


Lidia Grzybowska 

Was Mikołaj of Błonie a Supporter of the Conciliarist Movement?

TERMINUS

t. 25 (2023)

z. 1 (66)

s. 1–24

www.ejournals.eu/

Terminus

Abstract

The main aim of the paper is to address the question of whether Mikołaj of Błonie (before 1400 – ca. 1448), a Polish doctor of canon law, was a supporter of the conciliarist movement. In the first half of the 15th century, the most prominent representatives of Poland's intellectual elite were conciliarists. Initially, the Polish elite were moderately sympathetic towards conciliarism, but with the development of the situation during the Council of Basel (1431–1449), radical solutions started to be favoured.

This article analyzes selected fragments from two works by Mikołaj of Błonie in the broader context of the conciliarist discussion in order to determine to what extent the contemporary situation and the preacher's personal opinion could be reflected in the preaching and pastoral texts. These texts are *Tractatus sacerdotalis de sacramentis* (known as *Sacramentale*), a pastoral manual written around 1430, prepared for the lower clergy, and two collections of sermons – *de tempore* and *de sanctis* – also intended for use by lower clergy and uneducated audiences, written probably around 1438. Mikołaj of Błonie strongly postulated the need for reforms of the Church *in membris* while maintaining great caution in formulating conclusions regarding the reform *in capite*. His approach to power in the Church places him more on the side of the papists, although in his texts one can see a distant echo of the writings of Jean Gerson, Stanisław of Skarbimierz, and the discussions by Polish theologians and decreetists. Mikołaj's conservativeness can be explained in many ways: the preacher's personal views, the specific purpose of the texts, which did not provide space for ecclesiological discussion, and the context of polemics with the Hussites as well as the need to strengthen papal authority.

Keywords

conciliarism in the 15th century, Mikołaj of Błonie, *plenitudo potestatis*, ecclesiology, the Hussite movement

The conciliarism in Poland in the first half of the 15th century was a subject of interest for many researchers.¹ This research paints a nuanced picture that shows that it is impossible to clearly indicate which orientation, propapal, or proconciliar, was dominant. Undoubtedly, the University supported the conciliarist movement, while the sympathies of the clergy and the authorities in Poland were not so obvious, especially after the schism of 1439. Tomasz Graff showed that the idea of conciliarism was favored by, among others, Bishop of Kraków Zbigniew Oleśnicki or Primate Wincenty Kot, but the Bishop of Poznań, Andrzej of Bnin, or the Bishop of Wrocław, Konrad the Elder, strongly opposed the acceptance of the primacy of the Council of Basel over the Pope.² In the early 1430s, such clear-cut declarations were not necessary until the deposition of Eugene IV (25 June 1439), when the Polish clergy became polarised. The same thing happened at the highest levels of government. King Władysław III, who originally gave space to the conciliarists under the influence of Giuliano Cesarini and his involvement in the idea of an anti-Turkish crusade, opted for Eugene IV, while his younger brother, the Grand Duke of Lithuania Casimir, favoured the conciliarists. It was not uncommon, however, to switch sides. For example, Casimir, who took over the throne of Poland in 1447, almost automatically submitted obedience to pope Nicolaus V at his ascension. Also among the prominent members of the Council, there were radical changes,

¹ L. Grosse, *Stosunki Polski z soborem bazylejskim*, Warsaw 1885; J. Fijałek, *Mistrz Jakób z Paradyża i Uniwersytet Krakowski w okresie Soboru Bazylejskiego*, vol. 1–2, Kraków 1900–1902; Z. Włodek, “Eklezjologia krakowska w pierwszej połowie XV wieku”, in *ead.*, *Z dziejów filozofii i teologii na Uniwersytecie Krakowskim w XV wieku. Sylwetki, teksty, studia*, Kraków 2011, pp. 383–418; S. Swieżawski, “Kłeska koncyliarizmu. Przyczynek do dziejów etyki społecznej i politycznej w późnym średniowieczu”, *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 37–38 (1989–1990), no. 1, pp. 55–72; *id.*, *Eklezjologia późnośredniowieczna na rozdrożu*, Kraków 1990; M. Markowski, “Doktrynalne podstawy krakowskiego koncyliarizmu średniowiecznego”, *Folia Historica Cracoviensia* 6 (1999), pp. 77–89; T. Wunsch, *Konziliarismus und Polen: Personen, Politik und Programme aus Polen zur Verfassungsfrage der Kirche in der Zeit der mittelalterlichen Reformkonzilien*, Schöning 1998; K. Ożóg, *Uczni w monarchii Jadwigi Andegaweńskiej i Władysława Jagiełły (1384–1434)*, Kraków 2004; *id.*, “Ne contrarii haberemur doctrinae et scripturis nostris. Droga Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego do złożenia obojedniacji papieżowi Mikołajowi V”, in *Narodziny Rzeczypospolitej. Studia z dziejów średniowiecza i czasów wczesnonowożytnych*, vol. 2, ed. by W. Bukowski, T. Jurek, Kraków 2012, pp. 1185–1204; P. Rabiej, “Uczni uniwersyteccy w służbie i otoczeniu Zbigniewa Oleśnickiego, biskupa krakowskiego”, in *Polska i jej sąsiedzi w późnym średniowieczu*, ed. by K. Ożóg, S. Szczur, Kraków 2000, pp. 199–231; *Ecclesia semper reformanda. Kryzysy i reformy średniowiecznego Kościoła*, ed. by T. Gałuszka, T. Graff, G. Ryś, Kraków 2013. Literature review up to 2008 in: T. Graff, *Episkopat monarchii jagiellońskiej w dobie soborów powszechnych w XV wieku*, Kraków 2008.

