

Mazalová, Lucie; Mutlová, Petra

Melancholy about the lay chalice : the polemic between John of Capistrano and John of Borotín

Graeco-Latina Brunensia. 2022, vol. 27, iss. 2, pp. 85-99

ISSN 1803-7402 (print); ISSN 2336-4424 (online)

Stable URL (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.5817/GLB2022-2-6>

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/digilib.77371>

License: [CC BY-SA 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)

Access Date: 16. 02. 2024

Version: 20230124

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

Melancholy about the lay chalice: The polemic between John of Capistrano and John of Borotín

Petra Mutlová & Lucie Mazalová
(Masaryk University, Brno)

Abstract

Among various reform impulses in the 15th century, the preaching of John of Capistrano, a famous Franciscan friar and an ardent preacher, played an important role in spreading strict observance and orthodoxy. During his tour through Central and Eastern Europe, which he undertook between 1451 and 1456 in the last years of his life, John exchanged several hundred letters (ca. 400) with the people in the countries through which he travelled. These then constitute an unparalleled corpus illustrating the history of Europe in the late 15th century (Mixson 2018: p. 23). After the publication of letters related to Poland (Kras 2018b) and the upcoming volume illustrating Hungarian matters, an edition of the correspondence between John of Capistrano and various people from Bohemia and Moravia is currently under preparation. These letters (ca. 150) include – among others – a group of two dozen polemical letters that John of Capistrano exchanged with the Hussite “heretics”. This paper analyses one of the sharpest polemics, written by John of Borotín to John of Capistrano on 20 August 1451, by presenting its critical edition together with an English translation of the Latin text, as well as by resolving the question of the authorship attribution.

Keywords

John of Capistrano; Hussites; Utraquism; polemical letters; Reformation; heresy; medieval polemic; John of Borotín; observance

1. Introduction

Among various reform impulses in the 15th century, the preaching of John of Capistrano, a famous Franciscan friar and an ardent preacher, played an important role in spreading strict observance and orthodoxy. Capistrano's tour through Central and Eastern Europe in the last years of his life, between 1451 and 1456, is a well-known undertaking (Kras & Mixson 2018). During these few years, he exchanged several hundred letters (ca. 400) with the people in the countries through which he travelled. These letters constitute an unparalleled corpus illustrating the history of Europe in the late 15th century (Mixson 2018: p. 23). Attempts at editing the whole corpus of Capestranean letters have had to overcome various national traditions, as these letters are scattered over present-day Italy, Austria, Hungary, Czechia, Poland and other countries (Bonmann & Gál & Miskuly 1989, 1990, 1992). Recently, an incentive to make the material available for study in modern critical editions has been instigated by Letizia Pellegrini (2010: pp. 187–197) and a database of all Capestranean letters, named *Corpus Epistolarum Capistrani*, was launched (Sedda 2018: pp. 35–46). A volume containing letters related to Polish material was already published (Kras 2018b) while Hungarian material is about to be published later in 2022 (Pellegrini 2018: p. 34). The material relevant to the historical lands of Bohemia and Moravia is another step in completing this enterprise and the preparation of this volume is also already underway.¹ This will lay the foundations for complex interpretation of the whole corpus of the letters. This study presents a sample edition of one of the letters related to Bohemia.

Dividing the letters into volumes based on a territorial principle is a tricky task. Both the Polish and Hungarian teams faced some difficulties when selecting material for their respective volumes. For example, the Polish-Silesian epistolary brings an edition of fifty letters, which – as opposed to earlier conscriptions – take into account all material exchanged directly between John of Capistrano and the correspondents from the Polish Kingdom as well as from Silesia. However, letters that he sent from Cracow or Wrocław to the Bohemian Hussites are excluded from it (Kras 2018b: pp. 56–67). Contrary to such “exclusive” selection criteria, the Hungarian volume will contain more material, for example all confraternity letters that John of Capistrano issued during his operation in Hungary, resulting in roughly 188 letters in total, which survive mostly in singular copies. Between the spring of 1451 and 1454, when John of Capistrano travelled in and around the Czech Lands, he is believed to have written about 82 letters that are to some extent related to the matters of Bohemia and Moravia (Soukup 2018: p. 265). However, if we take into account all letters, i.e. including those sent to John of Capistrano as well as the confraternities charters, the number would amount to 150. At any rate, the most outstanding feature of the Bohemian and Moravian material is the dissemination and survival of the letters which John of Capistrano exchanged with the Hussites – these

1 This was made possible by a project financed by the Czech Science Foundation (GAČR), no. GX20-08389X, “Observance Reconsidered: Uses and Abuses of the Reform (Individuals, Institutions, Society)”, realised at the Masaryk University in Brno (Institute of Classical Studies) and Palacký University in Olomouc (Department of History) in 2020–2024.

survive in high numbers of copies and were circulated widely (Soukup 2018: p. 259). The polemical letters that he exchanged with the Utraquists (ca. 18) were most widely disseminated, especially those addressed to and sent by John of Rokycany, a famous theologian and a representative of the Utraquist Church. The highest number of surviving copies, however, is attested in the case of a letter exchange between John of Borotín and John of Capistrano (Soukup 2018: p. 268). A letter written by John of Borotín on 20 August 1451 can be considered as the most expressive among the polemical letters, built on the theme of the most pronounced symbol of the Hussites, the lay chalice. Because of its manuscript transmission, we selected this letter as a case-study for our editorial stand on the whole corpus of polemical letters. As a general rule, the future edition will not include translations of the Latin letters. Thus, for the sake of illustration, the present study brings an English translation of this letter together with its critical edition.

Born in southern Bohemia in 1378, John of Borotín studied at Prague University, where he became a master of Arts in 1410. He continued to study at the medical faculty, later held several offices in the university hierarchy (including that of rector of the Utraquist University in 1425–1426) and taught there until at least 1454. His last will composed in 1458 is the only indication of the date of his death (Tříška 1981: pp. 223–224; Weiss 2000: p. 74). His academic career revolved around astronomy, but he was also a supporter of John Hus and like-minded Utraquist masters. His defence of the lay chalice is an example of these attitudes even if it stands out from his literary oeuvre, comprising mostly university lectures and commentaries.

