "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because you tithe," etc. And below: "You have left the weightier things of the law, judgement and mercy and faith. Blind guides, who strain out a gnat and swallow a camel. Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because you make clean the outside of the cup and of the dish, but within you are full of rapine and uncleanness." And below: "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because you are like to whited sepulchres." And below: "But within you

(p. 783)

are full of hypocrisy and iniquity." And below: "You serpents, generation of vipers, how will you flee from the judgement of hell? That upon you may come all the just blood." And below: "Behold, your house shall be left to you desolate." It is all true, John; it all pertains to you; take it all, eat and drink it in your mouth, for at last you will pay the host.

You congratulate yourselves and assert: "when they have said all evil against us." Congratulate yourself, rejoice and exult, when you read this most true confutation of yours. Your conscience is not Augustine's, that you could say with him that in the eyes of God your conscience alone does not accuse you. You despise miracles; you ascribe them to Antichrist, according to the working of Satan, so that even the elect, if it were possible, may be led into error; as though you presumed to count yourself with your followers in the number of the elect, asserting the rest to be reprobate. Congratulate yourself, wretch, if I call you blind and wretched. If you were not a heretic on any other ground, you would be proved a heretic by this alone, that you wish to attribute divine works to Satan. And you call as your witnesses the magicians of Pharaoh and Simon [*sic*: "Simeonem"] the magician, deceivers like yourself; but consider their end for yourself. I have said it often: I pity you, John. Where did you read in my letters that I exposed myself to signs and miracles in order to derange the minds of men? You imitate the footsteps of your father, heaping up lies; all that you turn upon me fits yourself.

For miracles, in the true sense of miracle, God alone works, for a threefold cause: namely either to demonstrate his supreme power, or his wisdom, or his clemency, or his goodness [*sic*]. Of the first the Gloss says on 1 Cor. 1, at the words "the Jews require signs," namely of power. Of the second Augustine says, *On the Works of the Six Days*: "God is almighty not by rash power but by the truth of wisdom." Of the third the Gloss says on that of the Psalmist, "Thy testimonies are wonderful, O Lord": "Heaven and earth and all his visible works bear witness to God of his goodness and greatness."

Reply to John of Rokycana, part 7

(p. 784)

Miracles therefore are done, in consideration of the final cause, for the end of confirming and impressing true faith, as the Gloss says on the words of the Psalmist, "that he may give them the inheritance of the gentiles," that is, that the gentiles might believe. And in the last chapter of Mark the Lord said: "And these signs shall follow them that believe: in my name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they shall drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay their hands upon the sick, and they shall recover." And below: "But they going forth preached everywhere, the Lord working withal and confirming the word with signs that followed." And so you seem, John, to speak so indiscriminately and confusedly that you condemn even the miracles of Christ and his apostles and the other saints. You have read the Apostle saying: "I am become foolish; you have compelled me. For I ought to have been commended by you; for I have no way come short of them that are above measure apostles, although I be nothing. Yet the signs of my apostleship have been wrought on you, in all patience, in signs and wonders and mighty deeds." But you, John, follow the ways of those who strive to pervert any goods and gifts of the

Holy Spirit into evil. Against whom the Holy Spirit cries out: "Woe to you that draw iniquity with cords of vanity, and sin as the rope of a cart. Woe to you that call evil good and good evil, that put darkness for light and light for darkness, that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter. Woe to you that are wise in your own eyes and prudent in your own conceits." Behold a threefold woe to you, John, for a threefold cord is not easily broken. "Woe, woe, woe to the inhabitants of the earth" (Apoc. 8:13). "But our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ, who will reform the body of our lowness, made like to the body of his glory, according to the operation whereby also he is able to subdue all things unto himself." The word of God is not bound, John, so that he could never, or cannot, say anything other than

(p. 785)

your perverse sense: "except you eat and except you drink." And you flee to the refuge of yourself and your wretched accomplices: your Compacts. It has already been solemnly shown to you above what force, what authority, what strength now exists in your Compacts, and what their true understanding is, even if they be frustrated [*sic*] by the hanging of thousands upon thousands of seals. As to our safe-conducts, as to the true faith of Catholics to be observed by Catholic worshippers of Christ, all may trust the legates, and you most firmly, if you have resolved to come, really and effectively, for true eternal salvation, to abjure and to render obedience to the most holy Roman Church.

I wonder too that at the end of your letter you are not confounded, with wicked lips and a deceitful tongue, rashly to condemn most Christian kings and princes, saying: "Where there is a multitude there is confusion, and many are called but few chosen." And you allege the Arian heresy to compare it to yourself; which, however, nor any other heresies whatsoever, never could, nor ever will, prevail against the most holy Roman Church, since the Lord promised that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. Was Pope Leo, whom you alleged, an Arian? Did not Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose and very many others without number manfully resist the heresies of the Arians and the others in successive times? But just as that heresy and those of other predecessors were blotted out, so will yours be blotted out, the Lord happily fighting for us. I say "yours" too, for the accomplices you allege, Greeks, Ruthenians, Bulgarians, Armenians, Indians and the like, your equals, whom you also say Eugenius of divine memory, often touched with the communion of the chalice [*text unclear*], wished to be gathered into the bosom of holy Mother Catholic Church. I hold in my keeping the decree of Eugenius, fortified with a leaden bull. If you perhaps have a copy, turn it over diligently and read where there is any mention of communion under both species for the lay people.

(p. 786)

Will you find it? No, because it is not true. So then, from the beginning of your fable you began with lies, you went on with lies, and you ended with lies, because you are a liar, and your father. And if you sent phylacteries lengthened in the writing, I have answered at greater length in confuting your sloth. And behold, I have described it for you threefold, answering a fool according to his folly, lest he glory in his folly. You will not accuse my prolixity in writing, both because from my youth, even while living in the world, I have fought against heretics, and because the matter requires it. If, however, these things are not enough, I refer myself to what I have written at length on this matter in a certain treatise. Now, however, receive these few things, the pen running quickly and in haste, burning with zeal for your salvation and that of others, to the honour, praise and glory of our Lord Jesus Christ, who with the Father and the Holy Spirit lives and reigns for ever and ever. Amen.

From Cheb, 1452; begun on the vigil of the Nativity of the Lord and concluded on the Saturday after the octave of Epiphany, while occupied with many other arduous affairs.

Letters, 1451–1452

VIII. To the Burgomaster and Council of Znojmo

(p. 786)

Addressed to the magnificent and most respected lords, the Lord Burgomaster and the Council of the City of Znojmo, his most honoured benefactors and preceptors.

Magnificent and excellent lords, my most honoured benefactors and preceptors. With most humble and due commendation first offered, and with all readiness of mind to serve, saving grace and everlasting peace in the Lord.

How much I suffer with the trouble of your affliction, that immense and, to speak more truly, unspeakable goodwill of charity with which I embrace you all is my witness; God himself too is my witness, who searches the

(p. 787)

hearts of all. For that I have written nothing to your Magnificences since my arrival here has happened for no other reason than that little or nothing offered itself to be written; yet I was always held by no small hope that some great matter would present itself to be reported, whatever had been done. For I had informed the Lord Beneš, from whom you could learn everything. When we were leaving Krumlov in Bohemia, I had given letters of invitation to that aforesaid man Rokycana, and likewise to all the barons of Bohemia and to the city of Prague, that they should rouse and urge Rokycana to set out for Cheb. But it so happened that he, terrified with fear, being wholly lacking in reason, not only did not dare to appear but refused altogether, saying that he would not come to his enemies. And like a very great heresiarch and son of perdition and iniquity, with his most filthy, most foul and polluted mouth, in his letter directed to me, beginning from the supreme Pontiff and running through all the prelates of the holy Church of God, kings and princes and all who claim the Catholic name, he condemns them all, makes them heretics, and calls them his enemies.

The most reverend Cardinal of St Peter in Chains intended to hold a diet with the Bohemians on this condition, that they promise to abide by and assent to his sentence and declaration, since he is Apostolic legate; but they would by no means do so, as men who will recognize no superior and wish to live in the spirit of liberty. I was, however, with the illustrious Duke Louis of Bavaria and with the illustrious Margraves of Brandenburg, namely John and Albert, at Bayreuth, with many barons assembled. And among many matters treated, we arranged to hold a friendly diet with the Bohemians on the Fourth Sunday of Lent, having however first received an answer from the Lord Legate whether the Bohemians would accept. I await the answer from hour to

(p. 788)

hour; when I have it, I will inform you by the first messenger available. I expect any day an answer from the illustrious Duke Frederick the Elder of Saxony, whether it pleases him that I should preach the Gospel in his city which they call "Bridge," that is, Brüx [Most]. If they accept, I will go there most willingly, that those who sleep may be roused from the sleep of death; but if they refuse, I do not know what I ought to do, except that I shall await the answer from the Lord Legate. And as it pleases the Most High, so will I direct my steps.

The Bohemians, as is reported, are greatly terrified, and say that they fear the tongue of that monk Brother John of Capistrano more than if thirty thousand horsemen rose up against them. Indeed, as public report and rumour has it, they have had it proclaimed in Prague that no one is to dare to speak of me, either good or evil. Understand that they did this to avoid rumours and contentions and to extinguish the fame of these works of God which are done daily, of which there is great talk among them, although they say they are done by

diabolical power. But do not doubt that the judgement of the Lord is nearer to them than they think. For it is hard to kick against the goad. Though it tarry, it will not fail, for the wrath of God will come down upon them. The wicked know how to speak nothing but evil. As for their singing songs in contempt of you, pay it no heed; consider that the whole Christian people calls them heretics, and above all the Vicar of Christ, our most holy Lord Pope Nicholas V, in a leaden bull lately sent to me *motu proprio*, in which he calls them erroneous, superstitious and heretics because of the practice of [communion in] both species (*nominis* in the edition). A copy of this bull I sent the day before to the Lord Beneš, who is to hand it on to you, and finally to the people of Brno and Olomouc. My two brothers have not yet returned from Rome, but I expect them continually.

I therefore wish your Magnificences to be most earnestly asked

(p. 789)

and besought in the bowels of charity not to fear their threats, nor to wish to put temporal things before spiritual, but always to be steadfast and firm in the Catholic faith and in obedience to our holy Mother the Church, as you have always been wont, with the highest praise and glory; since there is laid up for you a crown of justice, which the Lord, the just judge, will render to you in that day. For the Lord is near, who will free his people from the hands of Pharaoh, and will console his faithful, whom he sometimes allows to be afflicted by the wicked, that they may attain greater glory and greater triumph.

What you write of the coming of the Hungarians to the borders and bounds of Moravia was most welcome to me; and this was most delightful to me, what the Lord Beneš reported, namely the most desired answers on the part of your city, of Brno, of Olomouc and of the most reverend Bishop of Olomouc to the articles given by the Bohemians. And since the lofty Lord John, governor of the kingdom of the Hungarians, offered to come to me wherever I wished with all his power and resources, I wrote to his Lordship in recent days, earnestly asking him to deign to protect and defend our Catholic Moravians with his arm from the jaws of the Bohemians. I hope that, if ever it should be necessary, he would come to the aid and succour of you all.

I will make an end of speaking, most faithfully offering you the gift of my prayers and giving and devoting my whole self to all your good pleasures and commands with my whole heart; which you can easily prove, if you see fit to use my service in any matter you consider welcome and salutary to you. May your Magnificences fare well, with your whole most Christian city, which may Christ protect for everlasting ages.

From Cheb, 10 January 1452, in great haste. Humble little servant of the Friars Minor of the Observance, though faithful bedesman, Brother John of Capistrano;

(p. 790)

I have subscribed with my own hand.

Note in the edition: Olomouc library, M. C. g. 16, pp. 284–286.

IX. John Borotín, schismatic, to the priest John of Capistrano

Greeting, and to do and teach saving works. I beseech you, religious brother beloved in Christ, to receive in charity the writing I write here, to read it in holy patience, and to discuss it prudently with a sound mind, as befits a wise man. For I do not intend to rebuke you or to offend you in your good and holy deeds, but I wish to set before the eyes of your mind what men say of you in Bohemia who have seen your works and heard your teachings, so that, if it is given you, you may understand whether the things you say, teach or assert are all sound, or whether they are scandalous and fitted for your perdition and that of others.

When I came lately into the district of Hradec, I heard many things about you even from grave men, and saw writings full of grief: namely how you, putting aside all fear of God, like another melancholic of unsound

mind, wound and do not cease to wound Bohemia and Moravia together with your venomous words and deeds, when you say and assert that all who communicate or have communicated under both species are damned and will be damned; which it is horrible and impious not only to assert or say but even to think. For if that subtlety were true, it would follow that Christ our Saviour, the institutor of this sacrament, who said, "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you," [would be condemned]. But you, as is said, like another antichrist, say the contrary to Christ: "If you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you will be damned." And the primitive Church, which practised both species,

(p. 791)

as the Council of Constance testifies, and the Apostle Paul, who taught this communion to the Corinthians when he says that he received it from the Lord (which epistle the whole Church throughout the world holds and reads), who also says: "Even if an angel should come from heaven and teach otherwise, let him not be believed." Bohemia too and Greece would fall under this anathema of yours which, as is said, you preach and teach; of which there is an evident sign, that you have already led many away from that most sacred communion, as though it were itself the way of perdition, as you, it is said, assert and teach. What else is this, then, but that you prepare the way to men's perdition, stir up wars and hatreds among men, and break charity among men, which is the way to salvation? O, if you understood what you teach and what you assert, you would surely lay your finger on your mouth in these matters and be silent!

Or do you not know, or perhaps pretend not to know, that the Council of Basel, then gathered in the Holy Spirit, which represented the Church, as was made clear to the whole world by the writings and sayings of this council, granted such most sacred communion under both species to the Bohemians and Moravians by the authority of Christ and of the Church, his true bride? Moreover the said council commanded the Archbishop of Prague, the Bishop of Olomouc and the Bishop of Litomyšl who then were, and all having the cure of souls, strictly enjoining them in virtue of holy obedience, to give communion thus to the people who have the custom of so communicating, even under the gravest penalties, as is contained in the Compacts of the said council with the Bohemians and Moravians, sealed with the seal of the council. To say and assert the contrary to a council gathered in the Holy Spirit is therefore, as is believed, to say the contrary to the Holy Spirit, which no one of sound mind will dare to attempt, unless perhaps a melancholic, full of the spirit of some melancholy. Nor wonder, brother, that I write "melancholy," for Aristotle asks in his Problems: "Why have all men

(p. 792)

of politics and heroes mostly been melancholic?" For signs of a certain melancholy appear in you, as is said, in that you are wont to shout and to incite others to such shouting. It is also said of you that you said: "If communion under both species is proved to me, I am willing to be burned." I hope that it will be sufficiently proved to you, if you are willing. Nor does any wise man wish you to be burned, but rather that you live and do penance for false and pernicious teaching, if it has been done by you, so that you may amend for the better, as is fitting.

These and many other things men say of you, which I pass over; I do not accept them as true of you, but set what I have heard before the eyes of your mind. For a wise man hearing will be wiser. And I desire and ask from the heart, nay, in the power of God I admonish you, as you love your honour and salvation, to answer me in writing on all these things, so that I may know how to answer for the truth before the wise and the common people to those who speak, or perhaps lie, about you, and to defend you in truth; since the Apostle Peter writes: "Give a reason of your faith to everyone that asks you." If anything written is strange or offensive to the ears, a religious and sensible man will pardon it.

Given . . .

Master of his own, John Borotín.

Note in the edition: Olomouc library, MS 2. VI. 6.

Reply to John Borotín, 1452

Reply to John Borotín, part 1

(p. 792)

X. Letter of reply of St John of Capistrano to the aforesaid letter of John Borotín

Brother John of Capistrano, least and unworthy of the Order of Minors, with saving spirit, the grace of eternal light.

It befits strenuous champions to put their prowess, bestowed on them by the Most High, to service in humble and devout obedience under our one God and Lord

(p. 793)

Jesus Christ and his one supreme pontiff, and then successively under ecclesiastical as well as temporal princes, so that their notable exercises may be directed to the protection of true justice, to be carried out by all mortals; so that they may receive the most peaceful fruits of their good labours and works, the unfading crown of retribution of everlasting glory, to which all the talents and intellectual industries and studies of Christians ought to aspire; so that when all must appear before the tribunal of Jesus Christ the judge, they may happily and joyfully receive, with the just and blessed, the triumphs of the eternal kingdom and the joys of the blessed, while the unjust and wicked, under the horrible curse of our Lord Jesus Christ himself, go down in headlong ruin to the torments of Tartarus with the apostate diabolical spirits, whom in this fleeting life they damnably chose to obey and serve rather than our most clement Lord Jesus Christ.

I pray you therefore, I beseech and adjure you, for the eternal salvation of yourself and your followers: consider these things, have God always before your eyes, and, as a friend of truth and of divine justice, love truth itself and cultivate justice itself. I would say these things to you, though unknown to one unknown, out of the charity owed to God and neighbour, with all fitting diligence. For the fancies of men are various, and their desires diverse, and the opinions of many erroneous, as appears clearly also in the sentences of the ancient philosophers, some of whom placed happiness in virtue of mind, that is, in magnanimity, some in the knowledge of truth and virtue, and some in carnal pleasure. But the true Catholic and holy doctors rightly and justly place happiness and true beatitude in the perfect aggregation of all goods, and in the most true knowledge, most happy apprehension and most perfect fruition of the supreme good itself. And so, blessed is the people whose Lord is their God, their glorious possession and

(p. 794)

infinite, inestimable and eternal treasure. These temporal goods, given us for support, are to be reckoned by true Christians not as substantial but as accidental, transitory and unstable. The only true riches are those which make us rich in virtues, exalt us with divine graces, adorn us with spiritual gifts and grace us with divine benefits, and make us sublime, and at the last make all the elect glorious with the double robe, namely of soul and body; in whose number I wish that you, Master, as also my littleness, may happily be gathered.

I have been roused very recently by the reports of these notable citizens of Olomouc, who state that the above letter was presented by your messenger to be consigned to me. Whether its author is a Christian, whether a rational man, whether a modest person, whether circumspect in speech, whether endowed with any decency, the contents of his own letter have laid open. In a serpentine manner he seems to flatter and fawn at the beginning; afterwards he has vomited out the poison he carried in his heart and belches forth what is his own, unable to utter anything but what he has. I, though unworthy and undeserving, yet coming into these parts as nuncio and commissary of the Apostolic [See] and general inquisitor of heretical depravity, teach, hold and observe, and pronounce to be observed by all the Catholic Christian people, the things that are true, Catholic

and salutary, and that have been taught, preached and observed by the most holy Roman Church through the course of so many years, perhaps for a thousand three hundred years, within which times so many holy men and women have been canonized. But whether those who presume to bark against my most true teaching deign to show any reverence to the most holy Roman Church, the Apostolic See and our most holy Lord, their own writings evidently show. For, as the Lord said (Matt. 10:40): "He that receives you receives me, and he that receives me receives him that sent me." And Luke 10:16: "He that hears you

(p. 795)

hears me, and he that despises you despises me; and he that despises me despises him that sent me." This Christ said to his twelve apostles when he sent them to preach. But these detractors of mine show as much reverence to the Pope and to the most holy Roman and universal Catholic Church, under the obedience of our same most holy Lord Pope Nicholas V, living and awaiting eternal salvation, as the decency they use in their writings.

For this John Borotín says that I, setting aside all fear of God, like another man of unsound, melancholic mind, wound and do not cease to wound Bohemia and Moravia alike with my poisonous words and deeds; as if he reckoned by his own judgement that all Bohemia and Moravia had cast off the meritorious yoke of obedience and rebelled against the most holy Church, when nevertheless by the grace of God a great part in each region has been preserved, and perseveres under the obedience of Catholic truth. That detractor adds that I said and asserted that all who communicate or have communicated under both species are damned and will be damned. This universal proposition of his, which he testifies I asserted, is most false and lying, and was never so uttered by me. For I have said, and I say, I testify and assert: that it is Catholic, meritorious, salutary and necessary to believe, hold and observe whatever the most holy Roman Church believes, preaches, teaches and keeps; and that all who are not afraid to think and teach otherwise than the most holy Roman Church preaches and observes concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, or concerning baptism or confession of sins, matrimony or the other ecclesiastical sacraments, and generally all heretics whatsoever, are excommunicated. I have also said and say with blessed Augustine: "Hold most firmly and in no way doubt that every heretic or schismatic will share the burning of eternal fire with the devil and his angels,

(p. 796)

unless before the end of life he has been incorporated into Catholic unity and reintegrated into the Church." I have also said and say with the same blessed Augustine that for every man who does not hold the unity of the Catholic Church, neither baptism, nor almsgiving however copious, nor death undergone for the name of Christ can avail to salvation. I have also said and say with the same St Augustine, to Vincent the Donatist, that "from the Catholic Church are all the Lord's sacraments, which you so have and give as they were had and given before" in the decrees, etc.; he speaks of those Donatist heretics who perverted and disturbed the ecclesiastical sacraments; on this is the text of the Decretum, [C.] 1, q. 1, c. 51, *Ex catholica*. Blessed Augustine means to declare that the Donatists ought not to have perverted the rite and observance of the sacraments commonly observed by the whole Catholic Church. Whence the same Augustine, writing to Demetrius [*sic*] the heretic, said: "The sacraments which you have not changed, as you have them, are approved by us, lest perhaps, while we wish to correct your depravity, we do sacrilegious injury to those sacraments which in your ministries have not been condemned by your depravity." I have also said and say with the same blessed Augustine, *On the Faith, to Peter*: "Hold most firmly and in no way doubt that for the baptized outside the Church, if they do not return to the Church, ruin is heaped up by baptism; for so much does the communion of ecclesiastical fellowship avail for salvation that one is not saved by baptism when it is not given where it ought to be given." I have also said with the same that gifts possessed outside the unity of the Church are useless, since he says: "Let us hold unity, dearest brethren! Outside unity, he who works a miracle is nothing. The people of Israel were in unity and did (not) work miracles; outside unity were the

magicians of Pharaoh, and they did things like Moses (the people of Israel, as I said, did not). Which were to be saved before God, those who worked miracles or those who did not? The apostle Peter raised

(p. 797)

a dead man; Simon Magus did (the like). There were many Christians who could not do what Peter did, nor what Simon did; but yet they rejoiced in this, that their names were written in heaven."