² T. Graff, “Biskup krakowski Zbigniew Oleśnicki wobec schizmy bazylejskiej (1439–1449)”, in *Zbigniew Oleśnicki. Książę Kościoła i mąż stanu*, ed. by F. Kiryk, Z. Noga, Kraków 2006, pp. 195–204; T. Graff, *Episkopat monarchii jagiellońskiej*; *id.*, “Katolicki episkopat metropolii gnieźnieńskiej i łwowskiej wobec wyboru pseudopapieża Feliksa V przez sobór bazylejski”, *Nasza Przeszość* 99 (2003), pp. 55–129; *id.*, “Rozterki religijne biskupów monarchii jagiellońskiej w dobie tzw. II unii polsko-węgierskiej 1440–1444”, in *Religijność. Wymiar prywatny i publiczny*, ed. by W. Szyborski, P. Nowakowski, Kraków 2007, pp. 129–148; T. Graff, “Wokół sprawy kardynałatu biskupa krakowskiego Zbigniewa Oleśnickiego”, *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne* (2002), no. 129, pp. 19–50; *id.*, “Wpływ kryzysu Kościoła powszechnego na społeczeństwo polskie w pierwszej połowie XV wieku. Wybrane zagadnienia”, *Analecta Cracoviensia* 44 (2012), pp. 217–240.

among them by Nicolaus of Cusa, Giuliano Cesarini, Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, and Mikołaj Lasocki.³

Therefore, the attitude toward papism and conciliarism of each thinker and/or member of the Council of Basle should be reconstructed separately from the preserved sources. The problem is that the sources cannot always tell us everything. This reservation should be made, *inter alia*, due to the type of text in which the declarations on power in the Church are made. This is the case of Mikołaj of Błonie (before 1400 – ca. 1448),⁴ a doctor of canon law, whose views on conciliarism and papism can be reconstructed on the basis of two texts. One of them is *Tractatus sacerdotalis de sacramentis* (known as *Sacramentale*), a pastoral manual written around 1430, prepared for the lower clergy, explaining issues related to the sacraments and the Holy Mass. The second is written – probably – a few years later, perhaps around 1438. They are two collections of sermons – *de tempore* and *de sanctis* – also intended for use by lower clergy and uneducated audiences. Both works have a clear purpose and a specific, primarily didactic, function. Mikołaj, for example, instructs the clergy on how to perform *cura pastoralis*. Is there room in such texts for considerations regarding the superiority of the pope over the council and the council over the pope? This article aims to analyze selected fragments from both works by Mikołaj of Błonie in the broader context of the conciliarist discussion and to determine to what extent the current situation and personal opinion of the preacher could be reflected in the preaching and pastoral texts.

Basel as a melting pot

The discussion of the supreme power of the pope, the hierarchy of the Church, and the scope of the council's power was not an invention of the 15th century, although it became crucial and somewhat sensitive. The issues of the church hierarchy, expounded by Pseudo-Dionysius in *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* and present in theological discussions from the very beginning of Christianity, became an important question for Nicolaus Cusanus and others. In the 14th and 15th centuries, the issues

³ T. Graff, "Prażacy kapituły krakowskiej wobec kryzysu Kościoła w latach 1439–1449", in *Ecclesia semper reformanda*, p. 351.