The letter is a reaction to John of Capistrano's activities in Moravia in the summer of 1451, namely his preaching against administering the communion to the laity in both kinds (Hofer 1965: pp. 57–146). It emphasises that the lay chalice was an accepted practice in the primitive Church and was also guaranteed to the Czechs by the Councils of Constance and Basel and ratified by the so-called Basel Compacts (*compactata*), an agreement between the Catholic Church and the Hussites. Relevant arguments attesting to this practice are succinctly enumerated. The results of John of Capistrano's unlawful denial of the lay chalice are then ridiculed by allusions to his mental disorder. The fact that melancholy is mentioned here is a weighty argument for the authorship. As already argued (Nowakowski 2021: pp. 87–89), Borotín's medical education played a role here and he applied his medical knowledge in the form of short allusions elsewhere in his works, too. The notion of melancholy is inspired by Aristotle's *Problemata*, where melancholy is particularly associated with the nature of poets, philosophers, or various heroes. In this letter, the reference to melancholy comes strictly in a negative sense together with accusations of deplorable deeds that others claim John of Capistrano performed (shouting, exaggerated reactions etc.). The notion of melancholy and its application in the Hussite discourse certainly deserve further attention – and the edition of this letter will hopefully stimulate future interest. The ironical style of the letter is palpable at many places and together with further rhetorical devices (such as threefold structure, *cursus*, rhyme) it makes the reading pleasurable not only as an erudite piece, but also as a witty one. Two other letters written by John of Borotín bring evidence that his style was rhetorically and stylistically elegant (Vidmanová 1997; 2000) and confirm the authorship of the present one.

The text of this letter survives in 40 manuscript copies, out of which we could examine 35. The majority of these are medieval and only 3 are early modern copies. None of these seem to be an autograph (for the only identified manuscript with Borotín's hand, see Burnett 2012: pp. 11–15). A 19th-century print made the letter accessible based on one copy from Olomouc, which is corrupted in several places and contains one longer omission caused by scribal inadvertence (Walouch 1858: pp. 790–792). Recently, Soukup (2018: p. 268) registered additional copies of this letter and our subsequent examination of relevant catalogues makes the number in all probability final.

At first sight, the most notable feature seems to be the very beginning of the letter: 5 copies ascribe the authorship to John of Borotín and 15 to John of Rokycany (in both cases, some of these occurrences are superscribed, appear in the margins or were added by a posterior hand); the remaining 15 copies do not contain any title (8) or address (7). This does not contradict the ending of the letter: 10 copies sign off with John of Borotín's name, 18 with John of Rokycany's, 3 copies do not contain any name and 4 copies finish the letter off with the name of 'Iohannes Bohemus' (and its variants), which can refer to both Borotín and Rokycana. Of these 4 copies, 2 have an omission in the address at the beginning of the letter, one contains Rokycana's name, another Borotín's. In sum, there are no discrepancies in the authorship attribution in the individual witnesses. As will be argued later, the collation of all copies did not result in attributing these manuscripts to distinctive groups that would correspond to naming either Borotín or Rokycana as the author of the letter. It then follows that the title and the signature of the letter are not indicative errors and could not serve as a binding clue for the filiation of individual copies. Moreover, many of the manuscripts were copied outside Bohemia and the confusion in the names can thus be explained by the fact that the copyists were not well informed. The name of the more famous figure of John of Rokycany suggested itself instead of the less common Borotín. The mistaken identity could be also explained on palaeographical grounds, as the two initials can look the same. A 19th-century edition of John of Capistrano's answer to the letter seems to indicate Borotín's authorship beyond any reasonable doubt since it refers to Borotín as the author of this sharp letter and quotes a couple of sentences from it (Walouch 1858: p. 795). However, the old print is based on a single copy and other manuscripts might contain different evidence. Despite this, as we argued above, the medical background of the argument of the text makes it clear that the author of the text was indeed John of Borotín. In the edition, the various forms of superscription and the address were therefore omitted.

With no autograph at our disposal and no decidedly oldest or best copy, we chose to analyse the transmission of the letter in its complexity. The brevity of the text allowed for a transcription and collation of all 35 manuscripts which we had at our disposal. The comparison showed that the text richly varies and is also heavily contaminated. All copies contain singular readings and/or errors and none of them could be considered undoubtedly derivative. Following the collation of all available copies, we examined 40 variant readings (distributed throughout the text) which were of indicative character. Having set aside all meaningless readings, 12 copies remained as representatives significant for filiation. A close inspection of these twelve copies – the omissions, additions,

common errors and different readings as well as a quantitative and qualitative evaluation of these readings – resulted in choosing manuscript *A* from the convent of Capestrano as the base text for the critical edition (for the list of the sigla, see below). This paper codex from the 15th century is of Italian origin and contains four Capestranean letters (Chiappini 1927: pp. 26–28). The authorship of the present letter is ascribed to Borotín here (both at the beginning and the end of the letter), but the dating formula is abbreviated. This copy seems to be the closest to the reconstructed text and it contains only two short omissions and almost no scribal errors (the omissions are supplied by readings of *B* and *W* in the edition). The orthography of this copy, written in a gothic cursive, appears in the edition: the scribe of this copy often used spellings with -ti-, even though majority of other copies use the typically medieval assimilated variants with -ci-; but other spelling variants in this copy are also medieval (diphthongs written as -e-, generally non-assimilated forms etc.).

Regarding the genealogical relationships between the surviving witnesses, we were unable to reconstruct the stemma, but it is possible to determine several genealogical groups. The most distinctive among these is formed by manuscripts *BCD*, where *B* is the only medieval codex while *C* and *D* are early modern copies. Nevertheless, *C* has several additions which cannot be found in *B* and thus could not have been derived from this copy; moreover, *D* has several better readings than the other two. Another discernible group is *PQR* which shows a high number of common readings at singular places together with unique omissions – one such omission is at the seam of the lines (indicating a scribal oversight) in one copy, but another time at the seam of the lines of another copy – for these and other reasons none of them could be excluded as derivative copies. Moreover, it often happens that individual readings of different copies stand against each other within a group: for example, in the case of group *STUV* with 10 singular readings, there are further cases where *SUV* stand in opposition to *T* while at other places *TUV* stand against *S*. The same holds true for groups *Zah*, *NO* or *Wi*. More importantly, there are numerous cases where readings of copies from genealogically related groups oppose each other, thus attesting to the practice of contamination. This is why we decided to include readings of all available manuscripts in the critical apparatus, which can be thus consulted in order to get a full picture of the relationships between the witnesses. The only exceptions are graphical variants, undeniable scribal flaws and marginal notes of informative character, which are not recorded in the apparatus. For practical reasons, the edition does not indicate the change of folios in all copies, but the range of folios can be found in the list of the sigla. The superscription and subscription of the letter differ greatly in the extant copies and, because they are mostly later additions or corrections made by different hands, we do not register them in the apparatus either. Apart from the above, the apparatus records all variant readings of the 35 copies.