Augustine means to express that although singular gifts of God are conferred on some of the elect, and not on each and every one, yet all and each of the elect will be saved. Hence the Apostle says (1 Cor. 12): "I give you to understand that no man speaking by the Spirit of God says anathema to Jesus; and no man can say the Lord Jesus but by the Holy Spirit. Now there are diversities of graces, but the same Spirit; and there are diversities of ministries, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations, but the same God, who works all in all. And the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man unto profit. To one indeed by the Spirit is given the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge according to the same Spirit; to another faith in the same Spirit; to another the grace of healing in one Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another the discerning of spirits; to another diverse kinds of tongues; to another interpretation of speeches. But all these things one and the same Spirit works, dividing to every one according as he will. For as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body, so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or gentiles, whether bond or free; and in one Spirit we have all been made to drink." See how the Apostle declares the unity of the whole Christian people in one mystical body of the Catholic faithful; from whose words also, when he says "in one Spirit we have all been made to drink," it is clearly intimated that the words of Christ (John 6), "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you," are to be understood spiritually and not carnally, as the Lord also declares in the same place when he says: "The words

(p. 798)

that I have spoken to you are spirit and life." In this sense too the Apostle speaks (1 Cor. 10): "For I would not have you ignorant, dearest brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and all in Moses were baptized, in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink (and they drank of the spiritual rock that followed them, and the rock was Christ). But with most of them God was not well pleased, for they were overthrown in the desert. Now these things were done in a figure of us, that we should not covet evil things as they also coveted." And below: "Neither do you murmur, as some of them murmured, and were destroyed by the destroyer. Now all these things happened to them in figure, and they are written for our correction, upon whom the ends of the world are come." And below: "The chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord? For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread." For it is most expressly plain, according to the true understanding of all the holy doctors, that the words of the Apostle, like the words of Christ, are to be understood spiritually and not carnally; for, as the same Apostle said (2 Cor. 3), "the letter kills, but the spirit quickens." For blessed Augustine says in the treatise of the *Eighty-three Questions*: "The circumstances of the Scriptures are wont to illuminate the substance of the truth." And therefore circumstances are to be considered both in the words of Christ and in the words of the Apostle.

For when he had fed five thousand men from five barley loaves and two fishes, and twelve full baskets of fragments were left over, and on the next day, having refused the applause when they wished to make him king, the crowds sought him, Jesus Christ said: "Amen, amen I say to you, you seek me, not because you have seen

(p. 799)

miracles, but because you did eat of the loaves and were filled. Labour not for the meat which perishes, but for that which endures unto life everlasting, which the Son of man will give you." And when they asked how they should work the works of God, Jesus Christ answered: "This is the work of God, that you believe in him whom he has sent." They said to him: "What sign therefore do you show, that we may see and may believe you?" See how the wretched unbelievers wounded themselves with their own darts, entangled themselves in their own words and chained themselves with their own snares, when they thought that the things of faith could be seen with carnal eyes. For, as St Augustine said, "there is no faith of visible things; for faith is to believe what you do not see." And the Apostle (Heb. 11): "Faith is the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not." The wretched, blinded Jews add: "What work do you? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written: He gave them bread from heaven to eat." Then Jesus said: "Amen, amen I say to you, Moses gave you not bread from heaven, but my Father gives you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is that which comes down from heaven and gives life to the world." And again: "I am the bread of life; he that comes to me shall not hunger, and he that believes in me shall never thirst. But I said unto you that you also have seen me, and you believe not." And again: "And this is the will of my Father that sent me, that every one who sees the Son and believes in him may have life everlasting, and I will raise him up in the last day." For they saw him as a man, and in this there was not faith but knowledge. It is necessary therefore to believe by faith that he is God and the true Son of God, just as he is true man. So too Thomas, who, unbelieving about his resurrection, wished to see and touch, and said: "My Lord and my God." Jesus said: "Because thou hast seen me, Thomas, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen and have believed" (John, last chapter). For what did Thomas see but Christ's humanity, and recognize

(p. 800)

his true resurrection? But when he said "my God," he made plain that he believed him to be true God, and so he confesses his divinity.

In such a sense of faith too are the words of Christ to be understood. When he had said to the murmuring Jews, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven," he said: "Amen, amen I say unto you: he that believes in me has everlasting life. I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and are dead. This is the bread which comes down from heaven, that if any man eat of it he may not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world." The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" Then Jesus said to them: "Amen, amen I say unto you: except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him. As the living Father has sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eats me, the same also shall live by me. This is the bread that came down from heaven; not as your fathers did eat manna in the desert and are dead. He that eats this bread shall live for ever." And when many even of his disciples said, "This saying is hard, and who can hear it?", Jesus answered them: "It is the spirit that quickens; the flesh profits nothing. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life. But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that did not believe." And when many of his disciples went back, scandalized by the aforesaid words, Jesus said to them: "Will you also go away?" Simon Peter answered: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we have believed and have known that thou art the Christ, the Son of God." See how most clearly the Holy Spirit declares the true

(p. 801)

understanding of Christ's words, "Except you eat and except you drink," and again that what precedes, what is in the middle and what follows is to be taken for the truth of faith, according to which it is necessary to believe that Christ Jesus is true God begotten of God, just as it is necessary [to believe] that he is true man born of the Virgin. Which Peter also testifies most clearly when he says: "And we have believed and have

known that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

For no one ought to doubt that divine Scripture has been more soundly understood, grasped and comprehended by the whole universal and Catholic Church than by heretics, who, it is agreed, have been confounded even from the time of the apostles; and as many as have withdrawn from the unity of the Roman Catholic [Church] have perished miserably. Hence blessed Jerome too, on that of Matthew 16, "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose," etc., "and whatsoever thou shalt bind," etc., said: "Whoever have separated themselves from the unity of faith and the holiness of the Church can neither be loosed from sins nor enter heaven." And blessed Bede says to the same effect: "Whoever in any way have segregated themselves from the unity of the faith or of the fellowship of blessed Peter the Apostle, such can neither be absolved from the bonds of sins nor enter the gate of paradise; rather they will be plunged into infernal destruction." If the Hussites diligently attended to this danger, they would surely turn away from their errors. They would consider too what a countless multitude of the faithful and once so acceptable kingdom of Bohemia they have, by their frauds, liberties, errors and lies preached, divided from the unity of the Church and thrust back into the infernal abyss, and busy themselves to thrust back still. Persevering with obstinate mind and hardened brow, and adding evils to evils without shame, they follow their errors in this way even today; they have led so renowned a kingdom into pernicious schism and very many heresies, and under the appearance of piety they fraudulently lead many in even today; as if they alone, better than all the faithful of Christ, even so many saints

Reply to John Borotín, part 2

(p. 802)

already canonized, understood the law of Christ, and wished by their perverse, depraved and condemned understanding to teach all others and entangle them in their errors. This will never be possible; nor will the divine truth itself, Christ Jesus, suffer it, since in the Gospel he so promised to Peter and his fellow apostles (Luke 22): "Behold, Satan has desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy faith fail not; and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren." For we think this was said to Peter not only for himself or for his time, but also for all his successors in the holy Roman Church. Hence too (Matthew, last chapter), after his resurrection and before his ascension, he said to his apostles: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Going therefore, teach ye all," etc. "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." Since therefore Christ is always with the Church, it has always been lawful and will perpetually be lawful for him to reveal his secrets to his faithful living together under the obedience of the successors of St Peter; as he also said to Peter and the other apostles in his last discourse (John 16:12): "I have yet many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. But when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will teach you all truth." The Spirit of truth, therefore, of our Lord Jesus Christ himself, revealed in successive times to the holy councils the whole rite concerning the use of the sacraments which today the holy Roman Church so preaches, teaches and observes; as Innocent says: "Indeed we find many things, both of the Lord's words and of his deeds, omitted by the Evangelists, which the apostles are read most expressly to have supplied by word or by deed." For Paul in the Acts of the Apostles (20:35) says thus: "I would have you remember the word of our Lord Jesus Christ, how he said: It is a more blessed thing to give rather than to receive." None of the four Evangelists

(p. 803)

writes this; nor did any of them express what Paul says, writing of Christ in 1 Cor. 15: "He was seen by more than five hundred brethren at once; after that he was seen by James; and last of all he was seen also by me, as by one born out of due time." Hence the Gloss says there on the word "Indeed": "The Church keeps many things which were not handed down by the apostles, which nevertheless, since they are approved by long

custom, are of no less authority than if they had been handed down by the apostles" (dist. 11, c. *Ecclesiasticarum*; dist. 12, c. *Illa*). Whence blessed Augustine, from the sayings of Basil, says: "Of ecclesiastical institutions we have received some in writing, some confirmed by apostolic traditions through the successors in the ministry, while others, strengthened by custom, usage has approved; to which an equal rite and the same affection of piety is owed to both." And below: "For, to begin there, what Scripture taught the faithful to be marked with the sign of the saving cross? Which [Scripture] commended either the threefold [cross], or the words of the long prayer or consecration set out over the bread and the chalice? For we have learned not only what is contained in the Gospel or inserted in any way by the Apostle, but also many other things that commend, as it were, great force to the ministries. We bless the font of baptism with the oil of unction; add to this that we anoint three times with oil those whom we baptize, and instruct them in words to renounce Satan and his angels. Whence these and not a few others of this kind have been observed in the ministries by the fathers, after ecclesiastical custom, with reverence and diligence, only by a silent and mystical tradition, kept in silence rather than published in writing." And the same Augustine, writing to the priest Casulanus about ecclesiastical institutions, says: "We praise the custom which is known to usurp nothing against the Catholic faith. In those matters on which divine Scripture has established nothing certain, the custom of the people of God and the institutions of the elders are to be held as law. And just as transgressors of the divine laws, so despisers of ecclesiastical

(p. 804)

customs are to be restrained." And the same Augustine, in the same book *On the Christian Faith*, says of the Catholic Church spread through the world: "Whatever is held in it is proved to exist in three ways: either it is the authority of the Scriptures, or universal tradition, or the proper instruction of a certain particular [church]. By the sacred authority of holy Scripture the whole Church is bound; by the universal tradition of the elders the whole is no less bound; but by private institutions and proper instructions each [church] subsists and is ruled according to the variety of places, as seems good to each." The aforesaid words are to be diligently ruminated. Since it cannot be proved by the firm authority of sacred Scripture that the lay people are bound by precept to communion under both species; and since by the universal tradition of the elders, the councils and the supreme pontiffs the universal Catholic Church throughout the whole world has kept, from long-standing and most ancient praiseworthy custom, free from all danger and abuse, through the course of so many years, that the lay people ought to communicate under one species only: it is known to be rash enough and horrible to presume to attempt the contrary.

My friend also falsely and lyingly throws at me that I said: "If you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you will be damned," and that so, like Antichrist, I say the contrary of Christ. This most false conclusion of his against me has taken nothing from Christ's truth, nor did I ever speak so. But as I said above: the words of Christ are to be taken spiritually with a pious and truthful understanding, as the Lord himself declared when he said: "They are spirit and life." Otherwise it would seem a charge against those Jews to whom he was speaking as to unbelieving and faithless and most obstinate enemies of the truth and reprobate heretics, if, as soon as they heard these words, they had not torn, rent and gnawed with their teeth the natural flesh of Christ in which he was speaking, and [drunk] his own natural blood,

(p. 805)

devoured it with a dragon's gape, and thirstily absorbed it like dry earth drinking in the heavenly dew. For the imitators and followers of those unbelieving Jews, as judaizers, wish to infer that, just as the words of Christ written in John 3 and spoken by the Lord to Nicodemus, "Unless a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," were from then on binding for necessity of salvation universally on all mortals, so too were the words of Christ written in John 6, "Except you eat and except you drink," etc. This, however, is ridiculous and absurd, discordant and rash. For it is most expressly plain that the Lord Jesus Christ instituted the sacrament of baptism when he said to Nicodemus, "Unless a man be born again of water

and the Holy Spirit," etc.; but when he said "Except you eat and drink," etc., he had by no means instituted the sacrament of his body.

It is also plain and notorious that the aforesaid words of Christ, "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Spirit," are to be taken in a sound and Catholic understanding. For according to the rule of logic, for the verification of copulatives it is required that both parts be true. Since therefore there is a copulative conjunction there, "of water and the Holy Spirit," it would seem to be inferred that without formal baptism there can be no eternal salvation. But since there are many, not only reputed saints but even canonized as saints by the most holy Roman Church, who did not have formal baptism, such as all the Holy Innocents, and St Emerentiana, foster-sister of St Agnes, and very many others, such as the philosophers and rhetoricians converted at the disputation of St Catherine, it is most lucidly clear that the words of Christ are to be understood and resolved according to their truest manner, sense and understanding. So too when he says (Mark, last chapter), "Going into the whole world, preach the gospel to every creature": therefore to ants, flies and fleas? Not so, he says, not so; but like the dust which the wind drives from the face of the earth, so will they be blotted out of the book

(p. 806)

of the living who strive to condemn sacred Scripture. For "every creature" is man, because, as blessed Gregory says, man has being with stones, life with trees, sensation with animals, and understanding with the angels and blessed spirits. Surely the eleven apostles, to whom Christ was then speaking, would have had enough to busy themselves with if they had had to preach the gospel to every creature distinctly and one by one. It is fitting, therefore, that the aforesaid word "every," which is a universal sign, be taken in a right, sound and Catholic understanding, so that it be preached according to place and time where a hearing is granted, and the truth preached be passed on by word of mouth from one to another, that the saying may be fulfilled which is written in the psalm and by the Apostle (Rom. 10): "Their sound has gone forth into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the whole world."

Jesus adds: "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believes not shall be condemned." From the aforesaid words very many most true propositions are drawn. Most true is the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ: "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved." It can also be most true: "He that believes and is baptized will be condemned"; for someone may have believed and been baptized and apostatized from the truth of faith and lived evilly and ended his life in crimes, and then have been and be damned, by the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ (Matt. 7): "Not every one that says to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that does the will of my Father who is in heaven, he shall enter into the kingdom of heaven." Therefore, together with the belief of faith and baptism, the exercise of virtuous work is required, as James said in chapter 2 of his canonical [epistle]: "Faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself." And below he says: "For even as the body without the spirit is dead, so also faith without works is dead." This too is most true: "He that believes, though he has not been baptized," namely with formal baptism, "shall nevertheless be saved" by virtue of spiritual baptism,

(p. 807)

which is called the baptism of the Spirit. So it is expressly plain from the determination of the most holy Roman Church in the chapter *Debitum* and in the chapter *Maiores*, *On baptism and its effect*; and our sacred theologians teach it in the fourth [book] of the Sentences, distinctions 4, 5 and 6. For a threefold baptism is distinguished, namely of the Spirit, of water and of blood. Therefore this too is most true: "He that believes, though he has not been baptized with formal baptism, shall be saved by virtue of the Spirit and of blood"; as is plain of many holy martyrs who confidently suffered death for Christ, even though not baptized with formal baptism. This too is most true: "He that has not believed, yet has been baptized," namely with formal baptism, "shall be saved"; as is most expressly plain in baptized infants, who do not yet know what they

believe, nor even what they see, as the most Christian Justinian says in the Code, IV, *De falsa moneta*, etc. [*reference as printed*]. Of these too blessed Augustine says, *On the Baptism of Little Ones*: "What is it for little ones to have faith, but the sacrament of faith?" For baptized little ones are saved by the merit of Christ and the faith of holy Catholic Church. Hence too Isidore says, *On Offices* II: "Little ones are baptized with another professing, because they cannot yet speak or believe; as also the sick, the dumb and the deaf, in whose stead another professes the faith and answers for them while they are baptized." And the Lord Jesus said: "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God" (Mark 10). It follows: "Amen I say to you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall not enter into it. And embracing them, and laying his hands upon them, he blessed them." This too can be most true: "Someone who has not believed, nor been baptized with formal baptism, yet has suffered death in reproach and ignominy of Christ, as were those holy little Innocent Martyrs (Matt. 2), shall be saved." For so says blessed Thomas Aquinas on the fourth [book] of the Sentences: "If today Saracens or other infidels

(p. 808)

were to occupy some city of Christians in which, among other worshippers of Christ, they killed many unbaptized little children in reproach and contempt of the Christian faith, it is piously to be believed that the baptism of the Spirit and of blood has supplied, and that such little children are saved." Most true too is the sentence of the Saviour in the same place, namely Matthew, last chapter [*sic*]: "But he that believes not shall be condemned." For it must be understood of adults, since of little ones it was said above that, baptized, they will be saved by the merit of Christ and the faith of the Church. The word "shall be condemned" must also be noticed, since in John 3 he said: "He that does not believe is already judged," namely before God and before men who know him to be an unbeliever; yet he will be condemned on the day of judgement, both in the sight of those who knew him in this frail life and in the sight of those who had no knowledge of him at all. This too is most true: "He that has not believed nor been baptized with any baptism shall be condemned," although Christ does not repeat "nor been baptized."

It is most expressly plain, therefore, that the words of Christ are to be understood by the breath of the Holy Spirit. And therefore so too must the words of Christ (John 6), "Except you eat and except you drink," etc., be understood, so that they are taken in a spiritual sense and not a carnal or literal one; as he said in the same place: "It is the spirit that quickens; the flesh profits nothing." Therefore to eat the flesh of Christ and drink the blood in faithlessness and the obstinacy of unbelief, whether of heresy or of schism, profits nothing; nay rather it harms, because he sins mortally who so eats and drinks, according to the sentence of the Apostle (1 Cor. 11): "For he that eats and drinks unworthily eats and drinks judgement to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord"; that is, as the Gloss says, not distinguishing this most holy sacrament from other foods. It can also be understood: not discerning the body of the Lord from the mystical body in the unity of faith of the Catholic Church. For, as blessed Augustine says: "I ask you, brothers and

(p. 809)

sisters, tell me: which seems to you greater, the body of Christ or the word of Christ? If you wish to answer truly, you must say this, that the word of Christ is not less than the body of Christ. And therefore with as much care as we observe when the body of Christ is ministered to us, with so much care let us observe the word of God which is dispensed to us, lest, while we think or speak of something else, it perish from a pure heart; for he will be no less guilty who has heard the word of God negligently than he who by his negligence has allowed the body of Christ to fall to the ground." These are words fearsome enough for those who understand, preach and teach sacred Scripture wrongly and most perversely, since they lead their hearers and followers with them in their errors into the abyss of eternal damnation.

It is fitting therefore to know the distinction which our doctors make on the fourth [book] of the Sentences, in the question on the manner of eating. Some take the body and blood of the Lord sacramentally and

spiritually, as do all good priests celebrating Mass; and for such it is a precept of the Church to communicate under both species when they celebrate, as we find in the second [distinction] *De consecratione*. And it seems no less [true] that on Good Friday, according to the most fitting rite of the most holy Roman Church, it is prescribed that the one singing the Mass communicates under one species only; and the supreme pontiff, whom we call Pope, whether on Holy Thursday or on the day of the Lord's Resurrection, communicates the cardinals, whether bishops, priests or deacons, and also the patriarchs and archbishops, metropolitans, bishops, abbots, provosts, priors, parish priests and whatever priests assist and approach, under one species only; and they are not damned on that account, as our friends would have it. There have been perhaps thousands upon thousands of saints of both sexes who never communicated under both species and yet are saints; among whom are blessed Benedict and Francis, who out of humility never wished to be made priests and

(p. 810)

never communicated under both species, but under one, and yet are most excellent saints. All of Christ's faithful also communicate sacramentally and spiritually who, in the state of grace and without mortal sin, devoutly receive the most holy body under one species only, according to the rite and ancient and praiseworthy custom of the most holy Roman Church.

Some, however, communicate sacramentally but not spiritually, as Judas communicated with the apostles. Such are all who communicate in mortal sin, of whom the Apostle [says] (1 Cor. 11): "For he that eats and drinks unworthily eats and drinks judgement to himself," etc. Some, again, take [it] spiritually though not sacramentally, as are all the faithful who truly believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, understanding spiritually his saving words "Except you eat and except you drink," etc., and fulfilling them in deed. Hence Augustine, *On the Remedy of Penance*: "Why do you make ready teeth and belly? It is not food for teeth and bellies, but for minds. Believe, and you have eaten. Only believe in him: this is to eat the living bread; he who believes in him eats him."

For in this sacrament the species or form of bread or wine is distinguished from the threefold substance itself of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, being true God and man, contains in himself the divine substance, because he is God; the spiritual substance, because he has a rational soul; and the bodily substance, because he took a true human body from the Virgin and possesses it glorified in heaven. He assumed it passible, he resumed it impassible; he assumed it mortal, he resumed it immortal. Truly, as in one essence or substance there are three persons, so in one person three substances are contained. In like manner in this deifying sacrament a threefold distinction is made: one, that which is sacrament and not the thing; another, that which is sacrament and thing; another, thing and not sacrament. Sacrament and not thing is the species

Reply to John Borotín, part 3

(p. 811)

of bread and wine, which remain accidents without a subject; for a sacrament is called the sign of a sacred thing, which, "because of the species it presents to the senses, makes something else come of itself into knowledge," says Augustine. Sacrament and thing is Christ's own flesh and blood. Thing and not sacrament is the mystical flesh of Christ, that is, the unity of the faithful, as of many grains one bread is made and of many grapes one wine is pressed together. Of this sacrament, therefore, one thing is said to be both contained and signified under the species of wine [*sic*]; the other signified and not contained. The thing contained and signified is the true flesh of Christ, which he took from the Virgin, and the true blood of Christ, which he shed for us; not, however, with passibility, as then, but with impassibility and glory, as he now reigns in heaven and works through grace in this sacrament. The thing signified and not contained is the unity of the Catholic Church. Whence blessed Jerome, on the Epistle to the Ephesians: "The flesh and blood of Christ is

understood in two ways: either that which was crucified and buried, and the blood which was shed by the soldier's lance; or that spiritual and divine [flesh] of which he himself says (John 6): My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." And Augustine says: "Because the Lord suffered for us, he commends to us in this sacrament his blood and body, which he also made to be ourselves. For we too have been made his body, and by his mercy we are what we receive. You came to the water and were sprinkled, and were made the Lord's bread. See what you have received. As therefore you see it is one, so be you one, loving one another, holding one faith, one hope and undivided charity. Heretics, when they receive this, receive a testimony against themselves, because they seek division, while this bread indicates unity. So too the wine was in many grapes, and now it is one in its birth. The chalice (is filled) after the pressure of the winepress; and you, after those fasts, after labours, after

(p. 812)

humility and contrition in the name of Jesus Christ, have now come as it were to the chalice, and there you are; on the table and in the chalice you are with us. For together we take this, together we drink this, because together we live." Hence Augustine, in the same place and in the sermon on infants, says: "So our Lord Jesus Christ signified us, and as he willed us to belong to him, he consecrated the mystery of our peace and unity on the table. He who receives the mystery of unity and does not hold the bond of peace receives not a mystery for himself but a testimony against himself. No one ought in any way to doubt that each of the faithful becomes a partaker of the Lord's body and blood when in baptism he is made a member of Christ, and that he is not estranged from the fellowship of that heavenly bread even if he passes from this world, established in the unity of the body, before he eats that bread and drinks the chalice; for he will not be deprived of the participation and benefit of that sacrament when he has found in himself that which the sacrament signifies." So Augustine.