⁴ The literature on Mikołaj and his works is relatively small: B. Ulanowski, *Mikołaj z Błonia, kanonista polski z pierwszej połowy XV wieku*, Kraków 1888 (Rozprawy AU. Wydział Historyczno-Filozoficzny, vol. 23); M.T. Zahajkiewicz, "Liturgia mszy świętej w świetle 'Tractatus sacerdotalis de sacramentis' Mikołaja z Błonia. Studium historyczno-liturgiczne", in *Studia z dziejów liturgii w Polsce*, ed. by M. Rechowicz, Lublin 1973, pp. 22–93; M.T. Zahajkiewicz, "Tractatus sacerdotalis' Mikołaja z Błonia na tle teologii przelomu wieku XIV i XV", Lublin 1979; T. Szostek, *Exemplum w polskim średniowieczu*, Warsaw 1997; M. Zwiercan, "Mikołaj z Błonia", in *Polski słownik biograficzny*, vol. 21, ed. by E. Rostworowski, Wrocław 1976, pp. 102–104; K. Ożóg, "Mikołaj z Błonia zwany Pszczołka (zm. po 1442 r.)", in *Profesorowie Wydziału Prawa Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, vol. 1: 1364–1780, ed. by W. Uruszczak, Kraków 2015, pp. 306–307; L. Grzybowska, *Kazania de tempore i de sanctis Mikołaja z Błonia. Zarys monografii*, Warsaw 2020.

gained more prominence due to the new philosophical orientation of nominalism and buridanism.

According to the provisions of the Council of Constance, which ended the long-term schism (1378–1417), Martin V called the Council of Pavia, inaugurated on 23 April 1423, and moved to Siena due to the plague. Even then, there was a conflict over proposed institutional reforms. On 19 February 1424, Basel was chosen as the place of the next council, which was far from the Roman Curia. It was a gesture of special significance that diminished the importance of Rome and the pope. The first conflict between the council and the pope appeared at the very beginning of the council's deliberations. The new pope, Eugene IV, tried twice – in November and December 1431 – to dissolve the council, which had begun on 25 July 1431, and move it to Bologna, i.e., closer to Rome. That is why during the third session, which took place on 19 April 1432, the relationship between the council and the pope was considered and the inadmissibility of dissolving a legally convened council was strongly emphasised.⁵

The direct argument for the Basel conciliarists in favor of their cause were two decrees from the Council of Constance – *Haec sancta* and *Frequens*. *Haec sancta* is the decree of Session 5 of 6 April 1415 on the superiority of conciliar over papal authority and its integrity,⁶ which Basel acclaimed a dogma of faith. *Frequens* is the decree passed on 9 October 1417, and it aimed to ensure that the pope convened councils regularly. Decrees of the Council of Constance, *Haec sancta* and *Frequens*, were used by the Council of Basel to proceed with an anticurial reform of the church. In Constance, they were prepared in completely different circumstances and eventually ended the Great Western Schism.⁷ Here, in Basel, their new reading started another schism. At the beginning of the Council of Basel, Cardinal Cesarini addressed several letters to Eugene IV reminding him that the legitimacy of his papal line depended on the decisions made in Constance and that he should support the Council in its work of reform.⁸ The Council of Basel took *Haec sancta* as the final evidence of the superior authority of the council over the pope. By contrast, the representative of Castile at the council, the Dominican theologian Juan de Torquemada, argued that *Haec sancta* never had been confirmed by Martin V and that Constance had not been a general council.⁹

Meanwhile, Eugene IV continued his efforts to act in defiance of council decisions. He conducted his negotiations with the Greeks, opposed reformist ideas,

⁵ *Sessio 3*, in *Dokumenty soborów powszechnych. Tekst grecki, łaciński, arabski, ormiański, polski*, vol. 3: (1415–1445): *Konstancja, Bazylea – Ferrara – Florencja – Rzym*, ed. by A. Baron, H. Pietras, Kraków 2003, pp. 284–291.

⁶ *Sessio 5*, in *Dokumenty soborów powszechnych*, p. 49.

⁷ S. Provdidente, “Causa unionis, fidei reformationis : les pratiques judiciaires et la définition de l'autorité du Concile de Constance (1414–1418)”, *Médiévales* (2013), no. 65, pp. 164–165.

⁸ T.M. Izbicki, “Papalist Reaction to the Council of Constance: Juan de Torquemada to the Present”, *Church History* 55 (1986), no. 1, p. 8.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

and even supported candidates for high church offices other than those nominated by the council. Finally, on 15 December 1433, in the bull *Dudum sacrum*, he recognised the validity of the council. Officially, on 5 February, the accession of Eugene IV to the council was announced,¹⁰ although it did not mean that Eugene IV laid down arms.