The present case study shows that editing the polemical letters exchanged between John of Capistrano and the Hussites is an exacting and time-consuming task. Moreover, the letter of John of Borotín in the appendix demonstrates the practical intricacies of editing the letters critically. The rich textual transmission of these letters sets the corpus of the polemics apart from the other letters sent by John of Capistrano to for example

burghers, representatives of ecclesiastical institutions and his supporters. Letizia Pellegrini (2010: pp. 195–197) already voiced some doubts about editing the letters critically and suggested that “a good edition” and not a critical one, would benefit the scholarship sufficiently within a reasonable timescale. Even though we believe that a critical edition of the corpus of the “other” letters, i.e. those of non-polemical character, will be a timely outcome of our current editorial project, we must conclude that the polemics of John of Capistrano with the Hussites will have to be published in a separate volume.

2. Manuscript sigla

A = Capestrano, Biblioteca del Convento di San Giovanni da Capestrano, ms. III, f. 47rv

B = Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3092, f. 144rv

C = Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 7243, f. 10v–11v

D = Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 7612, f. 6rv

E = München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 15183, f. 2r

F = Olomouc, Vědecká knihovna v Olomouci, M I 248, f. 146r–147r

G = München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 19638, f. 139rv

H = Wrocław, Uniwersytet Wrocławski, Mil. IV 77, f. 273v

I = Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 521, f. 237rv

K = Praha, Knihovna pražské metropolitní kapituly, N 50, f. 145r–146r, 151r

L = Fulda, Hochschul- und Landesbibliothek, C 10, f. 119rv

M = Oldenbourg, Landesbibliothek, Cim I 53, f. 1r–2r

N = Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3875, f. 222rv

O = Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat., 5346, f. 80r–81r

P = Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 13855, f. 141r–142r

Q = Kynžvart, Státní zámek, 20 H 5, f. 213r–214r

R = Třeboň, Státní oblastní archiv, A 19, f. 199rv

S = München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 4143, f. 159v–160r

T = München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 18271, f. 288rv

U = München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 5141, f. 115rv

V = München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 14610, f. 216rv

W = Innsbruck, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Tirol, 598, f. 7rv

X = München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 15183, f. 48r

Y = Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3338, f. 1v–2v

Z = Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3609, f. 243v–244v

a = München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 19542, f. 255va–256ra

b = München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 19648, f. 203v–204r

c = Braunschweig, Stadtbibliothek, 183, 1–2 (old foliation f. 50rv)

d = München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 23980, f. 2rv

e = Stift Schlägl, 81, f. 28rv

f = Lübeck, Stadtbibliothek, cod. 152, f. 51rv

g = Benediktinerstift Melk, Cod. 800, f. 7rv

h = München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 7495, f. 69r

i = Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 940, f. 282v-283r

k = Wrocław, Uniwersytet Wrocławski, I F 243, f. 1v-2r

3. Translation

Greetings and a wish to act and teach salutarily. I beseech you brother, who is religious and dear in Christ, to receive the letter I write here in love, to read it with holy patience and to reflect on it with common sense as befits a wise man. For I do not intend to reproach you, to offend you in your blessings or sacrifices, but I want to lay in front of the eyes of your mind what people in Bohemia, who observed your deeds and listened to your doctrines, say about you so that you may see (if it will be given) whether all that you say, teach or believe, is sound or scandalous or fit to your own and others' destruction. When I recently came to the region of Hradec Králové, I heard many things about you from also the most learned men, even saw in writing, which were full of pain because you, who set aside all fear of Lord and act as a raging melancholic, continuously distress Bohemia as well as Moravia by your poisonous words and deeds when you say and maintain that all who communicated or will communicate under both species are condemned and will be condemned. Yet to say and maintain this, or even to consider it, is dreadful, impious and profane. For if this deceit were true, then it would follow that Christ, our Saviour and the founder of this sacrament, who said: 'Whoever feeds on my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life', is condemned; but you – as they say – as a second Antichrist say contrary to Christ: 'Whoever feeds on my flesh and drinks my blood will be condemned'; and the primitive Church, which administered the Eucharist under both kinds, as is attested by the Council of Constance and the Apostle Paul, who taught this communion to the Corinthians (which he declared to have received from the Lord), and this epistle is accepted and read by the Church all over the world; he also said: "Even if the angel descended from heaven and taught otherwise, he shall not be believed"; Bohemia and also Greece would fall under this curse of yours, which – as it is said – you preach and teach and whose apparent sign is the fact that you have already discouraged many people from the most sacred communion as if it were itself a way to perdition, as you are said to falsely maintain and teach. What else is this if not you preparing a way to people's perdition, you stirring up struggles and hatred among people, and you destroying love, which is a way to salvation! If you only understood what you teach, what you maintain, if you held your tongue and fell silent! Or do you not know or pretend not to know that the Council of Basel, which at that time congregated in the Holy Spirit and represented the whole Church, as was clear to the entire world through what was said and written down at this Council, granted to the Bohemians and Moravians this most sacred communion under both kinds by the authority of Christ and the Church, his true bride. Moreover, the said Council commanded the archbishop of Prague and the bishops of Olomouc and Litomyšl, who then held the office, and everyone who was in charge of the souls, by instructing them strictly in the virtue of saint Observance to

communicate people, who were to be communicated, in this way under the threat of even the most severe punishments, as it appears in the Compacts of the said Council with the Bohemians and Moravians and sealed with the seals of the Council. Therefore, to say and to maintain something which is contrary to the Council congregated in the Holy Spirit means to say contrary to the Holy Spirit, as is believed, which no man in his right mind would dare to attempt unless he was a melancholic with a heart full of melancholy. Do not marvel, brother, that I write a melancholic since Aristotle inquires in his *Problemata* why all politicians and heroes were mostly melancholics. For the signs of a certain melancholy appear in you, as it is said, that you indeed have the habit of shouting and inciting others to such shouting. It is also believed that you have said: "If the communion under both kinds is proved to me, I want to be burnt at the stake." I hope that it is proved to you sufficiently, if you so wish. But no wise man shall wish you to be burnt but rather that you live and repent for the false and dangerous doctrine, if you held it, and that you improve for the better, as is fitting. These and many other things people say about you, which I pass by and do not accept as true about you, but I lay them as hearsay in front of the eyes of your mind.