Contemplate, then, my friends, these golden words; return to the heart; remember the days of old (then Bohemia was devout), and have the eternal years in mind; and do not despise, do not flee, do not withdraw from the sweetest milk of our kind mother and the fellowship of holy men in Christ Jesus. But be reintegrated with us, be reincorporated with us, so that, according to the Apostle (Eph. 3), "being rooted and founded in charity, you may be able to comprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth, to know also the charity of Christ which surpasses all knowledge, that you may be filled unto all the fullness of God. Now to him who is able to do all things more abundantly than we desire or understand, according to the power that works in us, to him be glory in the Church and in Christ Jesus unto all generations, world without end. Amen."

These, then, are the things I preach; these the things

(p. 813)

I beseech; these the things I pray for; these the things I urge. Take then, if you please, with charity, the remaining nectar, the food of angels and the reward of the blessed; and "be not emulous of evildoers, for evildoers shall be cut off," but the Lord will exalt the just.

Our friends say moreover that, according to what I preach and teach, the primitive Church, which practised both species, and Bohemia together with Greece would fall under anathema. But I never preached this hypothetical proposition, nor intend to preach it, namely that the primitive Church would have fallen under anathema. Far be it from me to say this. For the primitive Church, as far as Catholics are concerned, was always with Christ and was free for nothing else but teaching and preaching that Christ Jesus is the true Son of God, and so true God and true man, son of the most glorious Virgin, conceived by the Holy Spirit and born of a virgin, her virginity preserved at all times; then that he suffered, was crucified, died and was buried, and on the third day rose from the dead; then on the fortieth day ascended into heaven, and afterwards, on the tenth day from the day of the Ascension, sent the Spirit upon his apostles; and that he will come to judge the

living and the dead. And since they taught and preached these and other things pertaining to the necessity of faith and eternal salvation, since they had many gainsayers and persecutors and were few, they were always as men ready for death; and therefore those who were converted were likewise disposed to death for keeping that truth. When Peter preached, those hearing the truth itself were pricked in heart and said to Peter and to the rest of the apostles: "What shall we do, men and brethren?" But Peter said to them: "Do penance, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." And with very many other words he testified and exhorted them, saying: "Save yourselves from this perverse generation." They therefore that received his word were baptized, and there were added

(p. 814)

in that day about three thousand souls. And they were persevering in the doctrine of the apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread, and in prayers, as blessed Luke writes (Acts 2). It is seen, therefore, that they baptized in the name of Christ; you see also that he expresses "and in the communication of the breaking of bread," and does not say "the drinking of the chalice." Luke also adds in the same chapter: "And all they that believed were together and had all things common. Their possessions and goods they sold and divided them to all, according as every one had need. And continuing daily in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, they took their meat with gladness and simplicity of heart, praising God and having favour with all the people. And the Lord increased daily together such as should be saved."

These words therefore are to be contemplated and ruminated with keenness of understanding: that, as men expecting death from day to day and from hour to hour, they applied all their study, all their diligence and solicitude to keeping themselves holy and withdrawn from all earthly goods in holiness of life; and therefore they continued daily in the temple and broke bread from house to house, namely consecrated bread, as the doctors commonly understand. Nor is mention made there of the chalice. The phrase "from house to house" is therefore to be attended to; for then they did not presume to break bread in the temple, but, hiding here and there, they consecrated from house to house and ministered in simplicity of heart, without any ornaments, without solemnity, without ordered canonical hours and other divine office. They were not free, then, for the adornments of holy things [*sic*], because time did not allow it, nor was it certainly expedient; nor did they baptize any but adults, who of themselves asked to be baptized and sprinkled with water. For that primitive Church was like a tender little plant; and the synagogue of the Jews was maliciously jealous of it, persecuted the Catholics, laid snares for them, put them to death, stoned and slew them; and from the other side, too, the gentile people,

(p. 815)

clouded and foolish, rose up against those who invoked and preached the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and flayed them, oppressed them, did away with them, cut their throats and crushed them. Placed therefore amid such and so many dangers, reckoning daily that they would die, they prepared themselves for battle with heavenly arms, confessing, communicating, praying and pursuing other virtuous exercises and divine works, like saints desiring to profit all, to harm none, and humbly to be subject rather than to preside in pride. And even if it be granted that some communicated under both species, yet it is nowhere found, either by precept of the Lord or by precept of the apostles, that the lay people are bound by necessity of salvation to communicate under both species. It was admitted, then, salutarily, but never commanded, nor held under precept, to communicate under one or two species once a day, once a week, once a year, or at other distinct times. All these things, therefore, remained under the determination of the most holy universal Church, of the supreme Pontiffs, successors of Peter, and of the sacred councils, with all scruples and ambiguities driven away by most certain faith. At that time, then, when the primitive Church had not ordained the rite and observances of the ecclesiastical sacraments otherwise, nor made institutions about ornaments, those who communicated under both species and those who [communicated] under one in the state of grace did well

and salutarily, as did those who baptized and were baptized in plain water. And some consecrated without ornaments, merely giving pure wine with the words of consecration, as is read of the first Mass of St Peter in the ecclesiastical history.

But after it pleased the Most High, through the ministry of blessed Silvester, Judaea remaining in its faithlessness and the gentile people being converted to Christian truths, to spread, enlarge and magnify the holy Church militant, with the supporting aids, favours and protection of the Emperor Constantine, it was fitting and

(p. 816)

necessary for the holy Catholic Church, by divine inspiration, to ordain otherwise concerning the rite of the ecclesiastical sacraments and their ornaments and observances. And therefore it commanded that only priests celebrating ought to communicate under both species, as in the chapter *Relatum* and in the chapter *Comperimus*, *De consecratione*. Pope Fabian also commanded that men should communicate, if not more often, at least three times a year, unless perhaps one be hindered by some greater crimes, namely at Easter, Pentecost and the Lord's Nativity. Pope Soter also added that all the faithful should communicate on the Lord's Supper [Maundy Thursday]. In the Council of Agde too it was established that seculars who did not communicate at the Lord's Nativity, Easter and Pentecost should not be believed to be Catholics, nor held among Catholics. Afterwards, too, when secular men in the course of time still prepared themselves negligently for the communion of the Lord's body, it was therefore at last reduced to Easter, because the time of Lenten preparation precedes it, as the divine Bonaventure says on the fourth [book] of the Sentences, distinction 12. So therefore, by institution of the holy Roman Church, Innocent III in the general council commanded that every one of the faithful of either sex, after reaching the years of discretion, should alone faithfully confess all his sins at least once a year to his own priest, and should strive to fulfil with his own strength the penance enjoined on him, receiving reverently at least at Easter the sacrament of the Eucharist, unless by the counsel of his own priest he is to abstain from receiving it for some reasonable cause (as fully in the chapter *Omnis utriusque sexus*).

For the holy and immaculate, pious Mother Church, considering the abominations, abuses and dangers which she had learned from the reports of very many had occurred in the communion of the lay people under both species, since any children or little infants, any sick or those troubled with a vomiting illness, vomited up the blood of Christ,

(p. 817)

and any bearded men also scattered it through the hairs of their beard, or [*text unclear*] with the hairs of their beard, and also took the blood of Christ irreverently and shamelessly: it was and is meet and just, Catholic and salutary, that the lay people, established in the years of discretion and prepared in the state of grace, should have ceased and should cease from the communion of both species, and should dispose and prepare themselves at least once a year, namely at Easter time, for the communion of the Eucharist. And this custom of the holy universal Church, under the obedience of the supreme Roman pontiff, praiseworthily observed in successive times through so many hundreds of years, is today too to be salutarily observed as law.

And whoever communicates under one species receives the whole Christ (the glorious truth), if he lives in a Catholic, just and pious manner and walks rightly in the unity, concord and charity of the whole universal Church militant and the one mystical body of Christ, namely of the whole faithful Christian people; since after the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ his most glorious body was never without his glorious blood, nor the blood without the body, nor the body without the soul, nor the soul without the body, nor soul nor body without the Godhead; and not only after the resurrection, but also, understand it soundly, as to the union of the divinity with the soul and body, during the three days of his death. Whence Damascene says: "Cursed is the man who shall say that the human flesh which the divine Word once assumed was ever left behind."

The irrefragable doctor Alexander of Hales also, treating these things in his fourth [book], says that two great dangers could and can come from communicating the lay people under both species: namely, one of the spilling of the blood, of which mention was made above, and the danger of unbelief, which would not undeservedly creep [*sic*] into the minds of the faithful if it were always given to all under the species of bread and wine; for they could believe that Christ is not contained whole under either species alone, as also

(p. 818)

happened to some heretics. And he recounts the story of some religious who desired and pressed to be communicated under both species, though they were not priests; and the priest, celebrating piously, prayed earnestly that God would turn them from such a temptation. When after the consecration he came to the fraction of the host, the whole hollow of the host was seen to be filled with blood, at which all were astounded, both the celebrant and the bystanders, who also saw the same. But when the celebrating priest joined the parts of the host again, all that blood went back into the host, and the host remained in its former appearance. And so they, well edified, remained free of their temptation, begging pardon for their former importunity and superfluous petition, believing most certainly that under each species, namely of bread and of wine, the whole and entire Christ is taken by those in the state of grace, according to the rite, custom and observance of the most holy Roman Church militant. This all the Catholic doctors of the sacred page commonly hold, such as blessed Thomas, Bonaventure, the venerable Richard, Scotus, Francis de [*name left blank in the edition*], Peter of Tarentaise; and the whole faithful Catholic Church holds and keeps this under obedience to the supreme height of the Apostolic See, today and in modern times under obedience to our most holy Lord Pope Nicholas V, outside whose obedience and the unity of the universal Church there can be no salvation, as was said above.

Our friends also bring into their fellowship and agreement Greece, the Eastern church, not attending to how many errors and superstitions it is entangled in; and that, not on one only but on many articles and heads, for so many hundreds of years now, it has persevered in schism and diverse heresies, cut off and drawn away from the unity of the most holy universal Church and from obedience to the supreme Roman Pontiff, and also from the observance of salutary and just rites and praiseworthy customs, damnably

(p. 819)

And not even today is it united to the one mystical body of Christ and his most faithful spouse, the Roman and universal Church militant. And certainly, if our friends had diligently considered the errors of the Eastern church, they would never have alleged the Greek church to excuse their (heresy). For they would have known that to multiply incongruities is not to solve but to entangle. They would therefore have acted, and would act, more cautiously by closing their mouths with their hands than by alleging accomplices in error as their refuge.

And yet the Greeks too, if rightly considered, communicate the sick under one species. For they are wont on the day of the Lord's Supper to consecrate bread and dip it into the sacrament of the blood, and so reserve it for some part of the year as viaticum for the sick, so that when there is need they give the dried particle of bread to the sick and offer it to the sick person with unconsecrated wine. And so not even the Greeks themselves hold, nor can they hold, that it is of necessity of salvation and falls under the precept of evangelical truth that the lay people must communicate under both species; since to little children too the Lord's blood is given, abusively and not necessarily, under the one species of wine only; and even those who kept the usage of communicating under both species meant that it is not of necessity of salvation for all indiscriminately to communicate under both species.

Other and many abuses also arose in ancient times concerning the use of this saving sacrament. For some ministered milk in the chalice instead of the blood of Christ. Some, keeping a small piece of bread dipped in red must throughout the year, ministered water with its washing instead of the blood. Others too were wont to

offer the people the dipped Eucharist as the completion of communion. Others also consecrated and offered, instead of the blood, a cluster taken from the grapes and pressed by hand over the chalice. All these were and are reprobated as erroneous, as is expressly plain in *De consecratione*, dist. 2, c. [*number not printed*]. Hence blessed Augustine, in the second book *On the One Baptism*,

Reply to John Borotín, part 4

(p. 820)

against the Donatists, says: "Nor let anyone say: what we have received from the ancients, this we follow," etc.; since today too we can say: what the Lord's truth itself declared, this we believe, this we hold, this we confess, this we observe with all diligence: that "except you eat and except you drink," etc., is to be taken with the understanding of the Holy Spirit, from the declaration of our Lord Jesus Christ himself, saying: "It is the spirit that quickens; the flesh profits nothing. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life. But there are some of you that believe not; for Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed," etc. Much might be added about these matters, which, however, for brevity's sake I omit, pursuing what seems necessary; not attending to the blasphemies of my jealous friends, but only to this: to the sincere declarations of the truth, both of the words of Jesus Christ our Lord and of his glorious Apostle Paul, as has already been plain above.

It remains now to come down to your Compacts, on which I see you wholly rely. I have already turned over a copy of the Compacts many times; nor have I pretended not to know them, as my friends say; nay, I have read them through and considered them well. For what seems to have been great to you is clear to me, overcome by no passion: that your confidence has rested on a staff of reed. I wonder all the more that your providences, your great cunning, presume to allege such things; unless perhaps, harried by the flood of a violent river, you are embracing thorns for cotton, as they say in Italy of one who grabs at brambles when drowning [*text unclear*].

Tell me, I pray, what special mandate Philibert of Coutances presented to you at Jihlava, whether on the part of Eugenius of happy memory, or on the part of the Lord Julian [Cesarini] of most revered memory, Roman, then most worthy Cardinal of Sant'Angelo, sent first by Pope Martin V of happy memory to institute the Council of Basel, and at the time of the Compacts presiding in the same Council of Basel in the name and by the authority

(p. 821)

of Pope Eugenius IV himself; or what special mandate he had from the council itself to permit such things? Certainly none. For he exceeded the bounds of his mandate, since such and so great a cause of Catholic truth ought to have been determined not by Philibert alone and his colleagues, but by the supreme pontiff and by the universal holy Catholic Church. Nor in such a cause does a general mandate suffice (dist. 11, *Huic sedi*). For, as Pope Innocent decreed: "Whenever the question of faith is aired, I think that all our brothers and fellow bishops ought to refer it to none but Peter, that is, to the authority of his name and honour" (24, q. 1, *Quoties*). To this end blessed Jerome, writing to the holy Pope Damasus, says: "This is the faith, most blessed Pope, which we have learned in the Catholic Church and have always held; in which, if anything has been set down less skilfully or with too little care, we desire to be corrected by your authority, who hold both the see and the faith of Peter. But if this our confession is approved by the judgement of your apostolate, whoever wishes to blame me will prove himself unskilled, or malevolent, or even not Catholic but a heretic" (24, q. 1). And it is added: "The holy Roman Church, which has always remained immaculate, the Lord providing and blessed Peter the Apostle bringing help, will remain in future secure without any insult of heretics, and will persist firm and immovable at all times." It pertains, therefore, to the Pope and to the apostolic authority to determine causes of faith, as is also most expressly plain in the chapter *Maiores*, *Extra*,

On baptism and its effect, where Innocent III says: "The greater causes of the Church, especially those touching articles of faith, are to be referred to the see of Peter." [He means him] who, when the Lord asked whom the disciples said he was, is noted to have answered: "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God"; and for whom the Lord prayed that his faith fail not. [*A passage is omitted in the edition here.*] Augustine: "Schism itself, which is a Greek word, means a cleft; but there can be no cleft in unity. He therefore

(p. 822)

does not communicate with unity who communicates with schismatics. They have made parties for themselves, and, segregating themselves from that which is one, as we are now speaking in the Apostle's words, they have not the Spirit. By all which it comes about that, because they are not one in unity, because they wish to be in a part, because they have not the Spirit of the body of Christ, they cannot have the sacrifice." See, I do not speak of myself; for these are the words of the most illustrious Augustine (24, q. 1). Plainly, if one resists pertinaciously and obstinately and persists in error, even one doubtful in faith is judged a heretic (*Extra, De haereticis*, c. 1). For what the Pope approves no one may reprove, nor approve what he reproves. And the holy Pope Gelasius says: "The Church throughout the world knows that the most holy Roman Church has the right of judging concerning all, nor may anyone judge of its judgement; since appeal is to be made to it from any part of the world, but from it no one is permitted to appeal." And this indeed by reason of its primacy, which blessed Peter the Apostle held by the voice of the Lord and will always hold.

Philibert, therefore, could not grant what he did not have. Yet I do not believe it is hidden from you that it is commonly said to have been enjoined on him, both by Eugenius and by the Council of Basel, that, according to true form, what he had in fact granted he ought in fact also to revoke; which, from fear or shame, he refused to fulfil, and dared to return neither to Basel nor to Coutances; so that rather his bones remained shaken among you, whose temporal life perished. Whether his soul obtained eternal salvation? [*text unclear*]

I think you are not ignorant that the various and diverse errors of John Wyclif, John Hus and Jerome, and of their followers, adherents and accomplices, were all condemned as heretical in the sacred Council of Constance, and that their authors, namely John and Jerome, were burned with fire as heretics. At first errors were found

(p. 823)

to the number of forty-five or thereabouts; afterwards their followers, abandoning the others, kept to four. At the last, however, in the Council of Basel, even after your Compacts, they kept only to the distinction of this one last term, concerning the communion of the lay people under both species. I pray, I beseech and I implore [*sic*: "observo"] that those who have now put behind them and abandoned the other errors may acquiesce also in the sentence of truth on this double species; so that we may be unanimously peaceable, concordant and well-disposed, as brothers in Christ Jesus united and joined and bound to one another in the embrace of charity, redeemed by his most precious blood to attain eternal glory with all the elect of God under obedience to the supreme Prelate.

You know too that after the Compacts, for a year and months, many disputations were aired on both sides on this article of the communion of the lay people under both species, where your orators, masters and priests had as many, as long and as leisurely, peaceful and quiet hearings as they wished. But seeing that they could not prevail over the judgement of truth, whether they withdrew from there cheerful and content enough, those of them who still survive are themselves the judges of themselves. After their withdrawal, since they perniciously would not acquiesce in the truth, the sacred Council of Basel, then under the presidency of the aforesaid Lord Julian of most revered memory, then Cardinal of Sant'Angelo (from whose mouth, since he had been most intimate with me and my fellow student in law for very many years, when he had returned from Basel to Italy while I was then preaching in the city of Verona, our old friendship being also renewed, I learned the aforesaid and very many other things by truthful report), framed a decree of the tenor written

below against the aforesaid article of the said communion under both species:

"The most holy general synod of Basel, legitimately assembled in the Holy Spirit, representing the universal

(p. 824)

Church, for the perpetual memory of the matter. So that it may be seen more clearly, for the declaration of Catholic truth, what is to be held and done concerning the reception of the Eucharist for the benefit of the Christian people: after diligent examination of the divine Scriptures, the sacred canons and the doctrines handed down by the holy fathers and doctors, held in this holy synod over a long time, and all things having been considered which were to be considered for the declaration of this matter, this most holy synod has decreed and declared: That the lay faithful, or clerics communicating and not consecrating, are not bound by precept of the Lord to receive the sacrament of the holy Eucharist under both species of bread and wine; but the Church, which is ruled by the Spirit of truth abiding with her for ever, and with which Christ abides until the consummation of the world, as divine Scripture says, has to ordain how it is to be ministered to those not consecrating, for the reverence of the sacrament itself and as she sees expedient for the salvation of the faithful. And whether under one species or under two, according to the ordinance or observance of the Church, it profits those communicating worthily unto salvation. Nor is it in any way to be doubted that not the flesh only is under the species of bread, nor the blood only under the species of wine, [but] under the species of bread the whole Christ is entire. The praiseworthy custom, therefore, of communicating the people under one species, reasonably introduced by the Church and the holy fathers and hitherto observed for a very long time, and commended now for a long time by doctors of the divine law having much skill in the sacred Scriptures and canons, is to be held as law; nor is it lawful for anyone to reprove it, or to change it otherwise without the authority of the Church. Given at Basel in the public session of this holy synod solemnly celebrated, on the tenth day before the Kalends of January, in the year of the Lord 1437."

You see, then, how most clearly the most just sentence of truth has been concluded and decided in these few words.

(p. 825)

I know too that this decree was dispatched to Prague with a leaden bull. Whether you keep it, whether you have torn it, whether you have burned it, decide for yourselves; for even if the ox-hide or goat-skin has perished among you, yet the memory of the truth remains for ever; under which again and again I most urgently beseech you: do not blush, and let it not weary you to serve as soldiers of Christ the Lord.

Nor be ignorant, either, that the Council of Basel itself could not justly and lawfully have done otherwise than it did above, since near its beginning, under the presidency of the aforesaid Lord Julian, it had accepted, approved, ratified and confirmed each and every decree determined, concluded, ordained and instituted in the sacred Council of Constance; and in the same Council of Constance the memory of the heretic John Wyclif and all his poisonous little works were condemned, and also John Hus and Jerome were condemned and burned as heretics, and all their treatises and those of their followers, adherents, accomplices and abettors were likewise condemned as containing heresies; and it was decreed specifically and singly that the lay people must altogether desist from communion under both species, and that those who were pertinaciously hardened and would not desist should be punished as heretics; as is plain in the determination made at Constance in the cathedral church, in public session, in the year of the Lord 1415, the eighth indiction, on Saturday 15 June, under the presidency of the most serene Sigismund and of the most reverend Lord John, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, then vice-chancellor, in the presence of the illustrious princes Lord Louis, Duke of Bavaria, Frederick, Duke of Austria, and Frederick, Burgrave of Nuremberg, and Count Bertoldo Orsini, and very many others.

The Council of Basel conformed itself to the aforesaid Council of Constance; against the determination and sentence of which sacred councils no Catholic

(p. 826)

may lawfully resist or oppose with hardened mind, since they were instituted by apostolic authority, without which it is judged not a council but a conventicle or petty assembly, and whatever is done in it is deemed wholly void and empty (dist. 17, c. 1, with the four following). For I said above that the Council of Basel had a good beginning, because it was instituted by the authority of Martin and afterwards held ratified by Eugenius. But after the transfer made from Basel to Ferrara by Eugenius himself, and after the departure of the Lord [Cardinal] of Sant'Angelo himself, whatever was done, subsisting with no force of law, is judged void and wicked. It is plain, then, from your Compacts, that your opinion cannot stand, for the reasons and decrees stated above.