As noted by M. Decaluwé and G. Christianson, the years 1434–1437 brought a strong polarisation between conciliarists and papists.¹¹ Previously, the heterogeneous group of conciliarists included those who believed that power belonged to the council and those who believed that power should be shared with the pope. The events of the three years reinforced this division. Before Constance, a pope had been convening the council, and the council had served to centralise the papal monarchy. In Basel, it became clear that the council became the main instance of limiting and even contesting papal power and authority.¹²

Escalating anti-papism most clearly can be seen in the rhetoric of the time. Conciliar legislation is characterised by anti-papal resistance. Josef Wohlmuth studied the “language of discord” (*Dissenssprache*), which is characterised by the repetition of adverbs like *sine*, *absque*, *contra* and verbs like *dissentire*, *discordare*, *contravenire*, *contraire*, *deviare*, *dissidere*, *se opponere*, *protestari*, etc.¹³ The researcher observed that the language radicalised after the dissolution of the council and its transfer to Ferrara. Both sides of the conflict had continued to hurl insults at each other.¹⁴

On 25 June 1439, Eugene IV was deposed by the Council. The Pope, contrary to earlier arrangements, moved the Council to Ferrara in 1437, then to Florence in 1439. He excommunicated the delegates who remained in Basel. Moving to Ferrara was motivated by the issue of union with the Greeks, as Eugene IV agreed to this place with the Byzantine emperor. The council summoned Eugene to appear before the council and excommunicated all those who obeyed the pope. This behaviour of the Council was daunting to many of its supporters, including Cesarini and Nicolaus of Cusa,¹⁵ who came out in favour of the pope. Thus, the schism became a reality. Until 1449, the council, after a momentary success in achieving power, would persist in a long agony.

¹⁰ *Sessio 16*, in *Dokumenty soborów powszechnych*, p. 328.

¹¹ M. Decaluwé, G. Christianson, “Historical Survey”, in *A Companion the Council of Basel*, ed. by M. Decaluwé, T.M. Izbicki, G. Christianson, Boston 2017, pp. 17–18.

¹² É. Rosenblieh, “Contester la dissolution du concile, constitutionnaliser la monarchie pontificale (Église latine, premier XV^e siècle)”, in *Contester au Moyen Âge: de la désobéissance à la révolte: XLIX^e Congrès de la SHMESP (Rennes, 2018)*, Paris 2019, p. 202.

¹³ J. Wohlmuth, *Verständigung in der Kirche. Untersucht an der Sprache des Konzils von Basel*, Mayence 1983, pp. 164–176, 249–256.

¹⁴ In some cases, radical rhetoric functioned in texts written after the Council of Basel, such as in the chronicle of the Council of Juan of Segovia, cf. J.D. Mann, “The Devilish Pope: Eugenius IV as Lucifer in the Later Works of Juan de Segovia”, *Church History* 65 (1996), no. 2, pp. 184–196.

¹⁵ Graff, *Katolicki episkopat*, p. 61.

Question of *plenitudo potestatis* in the works of Mikołaj of Błonie

The events outlined above are the background for considerations on conciliarism in the writings of Mikołaj of Błonie. Coming from a small town in Mazovia (Błonie), he was the son of a townsman Falisław and was born before 1400. In 1414 he enrolled at the University of Kraków, where he obtained a baccalaureate (1415) and a master's degree (1421) in the liberal arts, and then in 1427 a doctorate in canon law. From 1422 to 1427, Mikołaj held the position of royal chaplain, probably serving as Queen Sophia's preacher. He was also an employee of the office, helping royal notaries, which brought him closer to Stanisław Ciołek, the royal vice-chancellor. In 1428, Ciołek was elected and consecrated as the bishop of Poznań. Mikołaj went to Poznań with Ciołek, where he became the chaplain of the new bishop and probably preached in Poznań cathedral. After the death of Ciołek (10 November 1437), Mikołaj returned to his homeland, Mazovia, where he had several prebends. He held several functions there – a parish priest in Czersk (already from 1430), a cathedral canon in Płock, and a Warsaw canon. From 1439 to 1441, he was also an official based at the collegiate church of St John in Warsaw.