A wise man who listens adds to his learning and I wish and ask from my heart and warn you in God's grace – as you value your dignity and prosperity – to reply to me in writing about all these things so that I am able to respond correctly in front of the wise men and lay people to all those who talk about you or rather lie about you and to defend you sincerely, since blessed Peter the Apostle wrote: "Be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have." If I wrote anything extraneous, offensive to the ears, may the religious and sensible man have understanding.

Issued in Hradec Králové. The least of his masters, Iohannes Borotín.

4. Edition

A 47r

| Salutem et salutis opera facere et docere. Obsecro te, frater religiose in Chris-
to dilecte, quatenus scripta, que hic scribo, in caritate suscipias, in patiencia
sancta legas et mente sana prudenter discutias, sicut decet sapientem. Non
enim intendo te carpere aut in benedictis tuis aut factis offendere, sed volo
ante oculos mentis tue ponere ea, que de te dicunt in Bohemia homines, qui tua
opera inspexerunt, tuas doctrinas audiverunt, ut si dabitur intelligas, si ea, que
doces, dicis vel asseris, sana sint omnia, si scandalosa et perditioni tue aliorum-
que adaptata. Cum nuper venissem in districtum Grecensem, multa de te a viris
etiam gravibus audivi, immo et scripta vidi plena dolore, quomodo scilicet tu
omni timore Dei postposito tamquam alter insane mentis melancholicus vulneras
et vulnerare non cessas dictis et gestis tuis venenosis Bohemiam simul et Mora-
viam, cum dicis et asseris, quod omnes, qui communicant vel communicaverint sub
utraque specie, damnati sunt et damnabuntur, quod nedum asserere vel dicere,
sed et cogitare horrendum est, impium et prophanum. Nam si illa falsitas vera
esset, sequeretur, quod Christus, Salvator noster, huius sacramenti institutor,
esset damnatus, qui dixit: “Nisi manducaveritis carnem Filii hominis et biberitis

1 te] *om. STU*, et *Y* || frater religiose] religiose frater *G 2* quatenus] *quamvis EIg, om. STU* || hic] *om. eiW* ||
in] et in *Z* || suscipias] *sustineas k* || in²] et in *PQ*, et *d 3* sancta] *sacra IXyhi, om. NOR* || et] in *O* || sana]
salva *h* || discutias] *disentias S* || sapientem] *sapientes M 4* carpere] *capere BCDEHILMNOPQSTUVWXYZab-*
cd efghi || aut¹] *om. H* || in] *om. k* || in – tuis] *dictis S* || benedictis] *benefactis Zh* || tuis] *om. BCDG* || aut²]
om. Pk || factis] *factis tuis BCDYc*, *verbis h*, *sanctis M* || sed] *om. O 5* oculos] *oculos tuos M* || mentis tue] *tue*
mentis PQ || ea] *ante te M, om. c* || te] *om. I* || dicunt] *dicuntur WZah* || in – homines] *homines in Bohemia*
BCDEGILMNOTUVXYbdjg, *homines in nostra Bohemia S 6* inspexerunt] *spexerunt H* || tuas] *ut tuas S*, et *tuas*
TUV || ut] *ut qui Y*, et *L* || ut – dabitur] *om. Zahk* || dabitur] *debite c*, *bene i*, *dabitur tempus aliquando S* ||
si²] *om. i 7* doces dicis] *dicis doces F* || dicis] *om. Gd* || vel] et *BCDEGILMNOTUVXYZdfg*, aut *ach* || sint]
sunt *GKMNWXZacdefik* || si] *potius S*, sed *c*, si *sunt k* || et] *si L* || perditioni] *predicacioni C* || tue] *tue et cd*
8 adaptata] *adoptata BCEGHKMWYabef*, *adoptativa k* || Cum] *Et c* || de] *a Zak* || a] *de GMXd, om. k* || a vi-
ris] auribus g || **8/9** a – etiam] *etiam a viris Y 8* viris] *viribus c 9* etiam] *quadraginta PQR, om. b* || gravibus]
gradatis i || immo] *om. F* || et] *eciam NO, om. Zah* || scripta] *scripto Y* || vidi] *om. Wi* || plena] *plena vidi W*
|| quomodo] *que Za*, *quoniam O* || scilicet] *om. OW* || scilicet tu] *tu scilicet b 9/10* scilicet – omni] *tu*
scilicet omnium nomine S 9 tu] *cum I 10* timore] *om. S* || timore Dei] *Dei timore BDSHi*, *nomine Dei TU* ||
tamquam] tam W || alter] *aliter ih* || insane] *vesane Zabh* || melancholicus] *melancolica b*, *meloncolicus TU*
11 cessas] *cesses W* || dictis et] *actis ac i*, *dictis ac O*, *dicis ex k* || tuis] *om. XZ* || simul] *om. k* || simul et] *si-*
militer S || et³] *om. TUV 12* dicis] *dictis Ie* || quod] *ut d* || omnes] *omnis S* || communicant] *communicat S*
|| vel] *aut BCD*, et *LZah* || vel communicaverint] *om. d* || communicaverint] *communicaverint BCDGMNP-*
QRTXYZbcdefghi, *communicaverant k*, *communicantur ah*, *communicaverit HSW 12/13* sub utraque] *utraque sub*
b 13 sunt] *om. d* || et] *vel BCDg* || damnabuntur] *dampnabuntur extreme g* || quod nedum] *dum id g* ||
nedum] negandum agi, *nedum FKZh* || asserere] *asserere b* || vel] et *X*, iam *NO* || dicere] *om. PQ 14* et] *om.*
CHK || est] et *EIg*, *est et c, om. STUV* || impium – prophanum] *impie et prophane b*, *impio et prophano R* ||
et²] atque g, ac *L* || prophanum] *prophanum est STUV*, *prophanum sit g* || si] *om. I 14/15* vera esset] *vera erit*
I, *esset vera k*, *esset Wei 15* quod Christus] *om. STUV* || noster] *om. d 16* esset damnatus] *plena docuisset*
et instituisset *h, om. ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRWXYZabcdfgik* || qui dixit] *non esset, qui dixit b*, *non bene dixisset,*
qui dixit g 16 /17 carnem – vobis] etc. *Zah 16/17* Filii – vobis] etc. *k* || **16** hominis] et *hominis W*