Moreover you yourselves know well whether you have effectively and really observed what you promised in your Compacts; whether you have held ecclesiastical unity in the unity of the Catholic faith and conformity with the rite of the universal Church; whether you have kept the decrees and decretals of the most holy Roman Church; whether you have feared excommunications and ecclesiastical censures; whether you have had recourse to the holy Roman Church for absolutions from cases reserved to the Apostolic See; whether you have restored ecclesiastical goods; whether you have had or have an archbishop instituted and confirmed by the supreme pontiff and the holy Roman Church; whether you have kept peace with the whole Christian people, whether within the said kingdom or outside it: judge for yourselves. And those who have died, who have been oppressed, plundered, burned, made desolate, are reckoned before almighty God, the most just judge, and cry with a loud voice, saying: "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and revenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" (Apoc. 6). Consider too whether your priests have offered communion under both species only to those who had formerly had the usage of being so communicated; or whether they have offered it to little infants on the day of baptism,

(p. 827)

and in the first year and at the age of infancy; or whether they have given it indiscriminately to adults too, without any preparation, without confession, coming out of taverns and perhaps from more disreputable places; or whether they have forced anyone violently, with prisons and beatings, to communicate under both species, as I have now learned from many trustworthy reporters. And there is now a plain example ready to hand at Krom■■íž, where the priests of Hradišt■ were detained and forced to minister communion under both species to the lay people, to the disgrace, insult, contempt, injury and scorn of the most holy Roman and universal Church militant, and to the prejudice, detriment, damnation and loss of eternal salvation of those same detainers; since by the very deed they have incurred the sentence of greater excommunication, from which they cannot be absolved except by apostolic authority, as is plain in the canon *Si quis suadente diabolo* (17, q. 4). By this bond are bound all who seized them, and who detained and detain them, with all who favour, counsel, help, participate and consent, who could have prevented it and could prevent it; according to the sentence of the Apostle (Rom. 1 [*printed "II"*]): "They are worthy of death," namely eternal, not merely temporal, "not only they that do them, but they also that consent to them that do them." Or do you not know that "he deserves to lose a privilege who abuses the power permitted to him"? (11, q. 3, *Privilegium*; *Extra*, *De privilegiis et excessibus privilegiatorum*, c. *Cum et plantare*; [c.] *Nam privilegium*). Notably to this is added the decree of Pope Gelasius, in which the episcopal dignity is taken away from a city that has killed its prelates. Whether there are any of your faith who have killed bishops, priests or clerics, decide for yourselves. But it has already been reported to me by many that a bishop and priests and those in holy orders were put to death with savage cruelty by your henchmen. No obedience, no reverence, no devotion, no charity or affection

(p. 828)

(of piety) has been shown by your people to the most holy Roman and universal Church militant; no esteem has been made, no consideration had, of the statutes, constitutions, precepts and ordinances of the same holy Roman Church; although by the decree of blessed Gregory (dist. 19) "it is lawful for no one either to wish or to be able to transgress the precepts of the Apostolic See, or the ministry of our disposition, which your charity must follow. Let him therefore be laid low by the grief of his ruin, whoever wishes to oppose the apostolic decrees, and let him have no place henceforth among the priests, but let him become a stranger to the holy ministry; nor let anyone afterwards have care of his judgement, since no one doubts that he is already condemned by the holy and apostolic Church for his disobedience and presumption; for he is to be cast out by the rejection of greater excommunication, since the discipline of holy Church was committed [to him], by which he ought not only to obey the commands of holy Church set over him, but also to impress them on others, lest they pass them by; and let him who will not obey the apostolic precepts be a stranger to the divine and pontifical offices." And blessed Augustine says in the second book *On Christian Doctrine*: "In the canonical Scriptures let the most skilful investigator of the divine Scriptures follow the authority of as many Catholic churches as possible, among which indeed are those which have been worthy to have apostolic sees and to receive epistles. He will therefore hold this measure in the canonical Scriptures: that he prefer those which are received by all churches to those which some do not receive; and among those which are not received by all, let him prefer those which more and weightier churches receive to those which fewer churches and of less authority hold." See how most splendidly the most illustrious divine Augustine instructs us that we ought to imitate and follow the footsteps of the holy fathers, to keep the apostolic teachings of the supreme Roman pontiff, and most diligently

(p. 829)

to guard and unanimously observe the precepts, rites and praiseworthy customs of the most holy and universal Church.

Since therefore it is manifestly established that the whole Catholic Church communicates the lay people under one species only, namely of bread, be not ashamed and be not confounded to keep the unity of the whole mystical body of our most holy Lord Jesus Christ, and the general tradition and rite of the whole Catholic Church militant; so that, receiving counsel with due reverence, as the wise man says, the confession and observance of the truth may bring you everlasting glory. For as it is written (Ecclus. 4): "For thy soul be not ashamed to say the truth. For there is a shame that brings sin, and there is a shame that brings grace and glory." For there are some who vainly and damnably glory in the defence of a lie and in excusing their sins, and of whom Solomon says (Prov. 1): "My son, if sinners shall entice thee, consent not to them. If they shall say: Come with us, let us lie in wait for blood, let us hide snares for the innocent without cause; let us swallow him up alive like hell, and whole as one that goes down into the pit. We shall find all precious substance, we shall fill our houses with spoils. Cast in thy lot with us, let us all have one purse. My son, walk not thou with them; restrain thy foot from their paths. For their feet run to evil, and make haste to shed blood." And so: "Turn ye at my reproof. Behold I will utter my spirit to you, and will show you my words. Because I called and you refused; I stretched out my hand, and there was none that regarded. You have despised all my counsel and have neglected my reprehensions. I also will laugh in your destruction and will mock when that shall come to you which you feared; when sudden calamity shall fall on you, and destruction as a tempest shall be at hand; when tribulation and distress shall come upon you." And in chapter 2 it is said: "Who leave the right way and walk by dark ways; who are glad when they have done evil, and rejoice in most wicked things;

Reply to John Borotín, part 5

(p. 830)

whose ways are perverse and their steps infamous." And at the end he says: "But the wicked shall be destroyed from the earth, and they that do unjustly shall be taken away from it."

Do not, my dearest ones, do not harden your heart like Pharaoh in Egypt, who, scourged ten times by the Lord and daily more hardened, at last perished drowned in the Red Sea with all his army and following, and not one of them remained (Exod. 14). Do not pertinaciously rebel against the supreme pontiff and trample with polluted feet the immaculate face of the holy, true mother, the Roman Church, like the tribe rebelling in heart against Moses and despising his precepts, with Dathan and Abiram, whom the earth, opening her mouth, devoured with all their tents and all their substance, and they went down alive into hell, covered with the ground, and perished from the midst of the multitude (Num. 16). Remember Sodom and Gomorrah with the three neighbouring cities, which would not be converted at the preaching of Lot nor of Abraham. The Lord therefore rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from heaven, and destroyed these cities and all the country about, all the inhabitants of the cities and all things that spring from the earth (Gen. 19). Have before your eyes the end of Balak and Balaam, who would not acquiesce in the sound counsels of Moses; but rather Balaam counselled and suggested to Balak that he send adorned women to the army of the children of Israel, inviting them to sin, so that the Most High, angered by their sins, might exercise his judgement (Num. 24 and 25). But afterwards Balaam the false prophet was slain, and Balak, and all the men and women of Moab and Midian, only the virgins being reserved, to the number of 32,000 (Num. 31); from which number of virgins it can be considered how great was the crowd of the slain. Look at the tribe of Benjamin, who, as sons of Belial, that is, without yoke, wickedly abusing the wife of the Levite, suffered the divine judgement. In the end, God chastised the sinners even by the wickedness

(p. 831)

of sinners, so that, all counted on both sides of the combatants, nearly 90,000 men were slain (Judges 19 and 20). So the tribe of Benjamin was blotted out. Contemplate, finally, the great slaughter in the time of the Maccabees, when the enemies of truth had profaned the temples and filled them with filth and abominations and turned them into stables and brothels: nearly 324,000 persons were slain, as in the second [book] of Maccabees from the eighth chapter to the end. Recall too to your memory the divine piety, mercy and clemency toward the great city of Nineveh, which, converted at the preaching of Jonah the prophet and brought to penance, merited to have the divine sentence changed (Jonah 3). Do you too therefore do penance, for the kingdom of heaven will draw near to you, as the Lord said (Matt. 4). Certainly the same also said (Luke 13): "Unless you do penance, you shall all likewise perish." These, then, are the things I teach [*sic*: "irtadico"], that I write, that I have said and say.

I have said and say, pursuing the aforesaid, with blessed Cyprian the Martyr: "He who does not hold the unity of the Church, whoever he be, though boasting much of himself and claiming very much for himself, is profane, is an alien, is outside." I have said and say again with the same St Cyprian, to Papinianus [*sic*], that the Catholic Church is one, which suffers no cleft nor division, like the seamless tunic of our Lord Jesus Christ, of which [we read in] John 19. Whence blessed Cyprian adds: "Finally, since the sacrament of unity is inseparable, and since they are without hope and acquire perdition for themselves from the indignation of God who make schism and, leaving their bishop, set up another, a false one, for themselves outside, divine Scripture declares in the books of Kings," namely 3 Kings 12, where the ten tribes were split off from the tribe of Judah and Benjamin and, leaving their king, namely Rehoboam, set up another for themselves outside, namely Jeroboam; "and the Lord," he says, "was angry with all the seed of Israel and

(p. 832)

shook them and gave them up to derision, until he cast them away from his face." Note the words, mark the mysteries: how dangerous it is to have brought the stain of schism upon the glory of the renowned kingdom of Bohemia. Cyprian also gives examples and compares schismatics to gentiles and pagans. Since our Lord

Jesus Christ, in the first sending of his twelve apostles to preach, commanded them, saying: "Go ye not into the way of the gentiles, and into the cities of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go ye rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 10); hence Cyprian says: "Sending them first to the Jews, he commands the gentiles still to be passed over; adding that the city of the Samaritans, where there were schismatics, must be omitted, he shows that schismatics are put on a level with gentiles." Finally blessed Jerome too says this, and it is found in the Decretum, [C.] 24, q. 1 [*printed "2. et 4."*], where it follows: "I think I do not say rashly that some are in the house of God in such a way that they themselves are also the same house of God, which is said to be built upon a firm rock, which is called the one dove, the fair spouse without wrinkle or spot, and a garden enclosed and a fountain sealed, and a well of living water, and a paradise with the fruit of apples; which house received both the keys and the power of binding and loosing. If anyone despises this house when it corrects him, let him be to thee, he says, as the heathen and the publican" (Matt. 18), where Christ says: "And if he will not hear the Church," etc. Jerome adds, of this house: "Lord, I have loved the beauty of thy house and the place where thy glory dwells. Take not away my soul with the wicked, nor my life with bloody men." Of this too it is said: "Who makes the barren woman to dwell in a house." And: "I rejoiced at the things that were said to me: We shall go into the house of the Lord." And: "Blessed are they that dwell in thy house, O Lord; they shall praise thee for ever and ever." And Gregory says in the *Moralia* that, since truth is seen only from the Catholic Church, the Lord says [*sic*: "prohibet"] there is a place with him from which he may be seen. Moses is placed on the rock that he may contemplate the face of God, because unless one holds the solidity of faith,

(p. 833)

he does not know the divine presence; of which solidity the Lord says: "Upon this rock I will build my church." For she alone is the one through whom the Lord willingly accepts sacrifice, and she alone intercedes confidently for those who err. Whence also concerning the victim of the lamb the Lord commanded, saying: "In one house shall you eat it, neither shall you carry forth of the flesh thereof out of the house." For it is eaten in one house, because in the one Catholic Church the true victim of the Redeemer is offered, of whose flesh the divine law forbids anything to be carried out, because it forbids that what is holy be given to dogs. She alone guards those placed within her with the strong bond of charity. Whence too the water of the flood lifted up the ark to higher places, but destroyed all whom it found outside the ark" (24, q. 1, c. *Ex sola*), where the Gloss says: "He proves by manifold authority that we cannot be saved unless we hold the unity of the Church," as in 1, q. 1, *Extra catholicam*, etc.; *Si quis inquit*. Where also St Cyprian says: "Ought anyone to say that the saving sacrament and the heavenly grace of communion can exist with heretics, with whom not even earthly food nor worldly intercourse ought to be shared? It is established that the oil with which the baptized are anointed cannot be sanctified, nor the Eucharist made among them," namely with the effect of salvation (says the Gloss), "where there is no hope and a false faith, where all things are done by lies. For the heretic, after the manner of apes, which, though they are not men, imitate the human form, claims for himself the face and authority and truth of the Catholic Church, though he himself is not in the Church; he blesses, though he is cursed by God; he promises life, though he is dead; a blasphemer, he invokes God; profane, he administers the priesthood; sacrilegious, he sets up an altar. To all these is added this evil too, that the priest of the devil dares to make the Eucharist."

For Cyprian meant to refer to the words of Christ in John 6, who said, after the departure of those disciples who had understood carnally "Except you eat and except you

(p. 834)

drink," and after the declaration of our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and after the answer of Peter himself, saying, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we have believed and have known that thou art the Christ, the Son of God," Jesus answered them: "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" Now he meant Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon; for he was about to betray him,

whereas he was one of the twelve. Many other things too could be adduced to this purpose, which, however, for brevity's sake I omit, holding most firmly that it is an article of the Catholic faith, set down in the Nicene creed: "And one holy, catholic and apostolic Church." For this sentence ought to be enough for all wayfarers to believe firmly, confess simply and observe most faithfully and immovably, all profiting [*sic*] unto eternal salvation; outside which unity absolutely no one is saved.

I have said and say that "heretic" comes from error and [departure from] rectitude, as if one said "erring from the rectitude of the truth of the Catholic faith." Whence he is called a heretic who is known to deviate even by a light argument from the rite of the Catholic faith, as the most Christian Justinian ordered to be written in [Code] 4 [*sic*], 2, at the end, title *De haereticis*. I have also said and say that "heretic" can also be said from *herciscor*, which is the same as "I divide, you divide." Hence "heretic" is the same as "divided," and "heresy" as "division" from the unity of faith. For the action *familiae herciscundae* is explained as that of dividing a household or an inheritance; and "hermit," that is, one praying divided and separated from others. And this was the opinion in the *Summa* on the title *De haereticis*, at the beginning, to which agrees 5 [*sic*], q. 1, *Denique*, and 4 [*sic*], q. 1, *Quidam autem*; and what is found in the extravagant of the Emperor Frederick beginning *Inconsutilem*, where he says that the name of heretic denotes a cutting or division, and that some heretics call themselves Patarenes, from *patior, pateris*, as if they ought to suffer death like martyrs for

(p. 835)

this faith of theirs, which should rather be called faithlessness. I have also said and say that "heretic" can be derived from *haereo, haeres* ("I cling") and *tycon*; for *tycos* in Greek is said of the murex and means the middle [*sic*]. For one is properly called a heretic only who pertinaciously clings to error and urgently defends, or strives to defend, falsehood for truth; for, according to Jerome, the heretic chooses for himself that opinion which he thinks better. For Jerome, in [the commentary on] the Epistle to the Galatians, means to mark the difference between heresy and schism, saying: "Between heresy and schism I think there is this [difference], that heresy has a perverse dogma, while schism, after episcopal dissension, equally separates from the Church; which indeed at the beginning can be understood to be in some part different. But there is no schism that does not invent some heresy for itself, so as to seem to have rightly withdrawn from the Church" (24, q. 3, *Inter haeresim*), where the Gloss says: "It can be said that the difference between schism and heresy is that which is between disposition and habit. For at first it is called schism, but when after a time it has pertinaciously clung to its sect, it is called heresy. Or say otherwise, that every heretic is a schismatic, but not conversely; and so the difference is that between genus and species" (dist. 35 [*sic*], *Relatum*). So when we say: every man is an animal, but not every animal is a man.

From this the holy Pope Clement wrote thus throughout the world: "It has been reported to us that some dwelling in your parts oppose the sacred doctrines and seem to teach, as it seems to them, not according to the traditions of the fathers but according to their own sense. For many talented men of your parts, as we have heard, take likelihoods from what they read; and therefore it must be diligently observed that the law of God, when it is read, be not read or taught according to the power or understanding of one's own talent. For there are many words in the divine Scriptures which can be drawn back to the sense which each one presumes of his own accord; but

(p. 836)

this must not be. For you must not seek an alien sense from outside, foreign [to it], so as in some way to confirm it even with the authority of the Scriptures; but you must take the sense of truth from the Scriptures themselves. And therefore one must learn the knowledge of the Scriptures from him who keeps it as handed down to him by the elders according to truth, so that he too may be able competently to assert what he has rightly received. For when anyone has received from the divine Scriptures an entire and firm rule of truth, it will not be absurd if he brings something from common learning and liberal studies, which perhaps he

touched on in boyhood, to the assertion of true dogma; yet so that, where he has learned true things, he turns away from feigned falsehoods." Behold most beautiful words, which you have heard, to be solemnly carved in golden letters in the flint of your memory, for your instruction and eternal salvation, if you will.

I have also said and say with blessed Jerome on the Epistle to the Galatians that heresy in Greek is so called from choice, namely that each chooses the discipline which he thinks better; and he adds: "Whoever, then, understands sacred Scripture otherwise than the sense of the Holy Spirit, by whom Scripture was written, demands, though he has not withdrawn from the Church, can yet be called a heretic, and is of the works of the flesh, choosing what is worse" (24, q. 1 [*sic*], *Haeresis*).

I have said and say again with blessed Augustine that he is a heretic who, for the sake of some temporal advantage, and chiefly of his own glory and pre-eminence, begets or follows false and new opinions; but he who believes such men is deceived by a certain imagination of truth (*ibid.*, c. [*text unclear*], *De haereticis*). How many today are caught in this article in the regions of these parts, since snares and traps are prepared for the souls of many simple persons with a fraudulent cloak under the appearance of piety! Those who sin from a certain simplicity and ignorance of the sacred Scriptures are to be pitied all the more, the more

(p. 837)

simply they err and perhaps think they are pursuing better works than other Christians. Yet they cannot say, like that Pharisee who, in reproach of the rest, even detested the publican present by him, saying: "O God, I give thee thanks that I am not as the rest of men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, as also is this publican. I fast twice in a week; I give tithes of all that I possess," etc. (Luke 18). And if that Pharisee, who yet boasted that he did good above other men, reckoning others extortioners, unjust and adulterers, while glorying in his fasts and paid tithes, was eternally damned, what then must they expect at death who do not even fast nor pay tithes, but even detain and usurp the very tithes to be paid to the churches and ministers of God, and seize and plunder whatever they can, whether ecclesiastical or profane, destroy, burn, lay waste, and inflict every evil they can upon the innocent poor of Christ and the most faithful Catholics, oppressing them? "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then will he render to every man according to his works," said the Lord Jesus Christ of himself, who will come to judge the living and the dead (Matt. 16). And if against those who have not kept the temporal or corporal works of mercy the Lord Jesus Christ himself terribly threatens so horrible a sentence of damnation and eternal curse, and shows that he will certainly pronounce it, when he says (Matt. 25), "Then he shall say to them also that shall be on his left hand: Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire, which was prepared for the devil and his angels," what then must those expect who have kept neither the spiritual nor the corporal works of mercy, but rather, with all savagery and cruelty, despising the divine and ecclesiastical precepts, have persecuted, plundered, beaten and slain the innocent poor of Christ, and given them over to very many slaughters; of whom the Wise Man writes (Wis. 5): "Then shall the just stand with great con-

(p. 838)

stancy against those that have afflicted them, and taken away their labours." The wicked, namely, seeing it, "shall be troubled with terrible fear, and shall be amazed at the suddenness of the unexpected salvation"; among whom shall be counted all the followers of Origen of damned memory, who rashly presumed to say that on the day of judgement the Lord will spare not only all men and women, however wicked, but even the demons themselves, granting them plenary indulgences and bringing them back equally to the kingdom of heaven — which is most expressly contrary to the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ in Matthew 25, when He says: "And these shall go," namely the wicked and unjust, "into everlasting punishment: but the just into life everlasting." There follows in the same book of Wisdom, after the words "of the unexpected salvation": "saying within themselves, repenting" — not for the sins they committed, nor for the omission of good works and their negligence about salvation while in this life they could have found the way of salvation, but

because of the most bitter pains which they understand are prepared for them, and which they already begin to suffer in soul and in body. It is written that, "repenting, and groaning for anguish of spirit," they say: "We fools esteemed their life madness, and their end without honour. Behold how they are numbered among the children of God, and their lot is among the saints." For on that day the damned themselves shall see the blessed Church: not only the glory of the blessed, but also the most triumphant glory of the humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ himself, as our theologians treat on the fourth book of the *Sentences*, last distinction. And the Master says that until that day the good see the wicked and the wicked the good; but after that day the good shall see the wicked in torments, and "the just shall rejoice when he shall see the revenge"; but the wicked shall no longer be able to see the good, whose joys they cannot afterwards behold, as blessed Gregory says on Luke. Then, therefore, the damned shall recognize their errors, but uselessly and fruitlessly, and shall say: "Therefore we have erred from the way of truth, and the light of justice hath not shined unto us,

(p. 839)

and the sun of understanding hath not risen upon us. We wearied ourselves in the way of iniquity and destruction, and have walked through hard ways, but the way of the Lord we have not known. What hath pride profited us? Or what advantage hath the boasting of riches brought us? All those things are passed away like a shadow, and like a post that runs on, and as a ship that passes through the waves, whereof when it is gone by the trace cannot be found. So we also, being born, forthwith ceased to be, and have been able to show no mark of virtue, but are consumed in our wickedness. Such things as these the sinners said in hell. For the hope of the wicked is as dust, which is blown away with the wind." And so it is added: "His zeal will take armour, and he will arm the creature for the revenge of his enemies. And he will sharpen his severe wrath for a spear, and the whole world shall fight with him against the unwise."