Assuming that the *Sacramentale* and two collections of Mikołaj's sermons were created in the 1430s, it is worth analysing whether there is any information that refers to the discussion about the highest authority in the Church, which ignited in the 1430s. The ecclesiological references related to the highest authority in the Church contained in the sermons and the treatise of Mikołaj of Błonie should be viewed primarily from the point of view of the Council of Basel and the Hussite issue. The transformations of the 1430s and the echoes of the Council are important to Mikołaj. His superior, the bishop of Poznań, Stanisław Ciołek, participated in the Council. Mikołaj himself was also delegated to Basel, but most likely he did not take part in it. We have no traces of his stay in Basel. It is possible that the delegation did not take place for financial reasons due to the conflict between the bishop and the chapter. The first evidence of Ciołek's stay in Basel appears in the Council protocols as early as 23 May 1434.¹⁶

The Bishop of Poznań officially joined the Council on 24 July along with Mikołaj Lasocki, but they did it as private persons, as the powers of attorney received from Jagiełło expired with his death. On the initiative of Ciołek, a solemn service for Jagiełło was held in Basel on July 31. Eventually, a letter of authentication from the Polish embassy came from the bishop and newly elected king Władysław III.¹⁷ Still, at the end of

¹⁶ *Concilium Basiliense. Studien und Quellen zur Geschichte des Concils von Basel*, vol. 3: *Protokolle des Concils 1434–1435*, ed. by J. Haller, Basel 1900, p. 157; *Concilium Basiliense. Studien und Quellen zur Geschichte des Concils von Basel*, vol. 5: *Tagebücher un Acten 1431–1438*, ed. by G. Beckmann, R. Wackernagel, G. Coggiola, p. 97.

¹⁷ *Codex diplomaticus Universitatis Studii Generalis Cracoviensis*, vol. 2, ed. by Ż. Pauli, Kraków 1870, p. 50, no. 125.

1434, Ciołek is in Basel, where he and the Polish delegation were defending the honour of the late Polish monarch.¹⁸

One of the key concepts related to the question of power in the Church is *plenitudo potestatis*. This is a term of canon law that indicates the jurisdictional authority of the pope, which was the subject of disputes throughout almost the entire Middle Ages¹⁹ and widely discussed at the Council of Constance. As William D. McCready notes, when the term *plenitudo potestatis* made its first appearance in papal documents, it was used to describe the delegated power of papal legates rather than the power of the pope himself.²⁰ By the late 13th and early 14th centuries, the term had taken on wider significance, primarily that the pope had supreme authority in temporal affairs and that he had this supremacy, not because of the beneficence of any temporal ruler, but simply from the authority inherent in the papal office itself.²¹ This was the subject of discussion by many authors, among them Aegidius Colonna Romanus (*De ecclesiastica potestate*), Alvarus Pelagius (*De planctu ecclesiae libri duo*), Conrad of Megenberg (*De translatione Romani imperii*), Augustinus of Ancona (*Summa de potestate ecclesiastica*),²² Franciscus of Mayronis (*Quaestio de subiectione* and *De praelatura domini spiritualis ad dominium temporale*), Henricus of Cremona (*De potestate papae*), Giacomo of Viterbo (*De regimine christiano*),²³ Joannes Quidort (*De regia potestate et papali*),²⁴ etc.

At the Council of Basel, supporters of the supremacy of the pope over the council included Giovanni of Ragusa, Juan de Palomar, Piero da Monte, and others.²⁵ One of the leading papists at the Council of Basel was Juan de Torquemada, a Spanish Dominican friar who influenced the intransigence of Eugene IV.²⁶ A set of arguments in favour of papal jurisdiction can be found in his treatise *Summa de Ecclesia* (1453), written after the council. In it, the Dominican friar defended papal superiority using biblical and canon law arguments (e.g., pointing out that the pope can grant

¹⁸ K. Grodziska, "Mikołaja Lasockiego pochwała Władysława Jagielly i królowej Jadwigi na soborze bazylijskim", *Analecta Cracoviensia* 20 (1988), pp. 381–399.

¹⁹ W.D. McCready, "Papal *plenitudo potestatis* and the Source of Temporal Authority in Late Medieval Papal Hierocratic Theory", *Speculum* 48 (1973), no. 4, pp. 654–674; A. Recchia, *L'uso della formula plenitudo potestatis da Leone Magno ad Ugucione da Pisa*, Roma 1999; M. Rizzi, "Plenitudo potestatis. Dalla teologia politica alla teoria dello stato assoluto", in *Images, cultes, liturgies. Les connotations politiques du message religieux*, ed. by P. Ventrone, L. Gaffuri, Rome 2014, pp. 49–60.

²⁰ McCready, "Papal *plenitudo potestatis*", p. 654; R.L. Benson, "Plenitudo potestatis: Evolution of a Formula from Gregory VII to Gratian", in *Collectanea Stephan Kuttner. Studia Gratiana* 14 (1967), pp. 195–217.

²¹ McCready, "Papal *plenitudo potestatis*", p. 655.

²² M. Wilks, *The Problem of Sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages: Papal Monarchy with Augustinus Triumphus and the Publicists*, Cambridge 1963, pp. 4–5.