16/17 Nisi – vobis] Ioh. 6,54

eius sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis”. Tu autem, ut dicitur, velut alter Antichristus dicis Christo contrarium: “Si manducaveritis carnem Filii hominis et biberitis eius sanguinem, damnabimini”. Et ecclesia primitiva, que utramque speciem practicavit, ut testatur concilium Constantiense et Paulus apostolus, qui hanc communionem docuit Corinthios, quam dicit se accepisse a Domino, quam epistolam tota per orbem terrarum tenet et legit ecclesia, qui etiam dicit: “Si etiam angelus de celo venerit et aliter docuerit, non credatur ei”. Bohemia simul et Grecia sub isto tuo anathemate caderet, quod tu, ut dicitur, predicas atque doces, cuius signum evidens est, quia plures iam ab illa sacratissima communione, tanquam ipsa esset perditionis via, ut tu licet false asseris atque doces, sicut dicitur, abduxisti. Quid igitur aliud est, nisi quia tu perditioni hominum viam paras, bella et odia inter homines suscitās et caritatem, que via est ad salutem, inter homines rumpis? O si tu intelligeres, quid doces, quid asseris, utique apponeres in

17 ut dicitur] dicis *BCDEILMNOSTUVYdg, om. G* || velut] sicut *L* **18** dicis] *om. BCDILNOSTUVYg*, tu dicis *d* || Christo contrarium] contrarium Cristo *PQ* || contrarium] contrarius *g* || manducaveritis] manducantes *a*, biberitis et manducaveritis *d* **18/19** hominis] *om. c* || hominis – sanguinem] etc. *h* **19** biberitis] bibentes *a* || eius sanguinem] sanguinem eius *Y* || damnabimini] condempnabimini *LPQR*, dampnabuntur *k* || Et] *Nec L* || ecclesia primitiva] eciam primitiva ecclesia *g* **19/20** utramque] sub utramque *k* || utramque speciem] utraque specie *Y* **20** practicavit] practicaverit *G*, predicavit *c*, pertractavit *f* || testatur] contestatur *d* || concilium] *om. H* || Constantiense] Constantiensis *O* || et] et sic *HKc* || Paulus] beatus Paulus *k* || apostolus] *om. GSh* **21** communionem] commemoracionem *b*, viam *c* || Corinthios] Corinthiis *P*, *om. h* || Corinthios quam] contra quod *S* || Corinthios – dicit] qui *Za* || quam] quid *Y*, quod *P* || quam dicit] qui *h* || dicit] dixit *L* || Domino] Domino narrat *h* **22** tota] totam *GNSc*, totum *DO* || tota per] per totum *b* || terrarum] *om. P* || tenet] ecclesia et *b*, tenet ecclesia et leget *k*, *om. a* || et – ecclesia] *om. k* || qui etiam] deinde *S* || dicit] dicis *H* **23** Si etiam] quod si *Zah* || etiam] *om. HKOPQbck* || angelus] angelus Dei *S* || angelus – celo] de celo angelus *M* || venerit] veniret *FKPQRSTXZaceh* || aliter] *in marg. infer. in rubr. add. Sancte Laurenti, martyr milesque fortis, ora pro nobis miseris peccatoribus F* || docuerit] doceret *SZah* || credatur] credatis *C* || Bohemia] in Bohemia *E*, Bohemiaque *PQR*, Bohemia quoque *FGHKLMTSTUXj* **23/24** simul] similis est *S*, simul quoque *NO*, quoque simul *Vk*, *om. F* **24** et] *om. H* || Grecia] Graciae quae *S*, Moravia *b* || tuo] *om. ZSah* || caderet] erraret *S*, cadent *HM*, errarent *TUV*, cadet *k* || quod tu] quod *IWbcei*, quod tu dicis *S*, quod tamen *a* || ut] tunc *b* || predicas] predicas ei *Y*, dicis *Zah* || atque] et *STUV* **25** signum – est] evidens signum hoc *S* || est] *om. EITUVh* || quia] quod *PQRTVXchi* || plures] plenus *b* || plures iam] iam plures *f* || iam] *om. PQR* || ab] *om. S* || illa] ista *cdO* || sacratissima] sanctissima *HS*, sacra *O* **25/27** communione – dicitur] *om. O* **26** ipsa] *om. L* || esset perditionis] perditionis esset *H* || perditionis via] perniciosa *b* || ut] et *c* || tu] tu dicis *OWei*, *om. PQR* || false] falsa *e*, *om. F* || atque] et *STUV* **26 / 29** atque – asseris] *om. k* **26** doces] dicis *Zah* || sicut] ut *TUV* **26/27** sicut dicitur] *om. S* **27** igitur] *om. W* || aliud] aliter *b* || aliud est] est aliud *S* || nisi quia] nonne *S* || quia] qui *D*, quod *L*, *om. O* || quia tu] tue *b*, *om. f* || tu] *om. M* || perditioni hominum] hominum perditioni *BCD*, perditionem hominum *FGHIKLMNOPRWYcefjh*, perditioni homini *EQXbd*, perditionis hominum *Zah*, perditioni huiusmodi *g*, perditionis hominibus *TUV* || perditioni – viam] viam perditionis hominibus *S* || viam] vias *PQZah*, tua doctrina *SWeik*, tua *Hc*, *om. Y* || paras] paras viam *Y* **28** bella] bellas *X* || bella – odia] bellum et odium *S* || odia] odium *NPQRTUV* || inter] non *G* || homines] odia *Z* || via] *om. Zah* || via est] est via *HWi* **28/29** inter homines] *om. BCDEILMNOSTUVXYdgh* || inter – rumpis] impugnas *Zah* **29** rumpis] irrumpis *BCDEILMXYg*, dirumpis *STUV*, erumpis *GNod*, ita rumpis *f* || O] *om. Zah* **29/30** O – taceres] *om. A* **29** tu] *om. EFGHIKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZabcdefghik* quid¹] quod *Hah*, quem *T* || doces] doceres *S*, dicis *h* || quid²] aut *Zah*, quidque *D*, et quid *V*, et quem *TU* || asseris] assereres *S* || apponeris] opponeres *b* **29/30** apponeris – hiis] in hiis apponeris *STUV*