Attend therefore and consider diligently, you kings, princes and barons, that "the king is not saved by much strength," namely bodily or temporal, "nor shall the giant be saved by his own great strength," in all vigour, not in bodily stature, not in arms, horses and chariots; "for vain is the horse for safety, neither shall he be saved by the abundance of his strength." "Hear therefore, and understand; give ear, you that rule the people and that please yourselves in multitudes of nations; for power is given you by the Lord, and strength by the Most High, who will examine your works and search out your thoughts; because, being ministers of his kingdom, you have not judged rightly, nor kept the law of justice, nor walked according to the will of God. Horribly and speedily will he appear to you, for a most severe judgement shall be for them that bear rule. For to him that is little, mercy is granted; but the mighty shall be mightily tormented. For God will not except any man's person, neither will he stand in awe of any man's greatness; for he made the little and the great, and he has equally care of all. But a greater punishment is ready for the more mighty."

Reply to John Borotín, part 6

(p. 840)

These are words of the divine Wisdom, written in Wisdom 6. And you therefore, kings and princes, dukes, margraves, counts and barons, knights and noble citizens, and all honest common folk of either sex and kind: hear and understand, and diligently consider and attend to these words. "Receive instruction, you that judge the earth. Serve ye the Lord with fear, and rejoice unto him with trembling. Embrace discipline," and do penance; be converted to the truth; be willing rather to believe the declaration of our Lord Jesus Christ himself and the teachings, admonitions and examples of so many of his holy men and women, than to follow the footsteps of one man alone, who was burned as a condemned heretic in the Council of Constance. John Hus was that bad goose, roasted and larded, which with its poisonous juice has led so many and such great numbers through the byways and precipices of mountains and crags, and does not cease to lead them, like buffaloes by the nose, into the infernal abyss and the damnation of the punishment and burning of eternity.

I have also said and say that not only is whoever does not hold what the most holy Roman and universal Church teaches, keeps, holds and follows to be deemed a heretic, but also whoever despises the precepts of the supreme pontiff and the decrees and decretals of the same holy Roman Church is to be deemed a heretic, as despising the keys of the Church (dist. 19, *Nulli*; and dist. 81 [*printed "d.1."*], c. *Si qui sunt presbyteri*), where blessed Gregory [*sic*], writing to all throughout the Italian and German kingdom and to all the faithful, says of certain rebels that their blessing is turned into a curse and their prayer into sin, the Lord testifying through the prophet Malachi: "I will curse your blessings." And it follows: "But those who will not obey this most salutary precept incur the sin of idolatry, as Samuel testifies and blessed Gregory instructs: it is the sin of witchcraft not to obey, and the crime of idolatry not to acquiesce. He therefore incurs the sin of paganism, whoever, while he asserts himself to be a Christian,

(p. 841)

disdains to obey the Apostolic See." For so Samuel said to Saul, king of Israel (1 Kings 15). When he had not obeyed his voice, Samuel said to him, from the power of almighty God: "Does the Lord desire holocausts and victims, and not rather that the voice of the Lord should be obeyed? For obedience is better than sacrifices, and to hearken rather than to offer the fat of rams. Because it is like the sin of witchcraft to rebel, and like the crime of idolatry to refuse to obey. Forasmuch therefore as thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, the Lord has also rejected thee from being king."

I say too and have said that, as he who begets errors and pertinaciously strives to defend what is erroneous is called not merely a heretic but a heresiarch, so he who does not beget nor himself invent errors, but defends errors invented by others, is called a heresiarch; according to 24, q. 3, c. *Dixit Apostolus*, and c. *Quid autem impius est quam impia sapere et sapientioribus doctoribus non credere*, and c. *Qui in ecclesia*, where the words of Augustine against the Manichees are cited, saying: "Those who in the Church of Christ savour anything morbid and impious, if, when corrected so as to savour something sound and right, they contumaciously resist and will not amend their pestiferous and deadly dogmas, but persist in defending them, are heretics." And in the chapter *Qui aliorum* the holy Pope Urban says: "He who defends the errors of others is far more damnable than those who err, because not only does he err, but he also prepares and confirms stumbling-blocks of error for others; whence he who is a master of error is to be called not only a heretic but even a heresiarch."

I have said and say again that whoever presumes to assert that the most holy Roman Church is not the head of the whole Catholic and universal Church is to be deemed a heretic (dist. 22, *Omnes*), where the text of Pope Nicholas is witness: "The Roman Church instituted all, whether the eminence of any patriarch, or the primacies of metropolitans, or the chairs of archbishops, or the dignity of churches of whatever order;

(p. 842)

but that [Church] he alone founded and raised upon the rock of the faith then newly arising, who committed to blessed Peter, key-bearer of eternal life, the rights of the earthly and at the same time of the heavenly empire. Not therefore any earthly sentence, but that Word by which heaven and earth were constructed, through which finally all the elements were founded, founded the Roman Church. It certainly enjoys the privilege of him by whose authority it is supported. Whence there is no doubt that whoever takes away from any church its right does injustice; but whoever strives to take away the privilege of the Roman Church, handed down by the supreme head of all churches himself, without doubt falls into heresy; and while the former is called unjust, the latter is to be called a heretic. For he violates the faith who acts against her who is the mother of faith, and he is found contumacious towards him who is known to have set her before all churches."

I have also said and say that every one who does not believe, receive or observe the things that were determined in the four holy councils, namely of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon, which four

councils we ought to venerate like the four Gospels (as in the chapter *Post translationem*, *Extra*, *De renuntiatione*), is a heretic. Hence the most Christian Emperor Justinian judged and decreed that whoever do not believe and hold what was established in the said four councils should be punished as heretics, as in the law *Quicumque*, Code, *De haereticis*.

I have also said and say with Pope Hilary that it is lawful for no one, without peril to his state, to violate either the divine constitutions or the decrees of the Apostolic See; and with blessed Damasus I say that violators of the canons are condemned. For such presumption is manifestly one kind of those who blaspheme the Holy Spirit, since, as has already been proved, they act against him by whose impulse and grace the holy canons were issued.

I have also said and say with blessed Pope Hadrian: let him be anathema before God who otherwise violates the censure of the Roman

(p. 843)

pontiffs. For he himself says thus in a general decree: "We establish that whoever of kings or bishops or powerful men shall henceforth believe or permit that the censures of the decrees of the Roman pontiffs may be violated in anything, let him become an execrable anathema, and let him stand guilty before God for ever as a transgressor of the Catholic faith" (25 [*printed "22"*], q. 1, c. *Generali*). This is also strengthened by the authority of the holy Pope Calixtus, writing to all bishops, whose decree is set down in dist. 12, c. [*text unclear*], in these words: "It is not fitting that members depart from the head; but according to the testimonies of Scripture let all members follow the head. And there is no doubt that the apostolic Church is the mother of all churches, from whose rules it is in no way fitting for you to deviate. And as the Son came to do the will of his Father, so do you fulfil the will of your mother, which is the Church, whose head, as has been said, is the Roman Church. Whatever, therefore, shall have been done without discretion of justice against her discipline, no reason will allow to be held valid." So there. This sentence holy Pope Gregory also pronounced, saying in the same place: "Let not the apostolic precepts be resisted with hard pride; but let the things commanded by the holy Roman Church and apostolic authority be salutarily fulfilled through obedience, if you desire to have true communion with the same holy Church of God, which is the head." Jerome confirms the same, writing to Lucinius: "I think you must briefly be admonished that ecclesiastical traditions are to be observed as they were handed down by the elders, and that the customs of others are not to be overturned by a contrary usage." Augustine too means this, writing to Januarius: "Those things which are not written but handed down, which we keep [*printed "custodibus"*], which indeed are observed throughout the whole world, are given to be understood as retained, commended and established either by the apostles themselves or by plenary councils, whose authority in the Church is most salutary; as that the Passion of the Lord, the Resurrection, the Ascension into heaven and the coming of the Holy Spirit are celebrated by an anniversary

(p. 844)

solemnity, and if anything else of the kind occurs which is kept by all wherever the Church spreads itself. But other things, which vary by places and regions of the earth, such as that some fast on Saturday, while others communicate daily in the body and blood of the Lord, others receive on certain days, and anything else of this kind that can be noticed: this whole class of things has free observances. For what is shown to be neither against faith nor against good morals is to be held indifferently, and is to be observed for the sake of fellowship with those among whom one lives."

These words at first sight seem in some way to agree with the opinion of our friends; but if what is written is rightly considered, the sentence of truth is not for them but for us. For first Augustine says: "Those things which are not written but handed down we keep, which indeed are observed by the whole world," etc. Therefore he does not hold that communion under one species only for the lay people today is commanded

by sacred Scripture, but that it is instituted by the tradition of the Church; while under both species it was tolerated in the primitive Church, as I have said enough above. Priests celebrating, however, are commanded to consecrate under both. Secondly, his words are to be considered when he says, "which indeed are observed throughout the whole world." For since among all Catholic faithful of Christ it is observed throughout the whole world that communion is ministered to the lay people under one species only, it is a great presumption and froward arrogance to change such a universal observance, and, leaning on one's own erroneous conscience against the universal rite, to presume to annul the praiseworthy custom approved by the most holy Roman and universal Church; against whom the divine Wisdom cries out (Ecclus. 37), saying: "O wicked presumption, whence camest thou to cover the earth with thy malice and deceitfulness?" And Solomon says (Prov. 3): "Have confidence in the Lord with all thy heart, and lean not upon thy own prudence." And the same Solomon (Prov. 3)

(p. 845)

says: "Be not wise in thy own conceit; fear God and depart from evil." And in the Canticle (1) he says: "If thou know not thyself, O fairest among women, go forth and follow after the steps of the flocks, and feed thy kids beside the tents of the shepherds." For the flock of Christ is the Christian people, of which he himself says (Luke 12): "Fear not, little flock, for it has pleased my Father [elsewhere: your Father] to give you a kingdom." And prelates are called shepherds (6, q. 1): "Let not the sheep rebuke their shepherd, let not the people accuse the bishop, let not the common folk reprove him, because the disciple is not above the master." But Peter was established by the Lord as shepherd of shepherds and of sheep and of the whole flock and Christian people, to whom he said three times, "Feed, feed, feed" (John, last chapter). For he said "feed" three times, that he might comprehend every kind of men to be saved in a threefold state, namely virgins, the continent and the married; or beginners, the proficient and the perfect. The Lord Jesus himself also called himself the chief and best shepherd (John 10): "I am the good shepherd, and I know mine, and mine know me." And below: "And other sheep I have that are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." Where blessed Augustine says: "If the rulers of the Church, who are sons, are shepherds, how is there one shepherd, unless because they are all members of the one shepherd? And indeed he who is shepherd has given [this] to his members. For Peter too is a shepherd, and the other apostles shepherds, and all good bishops. But no one calls himself the door; this he kept properly for himself." For Christ says on those words: "I am the door of the sheep" (John 10). And below he says: "All these were good shepherds, not only because they shed their blood, but because they shed it for the sheep; for they shed it not from pride but from charity. For heretics too, who have suffered some troubles because of their iniquities and errors, boast of the name of martyrdom, so that, whitewashed by this cloak, they who are wolves may steal more easily." And below the same Au-

(p. 846)

gustine, on the words "And there shall be one fold," says: "For he was speaking first of the fold of the race of the flesh of Israel; for there were others of the race of the faith of that Israel, still outside among the gentiles, predestined, not yet gathered." And in the same place Chrysostom says: "He had foreseen their future union," namely of believers. Whence he adds: "And there shall be one fold and one shepherd." And Gregory: "Of two flocks he made one fold, because he joined the Jewish and gentile people in his faith." And Theophilus [Theophylact] says in the same place: "For the seal of baptism is the same for all, one shepherd, the Word of God." Let the Manichees attend, then, since there is one fold and one shepherd of the New and Old Testament. Let the Bohemians too now attend: for if they wander outside the care of the one shepherd, namely the Pope, and are found outside this fold, they will infallibly fall into the jaws of wolves, or of demons.

Thirdly, the words of the same Augustine are to be considered when he says: "which indeed are kept throughout the whole world are given to be understood [as established] either by the apostles themselves or

by plenary councils," etc. Innocent agrees in the chapter *Cum Marthae*. For although in the primitive Church communion of the lay people under both species was also permitted and observed in some churches, yet it was never a precept of Christ or of the apostles in any church, as has been sufficiently shown above; nor can it be effectively proved that such a manner was held universally in the whole primitive Church, nor that any apostle gave communion under both species to the lay people, although Paul permitted it to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11). But, supposing indeed but not granting that at that time it had been universally observed, it would still not follow from this that we too are now bound to observe it universally; since many things were observed in the primitive Church which neither were nor are of necessity of salvation, nor a precept of the Lord: as that they had all things common (Acts 4). Likewise, that

(p. 847)

gentiles should be circumcised, as Peter permitted, wishing to please the Jews. And although Paul contradicted it, he yet had his disciple Timothy circumcised (Acts 16), whose father had been a gentile but his mother a believer. For the text says: "And taking him, he circumcised him, because of the Jews who were in those places." And he glories that he withstood Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed. "For before that some came from James, he did eat with the gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them who were of the circumcision. And to his dissimulation the rest of the Jews consented, so that Barnabas also was led by them into that dissimulation" (Gal. 2). Yet he himself had earlier circumcised Timothy, and so in reproving Peter he reproved himself too; on which see 2, q. 1 [*sic*], *Paulus Petrum reprehendit*, where it is added: "This is understood not of the office of ecclesiastical dignity but of purity of life and holiness of conduct; for Peter alone among the apostles held the primacy." For the Gloss says, on dist. 11, last chapter, on the words "Peter the Apostle," that Peter gave Paul licence to preach by the authority of the Lord, saying: "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have taken them" (Acts 13). And so, when the same Paul had been present at the council held at Jerusalem by the apostles, and at the conclusion and decree of the apostles themselves against the heresy of the Pharisees, who said that the gentiles must be circumcised and keep the law of Moses (Acts 15), afterwards, parting from Barnabas and going through Syria and Cilicia with Silas, confirming the churches, commanding them to keep the precepts of the apostles and elders, when he had come to Derbe and Lystra he circumcised Timothy, acting against the decree and against what he himself had preached; yet, as we believe, by the prompting of the Holy Spirit, to avoid scandal to the Jews. So, therefore, the most holy Roman and universal Church, inspired by the Holy Spirit, not only did away with communion under both species for the lay people, but

(p. 848)

changed very many other things after the times of the apostles, as I shall say below.

Fourthly, the words of the same Augustine are to be considered when he says: "or by plenary councils, whose authority in the Church is most salutary, [are] retained as commended and established." For, as the same Augustine says against Faustus the heretic: "I would not believe the Gospel unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me." Since, then, in the sacred Council of Constance it was decreed by the most holy universal Catholic Church that those unwilling to desist from communion under both species, both priests ministering to the lay people and the lay people themselves, should be punished as heretics: how great an arrogance, how great a frowardness and rash pride reigns in those who choose rather to live singularly as rebels than with humble devotion to keep the commands of holy Mother Church together with the whole Catholic Christian people!

Fifthly, the words of the same Augustine, as above, are to be considered, where he says that what is kept by all, wherever the Church spreads itself, is to be kept. And he adds in another phrase: "[things] which vary by places and regions of the earth, such as that some fast on Saturday and others not, some communicate daily in the body and blood of the Lord, others receive on certain days; and if anything else of this kind can be

noticed, this whole class of things has free observances." See how clearly Augustine determines that communion under both species is not necessary for the lay people, though also permitted; as in the primitive Church; and as in the Cistercian Order it was permitted for the ministers of the altar to communicate under both species until the Councils of Constance and Basel, in which it was forbidden them, and from then on, as true and lawful sons of obedience, they never more used such a concession. Our friends, therefore, cannot make so great a feast and display so loud a joy, either from the words of Au-

Reply to John Borotín, part 7

(p. 849)

gustine or from the words of blessed Thomas, William of Laon [*sic*], or any other doctors whatever who say that in the primitive Church, or even afterwards in some churches, it was customary to do so. From which it is most expressly plain that it is to be held indifferently, as the same Augustine says in the same place: "For what is shown to be neither against faith nor against good morals is to be held indifferently, and is to be observed for the sake of fellowship with those among whom one lives." From which words it is plain today expressly that it is against faith to refuse to obey the most holy Roman and universal Church (dist. 81 [*printed "S. 1. d."*], *Si qui sunt presbyteri*), where the words of St Gregory are cited, saying: "He therefore incurs the sin of paganism, whoever, while he asserts himself to be a Christian, disdains to obey the Apostolic See." For the words of Samuel, priest of the Lord, are cited there, saying to King Saul: "Does the Lord desire holocausts and victims, and not rather that the voice of the Lord should be obeyed? For obedience is better than sacrifices, and to hearken rather than to offer the fat of rams. Because it is like the sin of witchcraft to rebel, and like the crime of idolatry to refuse to obey. Forasmuch therefore as thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, the Lord has also rejected thee from being king."

So therefore it can be said today to the people of Prague and the followers of the renowned kingdom of Bohemia: because you have cast off the sweet yoke of obedience to our Lord Jesus Christ, who says, "He that hears you hears me, and he that despises you despises me"; because you have cast off, I say, like sons of Belial, the yoke of obedience to the most holy and universal Church militant and to all the ecclesiastical prelates and temporal kings and princes: the Lord has cast you off, so that the glory of your once praiseworthy fame, as to the worship of the Catholic faith, as to the cultivation of justice, as to good morals and the holy observances of the sacred and most salutary traditions of the most holy Roman and universal Catholic Church militant, has now vanished; so that, like sheep without a shepherd,

(p. 850)

you have neither archbishop, nor bishop, nor Catholic ecclesiastical prelate, nor are you willing to receive a Catholic king and [render] Catholic obedience to him, as you are bound by debt, not merely for fear of conscience. Where is the glorious progeny and most praiseworthy fame of the once sacred university of all studies? How many masters in the sacred page or bachelors shine or flourish in Prague? How many doctors of canon and civil law? Are there now in Prague, as once, 30,000 students or thereabouts? See what you have come to, casting off the yoke of the Lord and of holy Mother Church: so that, like sheep straying and wandering from the care of the shepherds, desiring to live in a spirit of liberty, like those Beghard and Beguine heretics who were uprooted and eradicated (in the chapter *Ad nostrum*, *De haereticis*, in the Clementines), you are held shut in and chained in the jaws of ravening wolves, namely of the infernal demons, by infernal faithlessness. For, as Solomon says (Prov. 5): "His own iniquities catch the wicked, and he is fast bound with the ropes of his own sins. He shall die, because he has not received instruction, and in the multitude of his folly he shall be deceived." And Prov. 18: "A fool receives not the words of prudence, unless thou say those things which are in his heart. The wicked man, when he is come into the depth of sins, contemns; but ignominy and reproach follow him."

Come to your senses, then, and breathe again like the prodigal son; be converted to the Lord as to a father, praying and saying: "Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee" (Luke 15 [*printed "1X"*]). Learn, I pray, the Lord's Prayer, saying: "Our Father, who art in heaven," and below: "Give us this day our supersubstantial bread" (as Matt. 6) or "our daily bread" (as Luke 11); which supersubstantial bread, taken for divine grace, we need more than natural [bread]. For Jerome says on that word "supersubstantial": "When therefore we ask that God give us the peculiar or chief bread, we ask for him

(p. 851)

who says in the Gospel: I am the living bread which came down from heaven." And Cyprian says in the same place: "For Christ is the bread of life, and this bread is not everyone's, but ours. And we ask that this bread be given us daily, lest we who are in Christ and receive the Eucharist daily" — understand spiritually, namely in the state of salvation — "should, by the intervention of some graver offence, while we are kept from the heavenly bread, be separated from the body of Christ." Daily, therefore, those tending to salvation must communicate spiritually, but not sacramentally, except in the manner which holy Mother Church declared (*De consecratione*, dist. 2, and c. *Omnis*); as to the lay people, things were finally reduced to once a year, as in the chapter *Omnis utriusque sexus fidelis*, where it says: "receiving reverently at least at Easter the sacrament of the Eucharist"; which phrase Eugenius IV, of pious and holy memory, declared by apostolic letters is to be understood from Palm Sunday inclusive to the octave of Easter, likewise inclusive. That decree and statute was issued in the general Lateran Council by Innocent III some 240 years ago.

For although Christ Jesus at the last sacred Supper instituted this most salutary sacrament of his most holy body and blood, and said to his twelve apostles, "Do this in commemoration of me" (Luke 22), in which words, according to the common teachings of the Catholic doctors, he instituted them priests; yet he did not determine the day, nor the place, nor the manner, nor the lay or clerical persons other than priests by whom this is to be done in his commemoration. But all these and very many other things, to be revealed in their times through the Holy Spirit, he left to the authority of his holy Church, his most faithful and immaculate spouse, whose visible, temporal and ministerial head he instituted Peter, granting him fullness of power when he said: "Whatsoever thou shalt bind," etc., "and whatsoever thou shalt loose," etc. (Matt. 16), and: "Feed, feed,

(p. 852)

feed" (John, last chapter). For while the other bishops are called to a part of the solicitude, the Pope alone obtains from the Lord fullness of power (2, q. 6).

And not to dwell on superfluities, omitting the variations of the times and the interpretations of the legal [precepts] of the Old Testament and of the divine precepts through the divine authority handed to the synagogue in the Old Testament, arguing from the lesser in respect of the synagogue: since the authority of the Church is much greater than was the authority of the synagogue. For by the authority of the synagogue before Christ's coming eternal life could never be obtained by anyone, as it is obtained through the authority of the Church handed down by our Lord Jesus Christ himself, who promised himself continually present to his holy Church with the fullness of his power, wisdom and likewise clemency (Matthew, last chapter): "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Going therefore, teach ye all nations," etc. "And behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." Lest the business enjoined be said to be difficult, (he added): "I am with you," who make all things light; and he said that he would be not with them only, but also with all who should believe after them; for the apostles were not to remain until the consummation of the world, but he speaks to the faithful as to one body. And Bede says: "As for his saying 'even to the consummation of the world,' the finite is put for the infinite; for he who in the present world remains with the elect, protecting them, will himself remain with them after the end, rewarding them." For the divine power is not so strictly bound to the words of the Gospel that beyond them no power remains to it of declaring,

interpreting, supplying, adding or diminishing by its prompting and authority through his holy Church; as the Lord Jesus Christ himself also said to his apostles on that same last night on which he instituted his most venerable Sacrament: "These things have I spoken to you, abiding with you. But the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my

(p. 853)

name, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you" (John 14). That same night too he said: "I have yet many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. But when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will teach you all truth." See then how the word of God is not bound, since he can dispose and change, and grant his Church to change, at the pleasure of his most holy and most just will.