²³ McCready, "Papal *plenitudo potestatis*", p. 654.

²⁴ Markowski, "Doktrynalne podstawy", p. 78.

²⁵ Świeżawski, "Klęska koncyliaryzmu", p. 59.

²⁶ M. Decaluwé, *A Successful Defeat: Eugene IV's Struggle with the Council of Basel for Ultimate Authority in the Church, 1431–1449*, Brussels 2009, p. 157.

plenary indulgences and bishops only for 100 or 40 days).²⁷ A plenary indulgence was granted in Basel without the consent of the pope, which escalated the conflict.²⁸

How then did the conciliarists understand the concept of *plenitudo potestatis*? First, it should be noted that the term ‘conciliarism’ covers a very wide spectrum of perspectives and does not always carry with it a homogeneous standpoint among its representatives. Conciliarist tendencies are already present at the beginning of the 14th century, e.g. in the writings of Wilhelm Durand Jr. (*Tractatus de modo concilii generali*, 1309–1311). Marsilio da Padova (†1342/3), who in 1326 wrote his *Defensor pacis*, carried to an extreme the issue of conciliar authority over the papacy. The professor of theology of Sorbonne attacked the *plenitudo potestatis* because he considered it a factor disturbing the peace in Christianity, especially in relations between the pope and the emperor.²⁹ He outlines the conciliar ecclesiology within the system of totalitarian Caesaropapism³⁰ (because a secular ruler, according to Marsilius, has a spiritual mission), although he sees the necessity of democratic foundations.³¹ Moreover, William of Occam even claimed that there could be more popes in the Church and that many people could run the Church without a pope.³² Konrad of Gelnhausen (†1390) in *Epistola brevis* and *Epistola concordiae* presented the theory of the ecumenical council, which has the highest ecclesiastical authority.³³ Francesco Zabarella in his *Tractatus de schismate sui temporis* (1403–1408) presents the Church as a great corporation, where the *plenitudo potestatis* resides in the *universitas fidelium* as *in fundamente*; the latter, without alienating the pope entirely, ascribes papal supreme power to his role “as chief minister”.³⁴ Pierre d’Ailly in *Lumen theologiae* also supports the council, although, like Occam, he rejects the feature that makes the council superior to the pope, i.e. infallibility. However, for him, the council is superior to the pope.³⁵

Famous representatives of conciliarism at the Council of Basel include Nicolaus of Cusa and Giuliano Cesarini (who would ultimately make an about-face and side with the Pope), Nicolaus de Tudeschis, Juan of Segovia, Juan González, Louis Aleman, etc. In 1433, during the Council of Basel, Cusanus, as a conciliarist engrossed in the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, prepared the treatise *De concordantia catholica*, in which he proposed church and empire

²⁷ T.M. Izbicki, “Indulgences in Fifteenth-Century Polemics and Canon Law”, in *Ablaskampagnen des Spätmittelalters. Luthers Thesen von 1517 im Kontext*, ed. by A. Rehberg, Berlin 2017, p. 79.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

²⁹ J.A. de Camargo Rodrigues de Souza, “Marsílio de Pádua e a ‘Plenitudo Potestatis’”, *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia* 39 (1983), pp. 139–141.

³⁰ M. Fois, “L’ecclesiologia del conciliarismo”, *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 42 (2004), p. 15.

³¹ de Camargo Rodrigues de Souza, “Marsílio de Pádua”, p. 132.

³² Markowski, “Doktrynalne podstawy”, p. 80.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

³⁴ Fois, “L’ecclesiologia del conciliarismo”, p. 21; B. Tierney, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory*, Leiden 1998, pp. 199–214.

³⁵ Fois, “L’ecclesiologia del conciliarismo”, p. 22.

reforms. In his proposition, the church is structured to attain union with Christ, not all in the same way, but hierarchically.³⁶ He claims that the bishop, not the pope, constitutes and unites the church, representing a clear nod to his conciliarist intentions.³⁷ On the other hand, Nicolaus de Tudeschis – Panormitanus, Zabarella’s student, stated that the council is a community organised for jurisdictional purposes and that the function of the pope is simply to execute the council’s decrees.³⁸ The Church had the power *in fundamento*, but the pope only had it as the Church’s minister (*in principali ministro*).³⁹ As M. Watanabe argued, the conciliarists generally distinguished between the Universal Church as the *congregatio fidelium* and the established Roman Church, understood as the pope and cardinals together. According to them, the Universal Church, which could be represented by a general council, was superior to the pope.⁴⁰ Finally, the *Cogitanti* council letter of 14 September 1432, which we know from many copies, was a straightforward declaration that the ‘fullness of power’ belonged to the council alone. The pope was *Vicarius Christi*, the head of the Church, but the pope was obliged to comply with the general council in matters of faith, schism, and Church reform.⁴¹