18/19 manducaveritis – sanguinem] Ioh. 6,54 **21** Corinthios] cfr I Cor. 11,23-25 **23** Si – ei] cfr II Cor. 11,14 Gal. 1,8 **27** perditioni – paras] cfr Sap. 5,7

hiis digitum tuum ori tuo et taceres! An nescis vel forte scire te dissimulas, quod 30
 concilium Basiliense in Spiritu sancto tunc congregatum, quod representabat ec-
 clesiam, ut per scripta dictaque huius concilii claruit toti mundo, communionem
 huiusmodi sacratissimam sub utraque specie auctoritate Christi et ecclesie, vere
 sponse eius, donavit Bohemis et Moravis? Mandavit insuper dictum concilium 35
 archiepiscopo Pragensi, episcopo Olomocensi et episcopo Lutchomisslensi, qui
 protunc fuerunt, et omnibus curam habentibus animarum in virtute sancte
 obedientie districte precipiendo, quatenus communicent sic populum habentem
 usum communicandi sub penis etiam gravissimis, ut habetur in compactatis dicti
 concilii cum Bohemis simul et Moravis, sigillis concilii sigillatis. Dicere igitur et 40
 asserere contrarium concilio in Spiritu sancto congregato est dicere contrarium,
 ut creditur, Spiritui sancto, quod nullus sane mentis | audebit attentare, nisi
 forte sit melancholicus spiritu cuiusdam melancholie plenus. Nec mireris, frater,
 quod scribo melancholicus, cum querat in Problematis suis Aristoteles: “Quare

A 47v

30 tuum] *om. C E F G H K M O P Q R S T U V W X Z a b c e f h i k* || et taceres] ut omnino taceres S, ut tacens Z, ut taceres *ah* || taceres] faceres O || An] Tu forte *P Q R Z a h k*, An forte *b f* || vel] et *c* || forte – dissimulas] dissimilas te scire P, dissimilas te scire Q, scire te dissimilas b, scire te dissimulas R || scire] *om. L N* || scire te] te scire *B C D E H I O S T U V W X Y Z a e g h i*, te nescire *ch* || dissimulas] dissimiles *F X d* || quod] *om. f 31 in* *om. d* || sancto] *om. k* || tunc] *om. ch* || congregatum] *agregatum ci*, congregatam *k* || representabat] reputabat I, presentabat *S U*, representabit *X*, representat *Z a h*, ostentabat *b 32 ut* et *c* || per] *Cristi P Q R*, *om. O* || dictaque] dictaque docent *S* || huius] huiusmodi *B C D*, hiis *b* || concilii] *om. W* || claruit] et claruit *S U V* || toti] toto *I* || communionem] cum communionem *M 33 huiusmodi*] huius *b* || sacratissimam] sacratissimamque *T X i*, sanctissimam *H S*, sacratissime *b* || ecclesie] eciam *b 34 sponse*] sponsi *b* || eius] cuius *k* || donavit] dotavit *Z* || Bohemis] Bohemisque *B C D* || Mandavit] Mandat *U V*, Nam dicit *W*, *om. S* || dictum] *om. M 35 archiepiscopo*] dicto archiepiscopo *T U V* || episcopo¹] et episcopo *W Z e h i*, et episcopis *S*, *om. B C D O* || et] *om. H* || episcopo²] *om. S W e i 36 et*] *om. b* || curam habentibus] habentibus curam *G M d f* || habentibus animarum] animarum habentibus *S T U V X b c k 36/37 in – habentem*] *om. k 37 districte*] discrete *I* || precipiendo] precipiens *P P Q a h*, precipientes *R T U V*, precipiendum *b*, precepit *S* || quatenus] ut *S Z a*, ut sic *h* || communicant] sic communicent *K L T X*, communicant *M*, communicarent *S d*, communicaret *G*, *om. b* || sic] sicut *b*, *om. H L K S X* || sic – habentem] populum *h 37/38 habentem usum*] sic usum habentem *H* || habentem – communicandi] usum communicandi habentem *Z a* || habentem – gravissimis] usum habentibus sub utraque specie etiam sub gravissimis poenis *S 38 usum*] usum sic *k* || communicandi] communicandi habentem *h*, communicandi in virtute sancte obedientia districte precipiens *k* || etiam] *om. h* || gravissimis] gravibus *P Q R f* || dicti] predicti *G f*, huius *h*, dictis *K 38/39 dicti concilii*] huiusmodi concilii sigillatis *Z*, huiusmodi concilii *a 39 cum – Moravis*] tam Bohemis quam Moravis datis *S*, tam Bohemis et Moravis *T U V* || cum – concilii] *om. G 39/40 cum – concilio*] *om. k 39 simul*] *om. B C D E I L M N O X Y d g* || sigillis] sigillo *ah* || concilii] concilii eiusdem *S* || sigillatis] appressis vel sigillatis *P Q R* || Dicere] Dicitur *I* || igitur] agere *c*, *om. Z 40 concilio*] *om. I* || est] *om. Y* || dicere contrarium] contradicere *B C D G I L M N O S T U V X Y d f g*, Spiritu sancto contrarium dicere *b 41 ut*] ut similiter *S* || ut creditur] *om. H M* || Spiritui sancto] *om. b* || sane – audebit] sacramentis audebat *S* || audebit] audebat *H T U V d* || attentare] acceptare *b*, temptare *O*, attendere *F 42 forte sit*] sit forte *H W* || sit] esset *Z a h*, *om. F* || melancholicus] melancholicus sit *f*, melancholicus aut *Z a h*, melancholicus ut *P*, melancholicus vel *Q 42/43 spiritu – melancholicus*] spiritu *k*, *om. i 42 cuiusdam*] eiusdem *B C D E F H I K L M N O W X Y a c d e g h*, aut eiusdem *f*, huiusmodi *Z*, *om. S T U V 43 scribo*] scribam *B C D E G I L M N S T U V X Y d f g* || melancholicus] melancholicam *I* || cum] que cum *Y*, quod *F* || querat] querit *i*, dicat *S*, scribit *H* || Problematis suis] suis Problematis *B C D* || suis] ipse *S*, *om. k* || Quare] quia *S*, quod *Z a h*

43/44 Quare – melancholic] cfr Bartholomaeus de Messana translator Pseudo-Aristotelis, *Problemata*, 30, p. 568 (Venetiis 1482)

45 omnes viri pollitici et heroici ut plurimum fuerunt melancolici? Signa namque
 et alios ad huiusmodi clamores excitare. Dicitur etiam de te, quia dixisti: “Si
 probabitur mihi communio sub utraque specie, volo, ut conburar”. Spero, quod
 50 sufficienter tibi probabitur, si voles. Nec optat aliquis sapiens, ut conburaris,
 sed ut potius vivas, penitentiam agas pro falsa et perniciosa doctrina, si facta est
 per te, et emendes in melius, ut decet. Hec sunt et alia plura, que de te dicunt
 homines, que pertranseo, que ego tanquam vera de te non accipio, sed audita
 ante oculos mentis tue pono.