Hence the same Innocent III wrote in the same general council: "It ought not to be judged reprehensible if, according to the variety of the times, human statutes too are varied, especially when urgent necessity or evident utility demands it; since God himself changed some of the things that had been established in the Old Testament in the New; nay, even in the Old itself, laws were varied according to the variety of the times." For no other precept is read to have been given to Adam at the beginning of his creation but: "Eat, and do not eat" (Gen. 2). When he died, having lived nine hundred and thirty years, nothing is anywhere read to have been revealed to him about the flood, nor to anyone down to Methuselah, who lived 969 years (Gen. 5). But it was afterwards revealed to Noah, when he was five hundred years old, 120 years before the flood (Gen. 6). And so was the second age, after the flood until Abraham, of whose birth [we read in] Gen. 11. Nor is express mention made of the priesthood until Melchizedek, king of Salem, who offered bread and wine in sacrifice to the Lord (Gen. 14). Nor had any mention yet been made of circumcision until that third age of Abraham, after the birth of his son Ishmael, begotten of Hagar, the handmaid of Sarai (Gen. 16). Nor was there any mention of a written law of the divine moral precepts until the fourth age, namely of Moses (Exod. 20). Nor was any mention made of instituting a king until the fifth age, namely of Samuel, who anointed King Saul and David; Saul was then good (1

(p. 854)

Kings 9). But because he afterwards departed from the Lord, he was deprived of the kingdom (1 Kings 16), and David, then a youth, was anointed king, who is commonly called the most excellent of the prophets. Nor does the transmigration of the Israelite people to Babylon occur until the sixth age, namely of Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel and the other prophets; nor was the Word of the Lord made flesh until the seventh age, according to this reckoning, as in the fullness of time, as the Apostle says (Gal. 4): "But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent his Son," etc. This last age is to last in the mortal human race until the end of the world, as the same Lord says (Matt. 24): "Amen I say to you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be done." And Matthew, last chapter: "Behold I am with you always, even to the consummation of the world." And so, according to the aforesaid reckoning, the whole time of the world's duration from the beginning to the end is divided into seven ages, according to the number of the seven days of the world's creation (Gen. 1) and of many other sevens in the Old Testament.

So the whole time of the duration of the Church militant is divided into seven states, according to the seven visions of John the Evangelist on the island of Patmos, described by him in the book of the Apocalypse. The first of the states is called that of justice and holiness, which lasted through the whole time of the life of Christ and his apostles; the second, of patience and severity, which lasted until the time of Constantine; the third, of prudence and sagacity, which lasted until the time of the most Christian Emperor Justinian; the fourth, of grace and charity, which lasted for the whole time of the life of St Gregory and continues in the elect until the end of the world; the fifth, of penance and community, which lasted in the state of monks and canons regular until Saints Dominic and Francis; the sixth, of want and poverty, which has lasted and lasts

until now in

(p. 855)

the mendicant orders; the seventh, of experience and finality, which will be in the time of the last Antichrist, and after his death will last until the end of the world. These divisions blessed John marked in his seven visions on the island of Patmos, where he had revelations of the holy mysteries and divine judgements until the end of the world. For first he sets the number of the seven churches under the figure of seven golden candlesticks, and in those churches seven prelates, whom by office he calls angels, figured first by the seven stars; of which in Apoc. 1, 2 and 3, in the first vision, declaring the figures, he gives the understanding of the things signified. [Secondly] [*printed "Quarto"*] he sets the number of the seven burning lamps before the throne of God, which are the seven spirits of God, that is, the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit (Apoc. 4). And continuing the vision he says, adding, that he who sat on the throne had in his right hand a book written within and without, sealed with seven seals (Apoc. 5, 6 and 7). Thirdly, at the opening of the seventh seal he sets the number of the seven angels with seven trumpets (Apoc. 8 and 9 to 12). Fourthly he sets the number of the seven heads of the great dragon (Apoc. 12); which dragon, that is, the devil, brings forth the beast, that is, Antichrist (Apoc. 13 and 14). Fifthly he sets the number of the seven angels having the seven last plagues in seven golden vials full of the wrath of the living God (Apoc. 15 and 16). Sixthly he sets the damnation of the great harlot under the name of Babylon, having seven heads, that is, seven mountains on which she is seated (Apoc. 17, 18, 19 and 20). Seventhly he sets the renewal of heaven and earth shown to him by one of the seven angels having the vials full of the seven last plagues, who showed him the fullness of glory and the excellence of the beauty of the supernal city of Jerusalem, in the fellowship of all the blessed spirits enjoying God and one another in God (Apoc. 21 and 22); and so is the end of the book. According to this sense I composed a great and lengthy

(p. 856)

treatise *On the Future Universal Judgement*, which I presented to Pope Eugenius of holy memory to be corrected, emended and disposed as it should please His Holiness; as I have also submitted, and submit, my other little works, together with the present one, to the judgement and correction of the most holy Roman and universal Catholic Church militant. Of which little works copies have been spread hither and thither, not only through all Italy but also through France, Spain, England, Flanders, Germany and other parts of the world, and copied in the Roman Church by venerable and holy men, divine grace favouring, everywhere with saving devotion. And therefore for brevity's sake I omit pursuing these things in the present little work. I intend, however, to our purpose, to demonstrate the authority of the Church, on which too I composed a useful treatise and had it presented with humble and due reverence to our most holy Lord Pope Nicholas V, who praised the work and has it carefully kept in his solemn library.

Running through briefly, then, let it suffice to relate that the supreme pontiff and the holy Church of God received authority from Christ, not only for the time of the apostles but for all the time of the world's duration, according to the word of the same Lord after the institution of his sacrament (John 14): "Amen, amen I say to you, he that believes in me, the works that I do he also shall do, and greater than these shall he do, because I go to the Father. And whatsoever you shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If you love me, keep my commandments. And I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it sees him not, nor knows him." If then, because the Spirit of truth abides with the Church for ever, God will certainly never permit his Church, ruled by the Holy Spirit, to go astray in her ordinances and determinations;

(p. 857)

and if, according to the variety of places and times, for certain reasonable causes, she interprets, declares, suspends, removes, adds to, diminishes or changes the divine law itself of the Old or New Testament, it must always be believed that she does so taught by the prompting and dictation of the Holy Spirit and by divine inspiration; since the Holy Spirit would never reveal to the Church anything in substance and effect contrary to what is necessary for salvation.

Holy Mother Church, therefore, led by the Holy Spirit, could, to conclude our purpose, change the communion of both species as regards the laity; not only because it was never of Christ's precept, but even if it had been, which however is in no way to be granted, because it is not true. For if Moses could change the divine precept of circumcision, since for forty years after the crossing of the Red Sea no one was ever circumcised, as is plain from Joshua 5; and if the Maccabees could change the observance of the sabbath, which had nevertheless been commanded to be kept with such diligence (Exod. 20 and in many other places) — and the Maccabees did change the sabbath by fighting, when previously they had refused to defend themselves on the sabbath (1 Macc. 2 [*printed "22. et 23."*]) — much more then could holy Mother Church withdraw the communion of both species from the lay people and establish that of one species. This altogether convinces and overcomes the adversaries, if they open the eyes of the mind together with us to the knowledge of Catholic truth. For, as it is said: "The reason of things past makes us know things to come" (c. *Scribam* and c. *Mandata*). When therefore we have looked at what the Church willed to do by her authority in the past, and what she does and what she has established, we shall also know more clearly what she can do in the present and in the future.

For, first, the Old Testament received its foundation and strength from the authority of the synagogue, and its repair and renewal from Ezra the great priest. Secondly, the whole Bible of the Christians, which is the solid foundation of all our true and Catholic faith and ecclesiastical discipline, received authority and

(p. 858)

validity from the approval, confirmation and acceptance of the most holy Roman and universal Catholic Church; out of reverence and devotion to which we also reckon as authentic those books which the Jews counted among the apocrypha, according to the revision and translation of our most illustrious and glorious doctor Jerome. For since many wrote gospels, such as Bartholomew, Nicodemus, Thaddaeus, Thomas and any others there may have been, not received by the Church they are reckoned as nothing (dist. 15, *Imprimis*). But four gospels are held authentic, namely of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, for no other reason than that they were received and approved by the Church, as blessed Augustine says against Faustus the heretic. So too with the epistles of Paul: since he himself makes mention of a certain epistle of his to the Laodiceans, saying to the Colossians in the last chapter: "Salute the brethren who are at Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church that is in his house. And when this epistle shall have been read with you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans, and that you read that which is of the Laodiceans"; and yet, because the Church did not approve the epistle to the Laodiceans, it is reckoned as nothing. Moreover, because it was doubtful among many whether the Epistle to the Hebrews was Paul's, it was reckoned apocryphal until it was approved by the Church after Jerome's translation. Many letters of Paul addressed to Seneca are also supposed to exist, which nevertheless obtain no firmness of strength, because they are not approved by the Church. In like manner, since the Church received only the Acts of the Apostles written by Luke, it rejected all others, such as those of Andrew, Philip, Peter, Thomas, Thaddaeus and Paul (dist. 15, *Imprimis*). In like manner too the canons called "of the Apostles," composed by heretics under the name of the apostles, were rejected by the Church (dist. 16, *Canones*). And so the whole volume of the Bible translated by Jerome obtains force and solid support from the authority of the Church, from which we draw all our de-

Reply to John Borotín, part 8

(p. 859)

fence for refuting the heresies that arise.

Thirdly, all the glosses of the doctors, both on the Bible and on the laws, canon or civil, and the laws themselves and all writings among the Christian people, are worth only as much as they are approved, or at least tolerated, by the Church, according to dist. 15, c. *Sancta Romana Ecclesia*, and the Gloss on the said chapter: *Ego solis*, etc. For in the preceding ages, while persecution raged, no opportunity was given for teaching the peoples. Whence too Christendom was split into diverse heresies, because the bishops had no licence to meet together, except (in the time) of the aforesaid Emperor; for he gave Christians the opportunity to assemble freely. Under him too the holy fathers, assembling from the whole world in the Council of Nicaea, handed down, according to the evangelical and apostolic faith, the second creed after the apostles. How much more, then, could the Church remove communion under both species from the laity and institute it under one only, according to the tradition of the Council of Antioch, which says: "All who oppose the sacred reception of the Lord's sacrament according to some private discipline of their own must be cast out of the Church." From this too the Sixth Synod of Constantinople forbade the laity the communion of the chalice, as a transitory ceremonial, while it enjoined it on priests to be done as a memorial (dist. [*text unclear*]). "For so we approach the secret blessings and are sanctified, made partakers both of the holy flesh and of the precious blood"; for which reason in the old law the untaught are forbidden to see the secret things of the Church, Scripture saying figuratively: "Destroy not the people of Caath from the midst of the Levites; but do this to them, that they may live and not die, if they touch the holy of holies" (Num. 4). And below: "Let not others by any curiosity see the things that are in the sanctuary before they be wrapped up; otherwise they shall die."

So, then, when the priest celebrates, the people see the species of bread consecrated and

(p. 860)

transubstantiated into the true body of Christ, really and effectively, with all the fullness of his divinity, with the whole soul, with the whole body and with the whole blood, glorified, hidden under that visible species of bread; but the people do not see the species of wine, only the colour of the chalice; yet they believe that the blood of Christ lies hidden within. The celebrating priest, however, often sees the species of wine transubstantiated into blood; he sees it, I say, and drinks it, as one worthier than the people to consecrate the secret sacrament of God, and [to take it] sacramentally and spiritually for his own salvation and that of the whole believing people; while the faithful people standing by are not forbidden to take it spiritually too. Whence, as if to remove this ambiguity, the Council of Toledo altogether forbade ministering the communion of the chalice to the laity even at the point of necessity. [*Reference as printed: "1 Tim. 2".*] In [times of] persecutors, when men expected death every hour, it was lawful for the laity fervently to drink the blood from the chalice, as an incitement to shed their own blood. From which blessed Cyprian said (letter 30 [*sic*]): "And since the Eucharist is made for this, that it may be a protection to those who receive it, let us arm those whom we wish to be safe against the adversaries with the bulwark of the Lord's protection. For how shall we teach or provoke them to shed their blood in confession, if we deny them the blood of Christ as they go to battle? Or how shall we make them fit for the cup of martyrdom, if we do not first admit them to drink the cup of the Lord in the Church by the right of communion?" Over which words our friends cheerfully keep holiday, not attending that nothing is set down in these words to their support, since he neither speaks by way of precept, nor could he have commanded it, not being supreme pontiff nor president of any council. For such a fervour of charity was a singular privilege of the Lord, as the Apostle says (Phil. 1): "For unto you it is given for Christ, not only to believe in him, but also to suffer for him; having the same conflict as that which you have seen in

(p. 861)

me, and now have heard of me." But privileges, as being exemptions from the common law, ought not to be drawn into consequence; for a privilege is called a private law or a benefit granted from the beginning not to all generally but particularly to some. Hence Isidore: "Privileges are the laws of private persons; for a privilege is so called because it is borne in private." Alexander III in the Lateran Council thus ordained, saying: "It is rash and unworthy for anyone to presume for himself by his own authority what the Roman Church, for a certain reason considered, willed to grant to someone by singular benefits." Where the Gloss says: "He calls this rash because what is granted by privileges ought not to be drawn by others by their own authority to the extreme, since privileges do not make common law" (26, q. 8); where the words of Jerome are also alleged, saying: "The privileges of individuals can in no way make common law." If, then, our friends wish to follow the footsteps of the primitive Church, to which many privileges were granted by the Lord Jesus Christ himself, that his true Catholic faith might be spread everywhere, as the Psalmist says, "Their sound has gone forth into all the earth," and Paul repeats (Rom. 10), and that his holy Church, his immaculate spouse, might be planted and spread, his truth being diffused through the world — let them show that they have such privileges as those holy fathers, our predecessors, had, and we will agree with them even on communion of the chalice and under both species for the lay people. Let them heal the sick with their shadow, like Peter (Acts 5); let them raise the dead, like Peter and Paul; like Andrew, who by his short prayer obtained from the Lord Jesus Christ the raising of forty dead (see the context); like James; like John in the draught of poison, as in his history; like Thomas, the raising of the brother of the king of India; lastly like Simon, who together with his brother Thaddaeus obtained the raising of thirty dead in one moment. But since they can in no way show such privileges granted to them, let them humble their souls together

(p. 862)

with us and submit their necks to the sweet and most safe yoke of holy obedience to the most holy Roman Church, like all the other true Catholic faithful of Christ, and confess together with us that when the cause ceases, the effect ceases.

So, consequently, lay communion under both species, granted for the aforesaid causes, ought to have ceased, and ought to cease, when those causes ceased. For, as I said above, the whole time of the Church militant is divided into seven states, namely of the apostles, the martyrs, the doctors, the pastors, the monks, the mendicants, and the antichristians persecuting the faithful of Christ; and so one state succeeded another, which it would be long to pursue now, as I said. Let it suffice, however, in brief words, on the opening of the seven seals, as John says (Apoc. 6): that at the opening of the first seal there appeared a white horse, in which is signified the state of Christ and the apostles. At the opening of the second there appeared a red horse, in which is signified the state of the holy martyrs. At the opening of the third there appeared a black horse, in which is signified the state of the heretics and of the holy pastors and doctors warring against them, such as were Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory, Jerome. At the opening of the fourth there appeared a pale horse, in which is signified the state of the hypocrites, confounded by holy supreme pontiffs and doctors alike with their errors and feigned morals and doctrines; since heretics commonly show some hypocrisies and pretences and painted colours, and cloak their errors with some likeness of truth; yet it is said there that hell followed him. At the opening of the fifth seal there appeared the souls of those slain for the word of God, crying with a loud voice for judgement of their blood; in which is signified the state of the monks, at which time ..... [*gap in the printed text*] the scourge of God did many evils against the blood of innocent Catholics. At the opening of the sixth seal there was a great earthquake, and the sun became

(p. 863)

black as sackcloth of hair; because in the sixth state, namely of the mendicants, after Francis and Dominic, there followed a great persecution by the Emperor Frederick against the holy Roman Church. Whence the divine Bonaventure of the Order of Minors, a most solemn doctor of the sacred page and cardinal of the holy Roman Church, in the prologue [of the life] and in several places of our seraphic father St Francis, affirms

that blessed Francis was signified as that angel of the sixth seal ascending from the rising of the sun, having the sign of the living God, namely the sacred stigmata of our Lord Jesus Christ divinely impressed in his hands and feet and right side, etc. At the opening of the seventh seal, too, there was silence in heaven as it were for half an hour, in which is designated the terrible persecution of Antichrist, against whom are designated the seven angels with seven trumpets, etc.

Since, then, modern times today are other than they were in the primitive Church, another ecclesiastical tradition too is to be kept than was kept then. For in the primitive Church they baptized in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 2 and 19); they communicated after dinner (1 Cor. 11); they circumcised gentiles; they consecrated indifferently in leavened or unleavened [bread]; they kept some legal observances, as concerning things offered to idols and things strangled and blood and the like; which however are by no means to be kept today, as was said above. And even in the time of the apostles many things were removed, as is plain from Acts 11, 13 and 15. So, consequently, holy Mother Church could withdraw lay communion under both species, that same Holy Spirit continually ruling, counselling and governing her, from which Spirit Catholic truth is derived; to act against which is nothing other than to hand oneself over into the power of Satan, like Judas, the betrayer of Christ, of whom it is written (John 13): "And after the morsel, Satan entered into him." Hence we can be taught how much we must beware of receiving a good thing badly; for if he is chastised who does not discern,

(p. 864)

that is, does not distinguish the body of the Lord from other foods, how shall he be damned who comes to his table an enemy feigning himself a friend? Where Augustine says: "Not, as some think who read carelessly, did Judas then receive the body of Christ. For it is to be understood that the Lord had already distributed to them all the sacrament of his body and blood, where Judas too was present, as Luke relates; and then they came to this point where, according to John's narration, the Lord by a morsel dipped and handed indicates his betrayer, perhaps signifying by the dipping of the bread that man's feigning." From these words, then, Augustine seems to hold that the dipped morsel handed by Christ to Judas was not consecrated. And on this there is the text in c. *Cum omne*, etc., *De consecratione*, dist. 2, which says: "That the Lord had already distributed to all the sacrament of his body and blood, where Judas too was present, as Luke relates." For it is not likely that Judas communicated twice [*printed "ore instinctu (sic)"; sense uncertain*]. This is against the pestilent dogma of our adversaries, who dip the body of Christ in the blood and in the mother's milk to communicate little infants on the day of baptism, after the example of the dipped morsel, etc. For the most wretched men will not confess that the whole Christ is contained under either species, and so under any smallest particle, as Hilary says (*De consecratione*, dist. 2, c. [*name not printed*]): "Where part of the body is, there is the whole. For the same reason holds in the Lord's body as in the manna, its figure, which went before, of which it is said that he who had gathered more had no more, nor did he who had prepared less receive less. For not visible quantity is to be reckoned in this mystery, but the power of the spiritual sacrament." Thus Hilary. And he adds in the same place: "The body of Christ which is taken from the altar is a figure, while bread and wine are seen outwardly; but the truth, the Lord's body and the blood of Christ, is believed in truth inwardly"; and understand, when he says "figure," the holy sacrifice or sacrament of the body

(p. 865)

of Christ. And Jerome says in the sermon for the fourth Sunday: "They receive the whole body of Christ in the single portions; each receives Christ the Lord, and he is whole in the single portions, nor is he lessened by being shared, but gives himself entire to each." Augustine too confirms this in the sermon on the words of the Lord on the mount, and it is had in *De consecratione*, dist. 2, c. *Qui manducat*, where he says: "The faithful know how they eat the flesh of Christ: each one receives his part. (Christ) is eaten in parts and remains whole and entire; he is eaten in parts in the sacrament, and remains whole and entire in heaven; he remains whole

and entire in your heart. For he was whole with the Father when he came into the Virgin; he filled her and did not withdraw from him. He came into the flesh that men might eat him, and he remained entire, that he might feed the fathers and the angels." And blessed Gregory says in the Easter homily: "This saving victim represents to us through the mystery that death of the Only-begotten, who, though rising from the dead he dies now no more, and death shall no more have dominion over him, yet living in himself immortally and incorruptibly," again, "in this mystery dies"; the Gloss says: that is, his death is reckoned true when it is broken. Gregory adds: "His body is everywhere; his flesh suffers for the salvation of the people," that is, the passion is represented, "and his death," that is, "his blood is poured no longer into the hands of unbelievers, but into the mouths of the faithful." Over which word our adversaries rejoice to keep a day of gladness; yet their feast ceases at once if they look at the Gloss there, which says: namely, by men consecrating, whether worthily or unworthily. Gregory adds: "Hence then let us weigh what this sacrifice is, which for our absolution ever imitates," that is, represents, "the passion of the only-begotten Son. For which of the faithful can have any doubt that in the very hour of the immolation, at the voice of the priest, the heavens are opened, and that in that mystery of Jesus Christ the choirs of angels are present?" It follows:

(p. 866)

"the highest things are joined with the lowest, and one thing is made of the invisible and the visible." At one and the same time and moment, he says, the body of Christ is both caught up into heaven by the ministry of angels to be united [there], and is seen on the altar before the eyes of the priest. "For so great is the unity of the Church in Christ that wherever it is, there is one bread of the body of Christ and one cup of his blood. For the chalice which the Catholic priest sacrifices is no other than that which the Lord handed on." And below: "For the divinity of the Word fills what is everywhere, and joins and makes it that, as it is itself one, so the truth of the body of Christ and his one body be in truth. Whence it is to be noted that whether one receives more or less of it, all equally receive the body of Christ most entirely, both all in general and each one in particular."