Just before the Council, when the discussions about primary authority in the Church were already in progress, Mikołaj of Błonie prepared a textbook for the clergy, *Tractatus sacerdotalis de sacramentis*. The handbook was commissioned by Stanisław Ciołek, Mikołaj’s close associate from the time of his work at the royal court in the early 1420s. The main aim of the treatise was to increase the competence of the lower clergy in the field of pastoral ministry. In this manual, on the verge of the opening of the Council of Basel, Mikołaj, when deciding on the issue of the administration of the sacraments and speaking of baptism, uses the term *plenitudo potestatis*. Mikołaj points out that sacramental grace flows from the head to the mystical body; therefore, any action on the mystical sacramental body through which grace is granted depends on the sacramental action on the real body of the Lord. Therefore, only those priests who can celebrate the Eucharist can administer other sacraments, which is a consequence of entrusting this task to the pope, who has full papal authority (“qui habet plenitudinem pontificalis potestatis”⁴²). He also points out that the pope, because he is the highest of the bishops, is said to have full power, not in relation to the true Body of the Lord, but in relation to the Mystical Body (“quod papa per hoc quod est Episcoporum summus, non-dicitur habere plenitudinem potestatis per relationem ad corpus

³⁶ R.J. Serina Jr., *Nicholas of Cusa’s Brixen Sermons and Late Medieval Church Reform*, Leiden 2016, p. 53.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

³⁸ M. Watanabe, “Authority and Consent in Church Government: Panormitanus, Aeneas Sylvius, Cusanus”, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 33 (1972), no. 2, p. 226.

³⁹ Izbicki, “Indulgences in Fifteenth-Century”, p. 95.

⁴⁰ Watanabe, “Authority and Consent”, p. 222.

⁴¹ Decaluwé, *Successful Defeat*, p. 185.

⁴² Nicolaus de Plove, *Tractatus sacerdotalis de sacramentis*, Venezia: Franciscus Bindonus, 1560, pp. 52–53.

Domini verum, sed per relationem ad corpus mysticum”⁴³). Mikołaj’s argument derives from St Thomas Aquinas, who in *Scriptum super Sententiis* analyzed these issues in detail.⁴⁴

Mikołaj’s opinion is based on a fragment taken almost entirely from Thomas, but we also hear an echo of discussions in the Polish community in the first half of the 15th century. The analysis of the Roman church, which is composed of the pope and cardinals, who form the mystical body of the Church, was a subject of interest to Stanisław of Znoyma (*Tractatus de Ecclesia*) and was the focus of the famous dispute of 1430. In approximately 1430, a theological dispute took place in Kraków reflecting the ongoing controversy concerning the primacy of the pope over the council.⁴⁵ Three editions of it were recorded in writing by Tomasz Strzemiński, Marcin of Holeszów, and Paweł of Pyskowice. It was a kind of discussion with the Hussite movement wherein one can find the statement, repeated after Stanisław of Znoyma, that the pope and the cardinals form the mystical body of the Church. The utterance that appears both in the 1430 debate and in Mikołaj indicates that the topic was widely discussed at that time and that the conclusions presented in both texts could be a testimony not only to a careful reading of St Thomas but also to the considerations undertaken at that time on the theological aspect of authority within the Church.

The issue of power in the Church was extended in the second sermon for the seventh Sunday after Trinity on the topic *Accipiens spetem panes gratias agens fregit et deedit discipulis suis, ut apponerent turbae* (Mt 15, Marc 8) from the collection *de tempore*.⁴⁶ In it, Mikołaj claims that the pope is the vicar of Christ and, together with the bishops, the successor of the apostles (“Cuiusmodi est Papa cum suis Episcopis Catholicis, qui sunt successores Apostolorum”, f. R4v). Ordinary priests are the successors of the other 72 disciples (“Alii vero simplices sacerdotes sunt successores septuaginta duorum discipulorum”, f. R4v). The pope has full power (“Inter quos omnes Papa est plenitudo potestatis”, f. R4v). Not even the greatest theological mind (neither Saint Jerome nor Saint Augustine) can oppose papal authority (“Contra cuius auctoritatem nec Hieronymus, nec Augustinus, nec aliquis doctorum sapientissimus suam sententiam defendit”, p. R4v). This last sentence is a strong statement because usually conciliarists, after stating that the pope has *plenitudo potestatis*, present a list of reservations and ‘however’s. Mikołaj, instead of making such exceptions, reinforces his formulation that absolutely no one has any authority over the pope, not even the most learned doctors. This suggests that Mikołaj did not intend to explicitly point to

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ Thomas Aquinas, *Super Sent.*, lib. 4 d. 7 q. 3 a. 1 qc. 3 co, Textum Parmae 1858 editum, <https://www.corpusthomicum.org/snp4007.html> (accessed on 10 Dec. 2022).