Audiens enim sapiens sapientior erit. Optoque et rogo ex corde, immo et in
 virtute Dei conmono, ut sicut diligis honorem tuum et salutem, quatenus su-
 55 per hiis omnibus mihi scripto respondeas, ut sciam de te loquentibus vel forte
 mentientibus coram sapientibus et plebeis pro veritate respondere et te in

44 omnes] homines *STUk* || pollitici] pollitarii *Z*, polliciaci *a*, politi *O* || et] *om. I* || heroici] heretici *MSYb*,
 erranei *Za*, erronei *hk* || ut] *om. PQR* || ut plurimum] in plenum *Za*, *om. Y* || plurimum] in plurimum *HXfh*,
 plurime *F* || fuerunt] sunt *LWYci*, fuerant *a*, fuerint *b*, sint *g* || Signa namque] signaque *LSi*, signum namque
Zb, signumque *a* 44/45 Signa – melancolie] Signa habent, per quae cognoscuntur, sic etiam *S* 45 cuius-
 dam] eiusdem *DEIKLNSWZacefhik* || melancolie] melancolici *I*, cuiusdam melancolie *E* || in te] vite *c*, rite *e*
 || apparent] apparuit *Zah* || quod] quia *L*, ut *W*, *om. HKSed* || quidem] ammodo *Z*, amodo *a*, quid *g*, *om. h*
 46 alios] alias *k*, *om. L* || ad] et *k* || huiusmodi clamores] clamores huiusmodi *BCDEGHKLMOTUVXfji*,
 clamorem huiusmodi *Nd*, clamorem hominum *W*, clamores hominum *e*, clamatores huiusmodi *Y* || clamores]
 acclamationes *S* || excitare] incitare *FSY*, suscitare *Zah* || Dicitur] Porro dicitur *S* || etiam] autem *h* ||
 quia] quod *BCDEGILMNOPQRSTUYdfg* || dixisti] dixisti quod *BDEILNOTVYg* 47 probabitur] prolaretur *I*
 || probabitur – communitio] tibi quis probaverit tibi *S*, mihi probabitur communio *Gb* || mihi] non *I* ||
 communitio] communicatio *f* || specie] specie esse communicandum *Sc* || volo – conburar] te velle comburi
S || conburar] combureo *Z*, comburer *ahk* || quod] ut *GXai* 48 sufficienter tibi] tibi sufficienter *TVZah*,
 tibi ista sufficienter *S* || tibi] *om. U* || tibi probabitur] reprobabitur *c* || si] etiam *si* *S* || si voles] *om. k* ||
 voles] velis *Whi*, volens *Z*, cupis *S*, velles *P*, volens *a*, volis *e*, volueris *Th* || Nec] Sed nec *k* || optat] optet *Z* ||
 aliquis] aliquid *b* || ut] ut cinus *S*, ut tu *NO*, quod *PQ*, *om. ah* || conburaris] comburi secundum Aristotelem
h 49 ut] ut tu *N* || ut potius] potius ut *b*, potius opta ut *h* || potius vivas] potius *R*, *om. PQ* || peniten-
 tiam] ut penitentiam *I*, et penitentiam *EPSZabdk* || pernicioso] viciosa *d* || si] que *b* 49/50 si – te¹] facta
P, facta per te *Q* || si – decet] *om. c* 50 per – et¹] *om. H* || et¹] ut *FGf*, *om. KSRU* || emendes] emendas
SZad, in Mendes *U*, emendes igitur *K*, emendens igitur *H* || ut] sicut *BCDEFGHIKMNOPQRSTUVWXYbdefi*, sicut
 et *Lg* || Hec] *om. Zahk* || de – dicunt] dicunt de te *TUVZah* 50/51 de – homines] dicunt homines de te
S || dicunt – te] *om. O* || 51 homines] homines in Bohemia *c* || que pertranseo] que ego transeo *TUV*,
 que transeo *h*, per quos homines nunc transeo *S* || que²] nec *Zahk*, quia *c* || que ego] et ista *S* || tanquam]
 de te tanquam *L*, *om. T* || tanquam vera] vera vel tanquam vera *HKc* || tanquam – te] de te tanquam
 vera *PQ* || de te] debite *Gb*, *om. Lcd* || non accipio] accepto *h* || accipio] accepto *PQRa* 52 oculos
 mentis] mentis oculos *K* || mentis tue] tue mentis *f* 53 enim] *om. ck* || sapiens] sapiens sapienciam *PQR*
 || erit] eris *TUV* || Optoque] opto quod *Y*, opto quia *H* 53/54 Optoque – Dei] in divina maiestate *S*
 53 et¹] *om. TUVk* || ex] etiam *EIL*, *om. TUV* || ex corde] *om. PQb* || immo] intimo *i*, *om. Zabh* || et²] *om.*
BCDEGILMNOTUVXYdg || in] *om. HKc* 54 Dei] *om. Y* || conmono] ammono *GZbh*, commoveo *e* 54/55
 conmono – hiis] *om. NO* 54 ut] rogo te ut *S*, *om. CHGIKNOWXik* || diligis – tuum] diliges tuum honorem
S || honorem] et honorem *k* || tuum] tuam *L* || et salutem] *om. H* || salutem] salutem anime tue *Zah*,
 tuam salutem *k* || quatenus] velis *S*, hiis quatenus *M* 55 hiis] *om. M* || mihi] *om. L* || mihi scripto] scripto
 michi *Yb* || mihi – respondeas] in scripto respondere *S* || scripto] scripta *Hak*, in scripto *Ud*, scriptis *O* ||
 respondeas] respondas *L* 56 et] *om. UV* || et plebeis] plebis *STV*, *om. k* || plebeis] volueris *b* || te] de te *EI*

53 Audiens – erit] Prov. 1,5

veritate defensare, cum scribat beatus Petrus apostolus: “Omni poscenti te fidei tue redde rationem”. Siquid scriptum extraneum, aurium offensivum, parcat vir religiosus et sensatus.