These words, then, crush the head of the dragon, the heresiarch who says that [Christ] is not received as much under one species as under both species; which is a particular heresy to be detested, which St Thomas too confounds, who compiled the Office of the Body of Christ at the commission of Pope Urban IV. More truly, then, we say that the most holy Roman Church abhors and destroys the aforesaid heresy in the chant of the Sequence of Corpus Christi, when she says: "Under different species — signs only, and not things — lie hid things most excellent." Where another heresy of the Hussites is also uprooted, who falsely assert that the substance of bread remains in the consecrated host, and likewise of wine in the full consecrated chalice. It follows in the Sequence:

"Flesh is food, and blood is drink; — yet Christ remains whole — under either species. — By the receiver not cut, — not broken, not divided, — he is received whole. — One receives, a thousand receive; — as much these, as much that one; — nor, received, is he consumed. — No division of the thing is made, — of the sign only is there breaking, — by which neither state nor stature — of the thing signified is lessened. — Behold the bread of angels, — made the food

(p. 867)

of wayfarers, — not to be cast to dogs," etc. It brings in the word of Christ saying to the Canaanite woman (Matt. 15): "It is not good to take the bread of the children and to cast it to the dogs." And to his apostles he said (Matt. 7): "Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest perhaps they trample them under their feet, and turning upon you they tear you." Concerning which the Apostle also says (Heb. 10): "A man making void the law of Moses dies without any mercy under two or three witnesses; how much more, do you think, he deserves worse punishments, who has trodden underfoot the Son of God, and has esteemed the blood of the testament unclean, by which he was sanctified, and has offered an affront

to the Spirit of grace?" Which words, if considered mystically as taken for the consecrated blood, beat back the deceitful lips of our adversaries, who give the consecrated blood of Christ indiscriminately to little infants, to robbers, to murderers, and to any abominable and wicked sinners, men and women. For St John Chrysostom says on those words, "Give not that which is holy to dogs": "That which is holy is, as baptism, the grace of the body of Christ. The mysteries of truth are pearls, because as pearls enclosed in shells are placed in the depth of the sea, so the divine mysteries enclosed in words are placed in the depth of the sense of sacred Scripture." Augustine in the same place understands the dogs as schismatics and heretics, saying: "We not unfittingly take the dogs as placed for assailants of the truth, and the swine for its despisers; because dogs leap forth to tear, and what they tear they do not let remain whole; because, as far as in them lies, if it could be done, they try to destroy the truth. But swine, though they do not attack with a bite as dogs do, yet defile by trampling here and there." And in the same place John Chrysostom says: "By dogs I think the gentiles and heretics are to be understood: the gentiles wholly unclean both for their acts and for their unbelief; the swine, the heretics, because they seem to call on the name of the Lord." And below: "or the swine not

Reply to John Borotín, part 9

(p. 868)

only trample the pearls with carnal acts, but also, turning shortly after through disobedience, tear them; and often too, being scandalized, they slander them as sowers of new doctrines; the dogs also, trampling holy things with filthy acts and disputations, tear the truths of the preachers." And in the same place, in the homily, on the word "turning," he said, and said well: "Turning: for they feign gentleness in order to learn; then, when they have learned, they disparage." From which Augustine says (*On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*): "Care must therefore be taken lest anything be opened to one who does not grasp it; for it is better that what is sought be shut, than that what is opened either be attacked through hatred, like the dog, or neglected through contempt, like the swine."

The secrets, therefore, of the most excellent sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, since they cannot be demonstrated to sense for the untaught laity, are not to be discussed explicitly, since it suffices for them to believe the mysteries of our faith implicitly (c. *Firmiter*, etc.). And therefore they are not to be communicated under both species, since it suffices them effectively for eternal salvation, according to the ordinance and rite of the most holy Roman and universal Church, to communicate under one species only, namely of bread transubstantiated into the true body most fully according to its most true and most glorious essence, as to the divinity as well as the humanity, really and effectively, the soul, body and blood being indivisibly and inseparably united in that sustaining divine Word of God personally for ever; according to which the same Lord Jesus Christ said (John 6): "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever"; making no mention there of the chalice of blood, because those who take the body take with the body the blood and all the perfections of Christ, of virtues, graces, properties and operations necessary for salvation, supposing a worthy disposition of the receiver. To this

(p. 869)

opinion — notwithstanding the pestilent dogma of the impious, asserting against Christ a precept of necessity of salvation that the lay people must communicate under both species, which is most false and utterly alien from the truth of Christ — all the other authorities of any Catholic doctors whatever, alleged either by our side or by the adversaries, being soundly understood, concur and are to be brought back.

For priests, however, as more skilled and more capable of so great a mystery, it is fitting and reasonable, and necessary by Christ's institution, both to consecrate and to communicate under both species when they celebrate; yet not otherwise than according to the ordinance of holy Mother Church herself, whose authority,

conferred by Christ, we have said to be necessary for the force and efficacy of all the sacraments and the truths of the Scriptures. It was, therefore, only for the sake of signification and an extrinsic sacramental denomination, not concerning the substance or efficacy of the sacrament, that Christ instituted this wonderful sacrament under both species. See, it was said above: "Under different species, signs only and not things," etc. For every use of the sacrament is not substantial but accidental; from the fact that, once the consecration of the body and blood of Christ is given, even if it were never received, for as long as the species lasted, remaining as accidents without a subject, for so long all the substantial truth and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ would subsist in the same sacrament, as our doctors teach. For as in baptism the outward washing with water is a sign of the inward washing by grace, so in the eucharistic reception the outward feeding customarily done by celebrants under the double species, namely of bread and wine, (is a sign) of the full inward feeding; which, though it (is done) as fully, effectively and really under one species as under two, is yet not expressed to sense by the sensible and sacramental sign as fully under one as under two, as St Thomas says. Which

(p. 870)

signification and denomination, however, is not to be searched out indiscriminately by the untaught, but rather individually by the understanding, wise and gifted; as we say of the understanding of sacred Scripture, to be searched out fourfold, namely historically, allegorically, tropologically and anagogically; of which I said more in the treatise *On the Future Universal Judgement*.

But as far as concerns your proposition on the double species, namely of consecrated bread and wine: as to that most express sign according to the historical sense, the completeness of the outward feeding under the double species, namely of bread and wine, is a more express sign of the perfect feeding of the soul by grace, caused by the power of the venerable sacrament under the double species, not really and effectively but significatively and demonstratively to sense; and so textually the words of Christ can be taken: "Unless you eat and unless you drink," etc. (John 6); "And take and eat, and drink ye all of this" (Matt. 26); "And they all drank of it" (Mark 14).

Secondly, allegorically: since there is no greater sensible drawing-near to a creature than by feeding, the conversion of one into another, whether bodily, as of the food into the one fed outwardly, or of the soul: because as bread eaten is converted into the flesh of man, and wine drunk into blood, so in this sacrament there is expressly made a signification, whether spiritual or intellectual, that there be a conversion of the one fed into the food — of the one fed, I say, as to the body, but spiritually, I say, as to the soul; as it says in *De anima* 3: "The soul is more where it loves than where it animates." And the Lord Jesus says: "Where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also." So it comes to those who receive this sacrament worthily, Christ inspiring blessed Augustine when he said: "You will not change me into you, like the food of your flesh, but you will be changed into me." And [the Lord] says to all in common, by way of pronouncement (John 6): "He that eats me, the same also shall live by me"; and "He that eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me

(p. 871)

and I in him." Which words he put first, and afterwards added: "As the living Father has sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eats me, the same also shall live by me." And this in two ways: either for good, by leading well the apostolic life through imitation of my life, signified by the conversion of bread into flesh, according to what the Apostle says (Eph. 5): "Be ye therefore followers of God, as most dear children, and walk in love, as Christ also has loved us and has delivered himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice to God for an odour of sweetness"; or secondly by abstaining from sins because of the shedding of my blood for the remission of sins and their detestation (Luke 22). And Eph. 1: "We have redemption through his blood, the remission of sins, according to the riches of his grace, which has superabounded in us." This, then, is figured

by the sacrament (the mystery) of Christ's blood transubstantiated under the species of wine; but really and essentially our redemption and the remission of sins was consummated in the shedding of his most precious blood and death on the cross; whence he himself said: "This is my blood, which shall be shed for the remission of sins." And Peter said in his first canonical epistle, chapter 1: "Knowing that you were not redeemed with corruptible things, gold or silver, from your vain conversation of the tradition of your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb unspotted and undefiled." And Apoc. 1: "Who has redeemed us and washed us from our sins in his own blood," etc.

Thirdly, tropologically or mystically: thus from the beginning of the world, after the fall of our first parents, for every adult wayfarer two things concerning Christ Jesus were, are, and until the end of the world will be necessary to be believed for eternal salvation: namely his incarnation, once revealed and figured in many ways, but now represented and to be made present until the end of the world through the sacrament of his body under the species of bread; and his passion and death with the shedding of blood, represented

(p. 872)

through the sacrament of his blood under the species of consecrated wine. And because without these two [things], which the species represent, no one could, can or will be able to be saved — since, as the Apostle says (Heb. 11): "Without faith it is impossible to please God"; and he says in the same place: "He that comes to God must believe that he is, and is a rewarder to them that seek him" — therefore, to express the aforesaid, the Saviour said (John 6): "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you." And Luke 22 [*printed "21"*]: "This is my body, which is given for you. Do this for a commemoration of me. ... This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you." But Matthew 26 said that Christ said: "[Drink ye all] of this. For this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins." Mark 14 expresses: "And when evening was come, he comes with the twelve." And below: "One of the twelve, who dips with me his hand." And below: "And having taken the chalice, giving thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And he said: This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many." You see, then, the variety in the utterance of the words and the sequence of the Gospel text; yet there is one sense of the truth.

To meditating continually and contemplating intellectually this representation the Apostle admonishes and exhorts, nay, so far as is necessary, commands (1 Cor. 11), saying: "For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until he come." And below to the end of the chapter, where he says: "Wherefore, my brethren, when you come together to eat, wait for one another. If any man be hungry, let him eat at home, that you come not together unto judgement. And the rest I will set in order when I come." See then how the Apostle, not commanding but rather rebuking the lay people of Corinth communicating under both species, repeats several times in his text in the same

(p. 873)

chapter. For he first puts forward: "But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor the Church of God."

From which it can be inferred: those contentious against the determination of the Church are not of the Church, but rather of the synagogue of the devil, of whom the Psalmist says: "I have hated the assembly of the malignant." And Solomon says: "The congregation of sinners is like tow heaped together." Secondly, the Apostle says: "Now this I command: not praising you, that you come together not for the better but for the worse. For first of all I hear that when you come together in the church there are schisms among you, and in part I believe it. For there must be also heresies, that they also who are approved may be made manifest among you." Let my friends, then, who exercise me in the defence of Catholic truth, see how he calls schisms in the Church of God heresies. Thirdly, the Apostle rebukes the abuse of such communion, expressing Christ's intention as far removed from all indiscreet reception of his sacrament, when he says: "When you

come therefore together into one place, it is not now to eat the Lord's supper." For they used to bring even common food to the church, and had bread and wine consecrated in abundance and other foods blessed, and so abominably and indiscreetly they ate and drank in the churches with their servants; and those who were rich gorged and got drunk, while the poor, having nothing to bring to the church, not only hungered and thirsted for the common food and drink, but were also deprived of the most holy communion itself. Hence the Apostle says after the aforesaid rebukes: "What, have you not houses to eat and drink in? Or despise ye the Church of God, and put them to shame that have not?" And so he intimates that the Church is not to be despised, as our friends despise her; and rebuking them again he says: "What shall I say to you? Do I praise you? In this I praise you not" — understand: rather I detest and condemn. Fourthly, the Apostle proceeds to the account of the institution of this

(p. 874)

most excellent sacrament, when he says: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and giving thanks broke and said: Take ye and eat; this is my body, which shall be delivered for you; this do for the commemoration of me. In like manner also the chalice, after he had supped, saying: This chalice is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me." And so he narrates the deed, yet does not command the laity to do so, since lay people have no power of consecrating; therefore it is not said to them, "Do this for the commemoration of me." Nor even in the consecration does the Church keep the words of the Apostle relating that Christ said, as he said: "This is my body, which shall be delivered for you"; but we say only that the formal words are: "This is my body." The Church, however, inserts that affirmation [*the word "enim"*], which whoever omitted would sin mortally, although transubstantiation would take place; yet none of the evangelists nor the Apostle said it, but only the Church. In like manner too the Church does not simply keep the words of the Apostle saying: "This chalice is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me." Which words Luke did not express either, but only said: "This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you"; nor did he say there, "and do this for the commemoration of me," but only above, in the communion of the body, when he said: "This is my body, which is given for you; do this for a commemoration of me"; so that our friends may understand that the twelve apostles were made priests before they communicated under the species of wine, since it is the common opinion of Catholic doctors that the apostles were made priests in those words, "Do this for a commemoration of me"; which words Luke alone among the evangelists expresses, nor did any of the evangelists

(p. 875)

pronounce the form of consecration of the chalice in the way the Church keeps it. For Matthew says: "For this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins." Mark says: "This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many," and does not say "unto remission of sins." Luke says: "This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you," and does not say "for many," nor "unto remission of sins." Paul relates: "This chalice is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me." And so a great variety appears among them in the sequence of the words. From all of which the Church gathered, with some change and some additions, the universal form of consecrating the precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, saying: "For this is the chalice of my blood, of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins. As often as you shall do this, you shall do it in memory of me." And although the substantial and necessary form stands in four words, namely "This is my blood," yet whoever should rashly presume [to alter] this form due to the Church — due, I say, by the Church's institution, since I said above that the necessary [form] is in four words, etc. — would sin mortally as often as he knowingly omitted any of the aforesaid words, acting against the rite and order of the Church. And so the

Church keeps many things which were neither expressed by Christ nor handed down by the apostles, which yet, being approved by long custom, are of no less authority than if they had been handed down by the apostles, as Augustine says. And Ambrose: "But the consecration, by what words and by whose speech is it done? By the Lord Jesus'. For all the other things that are said in the earlier parts are said by the priest: praise is offered to God, prayer is made for the people, for kings, for the rest; but when

(p. 876)

the sacrament is consecrated, the priest no longer uses his own words, but Christ's." And below he says: "See each point: 'Who the day before he suffered,'" etc.

Fifthly, the Apostle gives teaching of the perpetual memory of our redemption, when he says: "For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until he come." On which Eugenius [*sic*] says (*De consecratione*, dist. 2): "And because he was about to take the body he had assumed away from our eyes and bear it to the stars, it was necessary that on the day of the Supper he should consecrate for us the sacrament of his body and blood, so that what was once offered as the price might be worshipped continually through the mystery; that, since a daily and unwearied redemption was running for the salvation of men, the offering of the redemption might be perpetual, and that everlasting victim might live in memory and be ever present in grace: the truly unique and perfect victim, to be reckoned by faith, not judged by appearance nor by outward sight, but by inward affection."

Sixthly, he compares those who receive unworthily to Judas, when he says: "Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord"; as if to say: as though he sold it like Judas, who said, "I have sinned in betraying innocent blood," and going away hanged himself with a halter.

Seventhly, the Apostle instructs those intending to communicate to prepare themselves worthily by formed contrition, lawful confession and sufficient possible satisfaction, in which three perfect penance consists, as John Chrysostom says (*On Penance*). Hence in the same place the Apostle: "But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of the chalice."

Eighthly, he threatens the judgement of eternal damnation to those receiving unworthily, when he says: "For he that eats and drinks unworthily eats and drinks judgement to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord." From which St Augustine says: "He who is at discord with Christ neither eats his flesh nor drinks his blood, even

Reply to John Borotín, part 10

(p. 877)

though he receives daily the sacrament of so great a thing unto the judgement of perdition." Where the Gloss says: "That is, he is not incorporated into his body, which is the Church, by eating, that is, by believing." And in the same place Augustine says: "Holy things too can harm the wicked: to the good always for salvation, to the wicked for judgement; not because the thing is evil, but because the evil man receives badly what is good."

Ninthly, to one who looks rightly, the Apostle forbids the communion of infants and of all lacking the use of reason, when he says: "not discerning the body of the Lord," that is, not distinguishing it from other foods. So did the Corinthians. For in those receiving is required discretion sufficient for faith and devotion toward so great a sacrament, as blessed Thomas says (4 *Sent.*, q., d. [*numbers not printed*]). In the insane, however, it is considered whether the insanity was from birth or came on afterwards, and whether the insane person has lucid intervals and is teachable. If from birth, it is not to be given; if afterwards, testimony must be had of the past life, and if it is likely that he was in the state of grace at the time the insanity came on, it can be given,

unless danger of vomiting or of some other indiscreet abuse of it is feared. Likewise it can be given in the time of an interval, if he is teachable. So it was decreed in the Council of Carthage (26). Of little ones, however, Augustine says: "But if they are little ones and dull, who do not grasp teaching, let those who present them answer for them, according to the custom of baptizing, and, communicated by the imposition of hands with chrism, that is, anointed, let them be admitted to the mysteries of the Eucharist." The Gloss says: "This is understood of adults. The body of Christ is not given to little ones," as below, *Eodem in Ecclesia*. Where the words of the same Augustine against the heresy of the Pelagians, to Boniface, are related, saying: "Nor think that those cannot have life who are without the body and blood of Christ, since the Lord himself says: Unless you eat the flesh," etc. The Gloss says: as if to say: "Do not doubt, nay be certain, that

(p. 878)

they cannot have [life] if they are without the body and blood of Christ, that is, the unity of the Church."

Tenthly, the Apostle reproaches them with the death, infirmity and weakness of many of the Corinthians because of the abuse of so great a sacrament, when he says: "Therefore are there many infirm and weak among you, and many sleep"; as if to say: because of your abuses and abominations concerning so great a sacrament you deserve these things and worse. Let the people of Prague too take heed, since they have now been visited with blood in the rivers, with the sword in battles, and with plague and fires; let them take heed of the scourges of the Egyptians, of which we spoke above. Let them not harden their hearts, but humble their souls; let them grow sweet in their hearts, come to their senses, judge themselves, keep the teaching of the same Apostle saying in the same place: "But if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged." Let them receive the scourges of correction like Nebuchadnezzar; let them hear true preaching like the Ninevites, and not like Pharaoh and Herod, who received scourges because of their hardness and faithless will, unto the beginning of eternal torment — Exod. 14 of Pharaoh and his army, and Acts 12 of Herod, who, struck by the angel of the Lord, was eaten by worms and gave up the ghost. Let the Bohemians contemplate the words of the same Apostle, saying in the same place: "But whilst we are judged, we are chastised by the Lord, that we be not condemned with this world."

Eleventhly, the Apostle expresses his intention, what he thinks of conferring this sacrament on the laity, when he says: "Wherefore, my brethren, when you come together to eat, wait for one another." Note: "to eat," and he did not say "to drink," intimating that the lay people are to be communicated not under the double species, but under one only, namely of bread, in which, transubstantiated into the body of Christ, is the whole living Christ, the blood entire, and triumphant with all the fullness of graces and the sublimity of his glory.

And that the Apostle means the eating of Christ's body can well be understood from what

(p. 879)

follows, when he says: "wait for one another." For Catholics ought to come together with one another in the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, as the same Apostle says (Eph. 4). To signify which, too, they come together in the bodily church to receive the sacrament of the Lord's body, in which is contained and represented the unity of the faithful as to the spirit and as to the mystical body, as the same Apostle says (Eph. 4): "Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace: one body and one Spirit, as you are called in one hope of your calling." And blessed Augustine says (*De Trinitate* 3 [*sic*]): "Christ commended in this sacrament his body and blood, which he also made us ourselves; for we too have been made his body. This sacrament of piety is the sign of unity, the bond of charity; let him who wishes to live approach and believe," etc. To express this too the Apostle says: "If any man be hungry, let him eat at home," namely common food; it follows: "that you come not together unto judgement," namely into the church, bodily or naturally, to eat the body of the Lord.

Twelfthly, lest they should perhaps take his words amiss from what he had said of the body and blood of the Lord, he reserved the declaration of his words to himself, when he said: "And the rest I will set in order when I come." But because he did not afterwards come again, since he went to Rome and was beheaded there, so his words remained in the Church's power to be searched out and determined, as also the words of Christ as regards the lay people, as was said above.

Fourthly, anagogically, considering Christ's institution under both species, namely of bread and of wine, as Melchizedek, priest of God Most High, prefigured it, offering bread and wine from the tithing of Abraham (Gen. 14), we can contemplate thus: bread strengthens the heart of man and wine gladdens it; but our strength in this pilgrim life is only through faith and hope, since faith is the sub-

(p. 880)

stance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not (Heb. 11). Hope is the certain expectation of future beatitude, coming from divine help and one's own merits, as Augustine [*sic*] says. And the gladness of our mind in this pilgrimage proceeds from charity, as the Apostle says (Gal. 5): "But the fruit of the Spirit is charity, joy, peace, patience, longanimity, goodness, benignity, mildness, faith, modesty, continency, chastity. Against such there is no law. And they that are Christ's have crucified their flesh with the vices and concupiscences." Charity is the love by which God is loved for his own sake and one's neighbour for God's sake. Of which three virtues the Apostle says (1 Cor. 13): "And now there remain faith, hope and charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." Anagogically, then: since faith is to be succeeded by the clear vision of the divine essence and perfect knowledge of pure truth, from which results the very beatitude of all the saints — because, as Augustine says, vision is the whole reward; and the Lord Jesus said (John 17): "This is eternal life, that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, thy Son, whom thou hast sent"; where Augustine says: "The order of the words is: that they may know thee, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent, as the only true God"; consequently the Holy Spirit too is understood, because he is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, as the consubstantial charity of both — to charity, then, fruition succeeds, because, as the Master of the Sentences says (1, d. 1), fruition is to cleave to some thing with love for its own sake; from which also follows the apprehension that succeeds to hope. In these three endowments of the soul all perfect beatitude consists. And so Christ's institution under the double species figures, on the way, the beatitude of the homeland; therefore the words of Christ, "Unless you eat and unless you drink," etc., can be taken in the anagogical sense too, because without faith, hope and charity there can be no eternal salvation. But since the laity and untaught peoples do not know how to contemplate these things so explicitly, nor is it necessary for them,

(p. 881)

since it suffices them to believe implicitly, as was said, it also suffices them to have faith concerning the institution and truth of this sacrament, and, according to the ordinance of the Church, to communicate sacramentally and spiritually in the state of grace under one species only, once a year, faithfully and devoutly with due reverence, without relative speculation on the signs because of their lack of learning; as the Apostle says (Heb. 5): "And whereas indeed he was the Son of God, he learned obedience by the things which he suffered, called by God a high priest according to the order of Melchizedek; of whom we have much to say, and hard to be intelligibly uttered, because you are become weak to hear. For whereas for the time you ought to be masters, you have need to be taught again what are the first elements of the words of God; and you are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that is a partaker of milk is unskilful in the word of justice, for he is a little child. But strong meat is for the perfect, for them who by custom have their senses exercised to the discerning of good and evil."