Datum in Grecz Regine. Magistrorum suorum minimus Iohannes Borotin. 60

57 defensare] defendere *Sb* || cum] ut *O* || scribat] scribit *BCDHOPQTYZak* || beatus – apostolus] sanctus Petrus *S*, apostolus Petrus *Zah* || **Petrus**] Paulus *PQR* || poscenti] petenti *Yh* **57/58** fidei tue] *om. b* **58** rationem] rationem etc. *EGUi* || Siquid] Siquidem *S* || Siquid – extraneum] Si scripsi contrarium aut *Zh* || scriptum] scripsi scriptum *PQR* || aurium] auribus *S* || offensivum] offensivum sit *bg* || parcat] parcat *LNO*, precepit *b*, parce *h*, *om. I* **59** et sensatus] *om. f* || sensatus] sensatus etc. *bh* **60** Datum – Regine] *om. Obh* || Datum – Borotin] *om. S* || in – Regine] etc. *HTUVf*, Prage in vigilia sancti Laurencii anno Domini M^oCCCC^oLI^o *g*, *om. ABCDEFGIKMNPQRXYZacdk* || in – Borotin] etc. *L* || Magistrorum – minimus] minimus magistrorum *e* || suorum] *om. b* || minimus] *om. F* || Iohannes Borotin] Io Bor *A*, Rokiczana Iohannes *BCD*, *om. O* || Borotin] Rokyczanus *EINTUVXYZdgh*, Roczikzan XX die mensis Augusti anno LI *a*, Rockizana et cetera *GM*, Bohemus *PQR*, Bohemorum *b*

57/58 Omni – rationem] cfr I Petr. 3,15

Bibliography

- Bartholomaeus de Messana translator Pseudo-Aristotelis (1482). *Problemata. Textus Aristotelis secundum Petrum de Abano, Expositio in librum Problematum Aristotelis*. Venetiis: Johann Herbort de Seligenstat.
- Bonmann, O., Gál, G., & Miskuly, J. M. (1989, 1990, 1992). A Provisional Calendar of St. John Capistran's Correspondence. *Franciscan Studies*, 49, 255–345; 50, 323–403; 52, 283–327.
- Burnett, Ch. (2012). Teaching the Science of the Stars in Prague University in the Early Fifteenth Century: Master Johannes Borotin. *Aither. Journal for the study of Greek and Latin philosophical traditions*, 8(4), *International Issue no. 2*, 9–50.
- Chiappini, A. (1927). *Reliquie letterarie Capestranesi. Storia – codici – carte – documenti*. Aquila: Officine grafiche Vecchioni.
- Hofer, J. (1965). *Johannes Kapistran: Ein Leben im Kampf um die Reform der Kirche* (Vol. 2). Heidelberg: F. H. Kerle.
- Kras, P., & Mixson, J. D. (Eds.). (2018). *The Grand Tour of John of Capistrano in Central and Eastern Europe (1451–1456). Transfer of Ideas and Strategies of Communication in the Late Middle Ages*. Warsaw – Lublin: Tadeusz Manteuffel Institute of History, Polish Academy of Sciences; Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Kras, P. (2018b). John of Capistrano and His Correspondence Related to the Polish Kingdom and Silesia. In P. Kras, H. Manikowska, M. Starzyński, & A. Zajchowska-Boltroniuk (Eds.), *The Correspondence of John of Capistrano, 1: Letters Related to the History of Poland and Silesia* (pp. 47–67). Warsaw – Lublin: Tadeusz Manteuffel Institute of History, Polish Academy of Sciences; Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Mixson, J. D. (2018). Introduction. In P. Kras & J. D. Mixson (Eds.), *The Grand Tour of John of Capistrano in Central and Eastern Europe (1451–1456). Transfer of Ideas and Strategies of Communication in the Late Middle Ages* (pp. 21–29). Warsaw – Lublin: Tadeusz Manteuffel Institute of History, Polish Academy of Sciences; Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Nowakowski, P. F. (2021). Madmen and a Melancholic: Allusions to Health and the Anointing of the Sick in Polemics of the Hussite Period. *Studia Historica Gedanensia*, XII(2), 83–92.
- Pellegrini, L. (2010). More on John Capistrano's Correspondence: A Report on an Open Forum. *Franciscan Studies*, 68, 187–197.
- Pellegrini, L. (2018). The Correspondence of John of Capistrano: The History of a Research Trajectory. In P. Kras, H. Manikowska, M. Starzyński, & A. Zajchowska-Boltroniuk (Eds.), *The Correspondence of John of Capistrano, 1: Letters Related to the History of Poland and Silesia* (pp. 21–34). Warsaw – Lublin: Tadeusz Manteuffel Institute of History, Polish Academy of Sciences; Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Sedda, F. (2018). Corpus Epistolarum Capistrani (CEC): An Overview of the Database of John of Capistrano's Epistolary. In P. Kras, H. Manikowska, M. Starzyński, & A. Zajchowska-Boltroniuk (Eds.), *The Correspondence of John of Capistrano, 1: Letters Related to the History of Poland and Silesia* (pp. 35–46). Warsaw – Lublin: Tadeusz Manteuffel Institute of History, Polish Academy of Sciences; Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Soukup, P. (2018). The Polemical Letters of John of Capistrano against the Hussites: Remarks on Their Transmission and Context. In P. Kras, & J. D. Mixson (Eds.), *The Grand Tour of John of*

- Capistrano in Central and Eastern Europe (1451–1456). Transfer of Ideas and Strategies of Communication in the Late Middle Ages* (pp. 259–273). Warsaw – Lublin: Tadeusz Manteuffel Institute of History, Polish Academy of Sciences; Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Tříška, J. (1981). *Životopisný slovník předhusitské pražské univerzity 1348–1409*. Prague: Univerzita Karlova.
- Vidmanová, A. (1997). Druhý dopis Mistra Jana Borotína Rokycanovi. *Listy filologické*, 120, 3–4, 281–289.
- Vidmanová, A. (2000). Borotínovy dopisy Rokycanovi. In J. K. Kroupa (Ed.), *Septuaginta Paulo Spunar oblata (70 + 2)* (pp. 410–419). Prague: KLP.
- Walouch, F. (1858). *Životopis swatého Jana Kapistrána*. Brno: Wilém Burkart.
- Weiss, M. (2000). Mistr Jan z Borotína. *Studia Theologica*, 2(1), 73–75.

Mgr. Lucie Mazalová, Ph.D. / mazalova@phil.muni.cz

Department of Classical Studies
 Masaryk University, Faculty of Arts
 Arna Nováka 1, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic

doc. Mgr. Petra Mutlová, M.A., Ph.D. / mutlova@phil.muni.cz

Department of Classical Studies
 Masaryk University, Faculty of Arts
 Arna Nováka 1, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic



This work can be used in accordance with the Creative Commons BY-SA 4.0 International license terms and conditions (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode>). This does not apply to works or elements (such as image or photographs) that are used in the work under a contractual license or exception or limitation to relevant rights