It is no wonder, then, if in the primitive Church they permitted the lay peoples to communicate under both species, as a kind of indulgence to those tender in faith, for whom milk would be drink, as for little infants at

the start, from birth for a year and more; although up to three years they need the mother's comfort more than the father's, according to the judgement of human laws, which consider natural aptitude. Hence too the Apostle, writing to the Corinthians in his first epistle, which he sent as a whole, intending to reprove them for the abuse of communion under both species, put first in the first chapter: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you." And below: "Now this I say, that every one of you says: I indeed am of Paul; and I am of Apollo; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? Was Paul then crucified for you? Or were you baptized in the name

(p. 882)

of Paul?" And in the second chapter he says: "For I judged not myself to know anything among you but Jesus Christ, and him crucified." This, then, was the care and industry of the primitive Church: namely, to make known our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, who suffered and died for our salvation and rose from the dead on the third day, and his other mysteries. Whence he adds: "That your faith might not stand on the wisdom of men, but on the power of God. Howbeit we speak wisdom among the perfect." And below: "which was hidden." And below: "But to us God has revealed them by his Spirit. For the Spirit searches all things, yea, the deep things of God." So too below: "The sensual man perceives not these things that are of the Spirit of God ... but the spiritual man judges all things, and he himself is judged of no man." And in the third chapter he says: "And I, brethren, could not speak to you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal. As unto little ones in Christ, I gave you milk to drink, not meat; for you were not able as yet. But neither indeed are you now able; for you are yet carnal." See, then, how beautifully he forewarns them that, so long as they believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, he permitted them the rest under toleration pending a future declaration; as also in 1 Cor. 11 he said: "The rest I will set in order when I come."

Worthily and justly, therefore, holy Mother Church has so instituted and ordained that celebrating priests, as spiritual men, should consecrate and communicate under both species, but the lay people under one only, to avoid many dangers and inconveniences of which we shall speak below. Piously too the primitive Church, as to little infants, permitted some to communicate under both species according to the devotion of those who so asked, lest scandal should arise in the faith of the newly planted, who are called neophytes, if communion of both species were denied them. For many things are permitted to neophytes which are rather denied to those advanced in faith, as Innocent III says in the chapter *Deus qui Ecclesiam suam*, etc., where it is conceded to Jewish neophytes that they may

(p. 883)

remain in marriages contracted before baptism, though after baptism they are forbidden to contract with such (33, q. 3).

Finally, beyond the aforesaid, how many and how great things concerning the truth of the faith the most holy Roman and universal, pious Mother Catholic Church has disposed and ordained, which are to be held, believed and observed unshakeably by all Catholics, can be clearly evident to those who look rightly from what is written below.

First: although it is established from the sacred Scriptures that there is a Trinity in God, yet that the single [members] existing in the Trinity are named Persons the Catholic Church declared.

Secondly: that in Christ there are not two persons, as certain heretics held, the Church declared through her doctors, since it was not manifestly had from the sacred Scriptures.

Thirdly: that the mother of Christ is called Mother of God we receive from the authority of the Church, when we say: *Ave maris stella, Dei mater alma*. Because Christ Jesus is true God and man inseparably, therefore this man-God born of the Virgin is son of the Virgin, and consequently the God-man is son of the Virgin.

This too the angel said to the blessed Virgin Mary in her annunciation: "Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb." And below: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High." And below: "The Holy which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." But the Son of God is born of the Virgin; therefore the blessed Virgin Mary is Mother of God: against the heresy of the Carpocratians, who said that Christ was only a man and begotten of both sexes (24, q. 3); and against the heresy too of the Valentinians, who said that Christ took nothing of body from the Virgin; likewise against the heresy of the Nestorians, who asserted that the blessed Virgin was mother not of God but of a man only.

Fourthly: that little infants should be baptized for eternal salvation, not only on the day of birth after complete emergence from the mother's womb, but even if only the living head appears —

(p. 884)

this is by no means found expressed in the sacred Scriptures.

Fourthly [*sic; numbering repeated in the edition*]: that little infants [*text apparently defective here; sense: the practice of infant baptism*] take force and Catholic truth from the authority of the doctors and the long-observed custom of the holy Church, against which to assert pertinaciously is judged heretical; as Augustine says, writing against the Pelagians on the baptism of little ones: "Only from ancient, canonical and most firmly founded custom are baptized little ones called faithful." This is plain also from *De consecratione*, dist. 4, c. [*name not printed*]: "Little ones are rightly called faithful, who in a manner confess the faith through the words of those who carry them, and through the words of the same renounce the devil while living; and this is done by the grace of the sacrament and of God, which God gave to the Church." And in the same book on the baptism of little ones: "You will number baptized little ones among believers, nor will you dare to judge otherwise in any way, if you do not wish to be an open heretic."

Fifthly: the Church alone ordained that godfathers or godmothers should answer for little ones in the Church's place; and so little infants come to the font of baptism on the feet of the godparents, believe through the hearts of others, answer through the mouths of others, and through the faith, hope and charity of others obtain life everlasting, as is fully plain from *De consecratione*, dist. 4, c. *Parvulum*, where the words of the same Augustine are related, saying: "As no one is to be kept from baptism, so there is no one who does not die to sin in baptism: but little ones only to original [sin], the older to all." And in a certain sermon after Easter the same Augustine says: "Before all, both men and women who have received sons in baptism, I admonish you to recognize that you have stood as sureties before God for those whom you were bidden to receive from the sacred font. Therefore always admonish them to keep chastity, love charity, and hold before all the Creed and the Lord's Prayer; and hold them yourselves, and instruct those whom you received from the sacred font."

(p. 885)

Sixthly: only by the authority of the Church in the Council of Nicaea do we hold the creed of the apostles and of the elders; in which too, after the Council of Nicaea, the Church solemnly declared the article of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. And (the same was done) in the Council of Florence, the Greeks being present and then accepting it, the Emperor of Constantinople himself with his patriarch gladly consenting, as had earlier been had from the Council of Ephesus; although the Greeks themselves, after the death of those men, the Emperor and the patriarch, for the most part returned to their vomit. Our friends the Bohemians, however, would not come to that flourishing Council of Florence, celebrated by Eugenius of holy memory after the transfer made by him of the Council of Basel to Ferrara and from Ferrara to Florence; since they would not even acquiesce in the decree of the Council of Basel declaring that the laudable custom of the Church, of communicating the lay people under one species only, is to be kept as law. Nor did Rokycana himself wish to await such a decree, since he well reckoned that if he had left Bohemia or Moravia he would have had either to abjure his heresies at the Council of Florence or to follow

the end of Hus and Jerome and Wyclif, whose footsteps he damnably imitates, etc.

Seventhly: how many and how great heresies the vigorous, triumphant and ever-unconquered authority of the Church, against which the gates of hell could never prevail, either through heresies or through schisms, has magnanimously uprooted with invincible arms! Let those who know how to learn letters read [causa] 24 [*printed "22. cap."*] throughout, and on the names of the heresies, q. 3, c. *Quidam autem haeretici*.

Eighthly: although in sacred Scripture there is nowhere express mention of venerating images of our Lord Jesus Christ, or of the blessed Virgin, or of any saints whatever — nay rather, in the Old Testament it is forbidden by divine law (Exod. 20), as we read: "Thou shalt not have strange gods

Reply to John Borotín, part 11

(p. 886)

before me. Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, etc. Thou shalt not adore them nor serve them"; nor do we read that this prohibition was removed in the New Testament — yet the authority of the Church not only permits but commands it. Pope Hadrian says: "We therefore command that the true Lamb, our Lord Jesus Christ, be painted according to his human image in true images, instead of the old lamb." In the Old Testament too, after that divine prohibitive precept, the Lord commanded Moses to make two golden cherubim (Exod. 25). Likewise he commanded him to make the ark in which the manna, the rod of Aaron and the tables of the divine law should be kept (Exod. 25 and 37). Lastly he also commanded Moses to make a brazen serpent, to hang it on a high pole, so that those bitten by serpents in the desert should look on the brazen serpent as a remedy for health and not die (Num. 21). ..... Solomon too had images and cherubim carved in the temple of the Lord on tablets of iron [*sic*] (3 Kings 7). The same Solomon too wrote in the last chapter of the Song of Songs, the divine voice saying: "Put me as a seal upon thy heart, as a seal upon thy arm; for love is strong as death, jealousy hard as hell"; prophesying from these things that memory is to be had of the death of our Redeemer; as the Apostle too says (1 Cor. 11): "For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until he come." And Phil. 2: "For let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." And below: "Becoming obedient unto death, even to the death of the cross." From this too holy Mother Church commands that those be punished with a hard avenging sentence who irreverently and undevoutly dare rashly to handle images of the holy cross, of the blessed Virgin and of the other saints, as in c. *Si canonica*. For such images are memorial signs of the deeds of Christ and his saints, to stir the minds of beholders to devotion and to imitation of praiseworthy works, as

(p. 887)

to the good morals necessary for salvation, and to obtaining the suffrages of the aforesaid, as blessed Gregory says: "For what writing provides to readers, a picture provides to the unlettered who look at it; since in it even the ignorant see what they ought to follow; in it those read who do not know letters."

Ninthly: a strict precept concerning the observance of the sabbath was given to Moses for himself and all the people (Exod. 20), because the Lord rested on the seventh day from all the work which he had done, and blessed the seventh day and sanctified it (Gen. 2); and those who transgressed the observance of the sabbath day were put to death by divine command (Num. 15). And yet, out of reverence for the Lord's day of the resurrection, the observance of the sabbath was removed by the Church's authority and the observance of the Lord's day introduced.

Tenthly: though it had been commanded that the Pasch should be celebrated on the fourteenth day of the first month, namely March, as a lawful everlasting covenant (Exod. 12), yet by the authority of holy Mother Church it was changed as to the day, so that our Pasch never coincides with the Pasch of the Jews and our Pasch is always celebrated on the Lord's day.

Eleventhly: although in the divine law circumcision was imposed under pain of death as an everlasting covenant, as is plain from Gen. 17, even on those who were not of the stock of the Jews, as is written there: "All the male kind in your generations, he that is born in the house as well as the bought servant shall be circumcised, and whosoever is not of your stock; and my covenant shall be in your flesh for a perpetual covenant. The male whose flesh of his foreskin shall not be circumcised, that soul shall be destroyed out of his people, because he has broken my covenant" — yet that circumcision was given not as a testimony of eternal salvation, but "for a sign of the covenant between me and you"; which sign Moses declared (Deut. 10) when he said: "And now, Israel, what does the Lord thy God require of thee, but that thou fear the Lord thy God, and walk in his ways, and love him, and serve the Lord thy God with all thy

(p. 888)

heart and with all thy soul?" And below: "Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart, and stiffen your neck no more; because the Lord your God, he is the God of gods and the Lord of lords, a great God and mighty and terrible, who accepts no person nor taking of reward." And so through forty continuous years, during which they were led through the desert, no one was ever circumcised; nor did any of the circumcised, except Caleb and Joshua, enter the land of promise. But to Joshua, after the entry into the land of promise and the crossing of the Jordan, it was said by God's revelation: "Make thee knives of stone, and circumcise the children of Israel." He did as the Lord had commanded (Josh. 5). See, then, how even in the time of Moses the law of circumcision was suspended, and also in the time of Joshua, until they came to the plains of Jericho, the great city. So too in succession, after the birth of Christ, Christ was circumcised on the eighth day (Luke 2 [*printed "27"*]); the apostles too were circumcised, and some of the gentiles. Yet the apostles themselves in the first Council of Jerusalem wholly forbade circumcision, as is plain from Acts 15, where for a law they wrote a letter to the Antiochenes, saying: "It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay no further burden upon you," etc. And Paul in the epistle to the Galatians (5): "Behold, I Paul tell you, that if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." And below: "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision avails anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith that works by charity." See, then, how the Church wholly removed circumcision and annulled it among Catholics, so that whether one was circumcised before or not, coming to baptism he may confidently await the blessed hope and the coming of the glory of the great God, not in circumcision but in the grace of baptism, from the mystery of faith and formed by charity. It is plain, then, that the authority of the Church is ample enough beyond those things which are contained in the Gospels, so that by Christ's authority she can change, add, or cut away, [and give] declaration and interpretation according to the prompting

(p. 889)

of the Holy Spirit, for reasons often hidden from us, yet effective and useful for salvation, even beyond the very words of Christ confirmed in the Gospels and changed by the Church.

Twelfthly: Christ, on the day of his most triumphant Ascension, gave the formal law of the sacrament of baptism (Matthew, last chapter), saying: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Going therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." For it is plain, as our doctors and holy fathers teach, that the baptism of Christ succeeded circumcision with incomparably greater efficacy. Nevertheless the apostles themselves, by the prompting of the Holy Spirit, changed the aforesaid form of baptizing, as is plain from Acts 2, where Peter said: "Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus of Nazareth [*sic*] for the remission of your sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." And in chapter 8 it is written: "But when they had believed Philip preaching of the kingdom of God, in the name of Jesus Christ they were baptized, both men and women." And below in the same chapter: "They prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Spirit; for he was not as yet come upon any of them, but they were only baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." And in

chapter 11 [*sic; the episode is in Acts 10*]: when Peter had converted Cornelius and his household, who were gentiles, Peter said: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?" And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Our doctors teach (on the fourth book of the *Sentences*) that the apostles did this by the prompting of the Holy Spirit, because at that time the name of Jesus was quite hateful to unbelievers and pagans; whence, so that it might be made lovable to the baptized, it was lawful for the apostles, by licence of the Holy Spirit, to baptize in the name of Jesus. But today, if men did so, one would not be baptized, as St Thomas says;

(p. 890)

just as if one were baptized in the name of the Trinity, or in the name of the Begetter and the Begotten and the One proceeding from both: because as in the name of the Trinity the persons are not expressed, but the number, so in the name of the Begetter and the Begotten and the One proceeding from both the persons are not taken as subsisting in the manner of hypostasis, but only in the manner of act. And therefore it is not the same signification, and so not baptism, as is plain in c. 1, *Extra, De baptismo et eius effectu*. The Gloss, however, there and in c. *Aliter*, q. [*sic*], *De consecratione*, dist. 4, holds that even today, though one ought not to be baptized in the name of Christ, yet if one is so baptized, the baptism is valid — not theirs, but Christ's; and so there is a difference between theologians and canonists. I, however, say, to save both, that today the form handed down by Christ to the Church is to be kept, as is plain from many laws alleged in those glosses. If anyone, by the same prompting of the Holy Spirit by which the apostles themselves baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, should baptize, I would say it is baptism now as it was then. In the Greek Church, however, it is said: "The servant of Christ is baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen." And the person of the minister is not expressed, because, as our Subtle Doctor says, (this) was granted to avoid schism (1 Cor. 3); for they gloried in the names of the ministers, saying: "I am of Paul, I of Apollo, I of Cephas." From this, therefore, the theological doctors conclude that today, for those baptized in the name of Christ, the rule of the chapter [*text unclear: "c. s."*] *De baptismo et eius effectu* should be held, namely that they be baptized with these words: "If you are baptized, I do not baptize you; but if you are not baptized, I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen."

Thirteenthly: although in the primitive Church only those who [came] of themselves were baptized, afterwards holy Mother Church, the Holy Spirit teaching her, took up the rite of baptizing little ones on the day of birth; [and] though not perfectly, if the head appears, it is nevertheless expedient for salvation.

Fourteenthly: the Church held and ordained

(p. 891)

earlier that, apart from the vigils of Easter and Pentecost, solemn baptism should in no way be celebrated, and that, except at the point of necessity, baptism should be deferred until the aforesaid feasts. Afterwards, however, because it was safer, the Church introduced the custom of baptizing at any time.

Fifteenthly: neither in the teaching of Christ nor of the apostles can it expressly be found that any others ought to perform the office of baptizing than priests and clerics succeeding in the place of the apostles, since to such the Lord said: "Baptizing them in the name," etc. (Matthew, last chapter). Afterwards, however, the Church by her authority ordained that at the point of necessity men and women, clerics and laity, believers and unbelievers, Catholics and heretics, keeping the form, matter and intention of Christ and the Church, can baptize.

Sixteenthly: we read of very many changes concerning marriages to be contracted and contracted, made by the Church according to both the Old and the New Testament, etc. For first, almighty God created Adam from the slime of the earth to his image and likeness as to the soul (Gen. 1). Him he placed in the paradise of pleasure, and there cast a deep sleep upon Adam, and took one of his ribs and created Eve; and so he

instituted marriage between them when he brought Eve, [formed] from Adam's rib, to him; and he answering said: "This now is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh" (Gen. 2). And so one [woman] was espoused to one [man] from the origin of the world. Then Cain took his sister to wife, because no other woman was found except his mother and sister, and begot Enoch. Afterwards, the children having multiplied, Lamech took two wives; nor is any express prohibition found then concerning the degrees of consanguinity or affinity until the age of Moses, who wrote (Lev. 18): "No man shall

(p. 892)

approach to her that is near of kin to him, to uncover her nakedness." And there it is forbidden concerning the mother, the mother's sister or stepmother, the full sister, the granddaughter by son or daughter, the sister of father or mother, the wife of the father's brother, the daughter-in-law, the wife of a living brother, the sister of one's own wife, and the daughter of her son or daughter, etc. Then divorce was granted between husband and wife, lest wives not pleasing to their husbands should be killed; although marriage is called an indissoluble bond, and those who did not keep it underwent death (Lev. 20): "If any man commit adultery with the wife of another, and defile his neighbour's wife, let them be put to death, both the adulterer and the adulteress."

Afterwards it was also ordained through Moses that, when brothers dwelt together and one of them died without children, the wife of the deceased should not marry another, but his brother should take her and raise up seed for his brother (Deut. 25). Concerning consanguinity and affinity, and many like things concerning marriages, were permitted in the old law, which yet were cut away by the teaching of Christ; who, when he was asked by the Pharisees whether it was lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause, answered: "Have ye not read that he who made man from the beginning made them male and female? And he said: For this cause shall a man leave father and mother and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be in one flesh. Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let no man put asunder" (Matt. 19). And when they pressed about the bill of divorce, he said to them: "Because Moses by reason of the hardness of your heart permitted you; but from the beginning it was not so." Yet in the evangelical or apostolic law described in the Bible we do not read of a prohibition of marriage because of consanguinity or affinity, although fornications and adulteries are reproved in many places and most vehemently detested.

But holy Mother Church, by the authority handed to her, changed many things both concerning marriages to be contracted and

(p. 893)

those contracted. First, concerning marriages to be contracted, beyond the degrees forbidden by divine law, both in ascendants and descendants and in collaterals, she forbade and forbids marriage to be contracted. She forbids too that a brother take to wife the wife of his brother, even if he died without offspring. She also ordained concerning marriages already contracted, following the teaching of Christ, that no one should put away his wife except for the cause of fornication. Nay, even beyond the teaching of Christ she ordained that if both spouses have committed adultery, separation cannot be made, because offence must be offset by offence, and equal offences are removed by mutual compensation. And though one of them had not committed adultery but should commit it after separation from bed, she ordained, also beyond the teaching of Christ himself, that the marriage be restored. Many other things too the Church ordained, both concerning marriages to be contracted and contracted, as is plain from [causae] 27 to 36 and the whole fourth book of the Decretals; on which matter, namely of marriages, I composed a fine treatise, and therefore at present I do not intend to pursue this matter, etc.

Seventeenthly: many things too were changed concerning the sacrament of penance, which began even in our first parents in the earthly paradise, from Adam and Eve, when the Lord made them garments of skins and cast them out of paradise (Gen. 3); which was a kind of initial form of solemn penance.

So too the holy Church determined that there are three acts of penance: one, namely, before baptism in adults, that is, the inward one, because after baptism they are not bound to outward penance, as the doctors say; the second act of penance is after baptism, for mortal sins; the third for venial sins.

So too holy Mother Church, beyond sacred Scripture, ordained holy anointings in the sacrament of baptism, in the sacrament of confirmation by the bishop,

(p. 894)

in the sacrament of extreme unction, and in the sacrament of the priesthood.

Holy Mother Church also ordained holy blessings with the sign of the cross, repeated many times in all the aforesaid sacraments: as in the sacrament of baptism the water is blessed, catechism precedes, salt is put into the mouth, etc., and similar things according to the order of the holy Roman Church (*De consecratione*, dist. 4, c. *Sive parvuli*), where Pope Celestine says: "Whether little ones or young men come to the sacrament of regeneration, let (the priest) not approach the font of life before the unclean spirit has been driven from them by the exorcisms and exsufflations of the clerics." And in c. *Sicut nostis*, where the words of Augustine on the Creed are related, saying: "As you know, dearest brethren, little ones are breathed upon and exorcized, so that the hostile power of the devil may be driven from them, which deceives man in order to possess men. It is not, therefore, the creature in infants that is exorcized or breathed upon, but he under whom are all who are born under sin." And in the following chapter the words of Rabanus on the institution of clerics are related, saying: "Afterwards the one to be baptized is signed with the seal of the holy cross, both on the heart and on the forehead, so that the apostate devil, recognizing in his former vessel the sign of his own destruction, may know that it is henceforth foreign to him. From then on prayers are said over him that he may become a catechumen; then blessed salt is given into the mouth of the one to be baptized, so that, seasoned by the salt as a type of wisdom, he may be free of the stench of iniquity [*printed "equitatis (sic)"*], and may no longer putrefy from the worms of sins, but rather be kept unharmed to pursue better grace." And in the following chapter the same Rabanus says: "Afterwards his nostrils and ears are touched with spittle, and the Gospel word is said to him, that Jesus, when he healed the dumb and deaf man, touching his tongue with spittle and putting his fingers into his ear, said: Ephphetha, which is, Be opened." Ambrose says in *On the Sacraments*: "Because of the glory of the gift and the work, the bishop does not touch the mouth" — understand: with spittle — "but touches it only

(p. 895)

with salt." It follows [in the words] of Gregory [*sic*]: "but the nostrils, that he may receive the good odour of eternal piety"; where the Gloss says: "Because of the glory of the gift," that is, because of the glorious gift of the Eucharist, that is, the glorious work of preaching. Whence Ovid: "And while the other animals look prone upon the earth, he gave man a lofty face, and bade him see the sky and lift his upturned countenance to the stars." And in the following chapter the same Rabanus says: "Then by the priest — — —"

[The text breaks off here, incomplete, in the edition.]

(MS 2.VI.6, library of Olomouc.)

[Editor's note in Czech at the foot of the page: "Note. All these documents were drawn by Professor Mat■j Procházka either from old manuscripts or from copies, and are appended here. — The Author."]