⁴⁵ Włodek, “Eklezjologia krakowska”, pp. 394–406.

⁴⁶ Mikołaj z Błonia, *Sermones venerabilis magistri Nicolai de Blony decretorum doctoris, capellani episcopi Posnoniensis* [!], *valde deservientes populo, sed et clero utcumque docto eos digne legenti predicanti, aut audienti, de tempore, et de sanctis*, Strasbourg: Georgius Husner, 1498. After the quotation – number of the page in incunable.

conciliar sympathies, perhaps because that was not what his sermons were intended for, or perhaps because he had none at all.

On the other hand, Mikołaj states that any doubt concerning the faith can be resolved by the Church based only on the teachings of the Doctors and Fathers of the Church, and preaching must also be based on these foundations (“Non igitur predicanda sunt, nec etiam a predicatoribus audienda quecunque dogmata, sed solum ea, que a Catholicis Doctoribus et sanctis Patribus, et presertim, que ab Ecclesia univ ersali predicantur, et approbantur”, p. R4v). Mikołaj points out that the pope is the vicar of Christ and emphasizes that absolute power belongs to the pope and no one can oppose or undermine it. Although he notes that it is the pope and the bishops who are the successors of the apostles, only the pope has the *plenitudo potestatis*.

The important context for any analysis of Mikołaj’s settlement of power is the ecclesiology of Jean Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris and a prominent moderate conciliarist. In Constance in 1418, he recognised *Haec sancta* as a doctrinal decree. He thought of a council that although the *regulariter* is convoked by the pope, the *casualiter* can also be convoked without papal consent by some of the believers. Gerson’s ecclesiological thought, quite complex, reaches its fullness in the work *De potestate ecclesiastica*, in which he proposes a Church hierarchically structured by the will of God *sub uno monarcha*, a pope endowed with *plenitudo potestatis*.⁴⁷ The universal hierarchical Church consists of permanent parts: a pope, cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and parish priests.⁴⁸ The latter were to replace 72 pupils of the apostles. They all participate at different levels in the unique power, the *potestas ecclesiastica*: the pope exercises the *supremitas*, and the parish priests participate in it at the lowest level. Where Mikołaj stops after discussing the successors of Peter and the successors of the 72 disciples, Jean Gerson goes on to explain further. He argued that the council, which represents the entire Church, exercises all ecclesiastical authority, whether the pope exists or not (dead or deposed). Thus, in the Council, all levels of ecclesiastical authority persist. It, therefore, has a power superior to that of the pope by an extension (*amplitudo*) because the pope is only a part of all ecclesiastical power; moreover, it still surpasses the papacy in the infallibility of governance, reform *in capite et in membris*, in matters of faith, etc. The

⁴⁷ We have manuscripts in Poland containing both Mikołaj’s *Sacramentale* and Gerson’s writings (see the codex written in 1471–1473, Wrocław, Wrocław University Library, I Q 73: <https://www.bibliotekacyfrowa.pl/dlibra/publication/19619/> (accessed on 10 Dec. 2022), codex from 1448 Wrocław University Library, I Q 145 ad codex from 1486 Wrocław University Library, I Q 147).

⁴⁸ He wrote his most well-known treatise on ecclesiastical power, *De potestate ecclesiastica et de origine iuris et legum*, based on his lectiones of 1402 and read it publicly at Constance in February 1417. Gerson argues in thirteen “considerations” that the hierarchy of the church represents a sort of corporation that is responsible for the transmission of salvation to all believers within the mystical body of the church. Plenitude of power in such a corporation lies in the whole body of the membership. D. Kern, “Beyond Borders: Jean Gerson’s Conciliarism in Late Medieval Spain”, *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme* 42 (2019), no. 3, Special Issue: *Situating Conciliarism in Early Modern Spanish Thought*, p. 31.

council can regulate all ecclesiastical authority; it can infallibly dictate the norms of faith to the pope because the council represents the infallible church, while neither the pope nor the cardinals are. It can dictate the rules by which the pope is to be guided, judge him, and even remove him.⁴⁹ Thus, Gerson does not approach in his views the extreme set of Marsilius of Padua. For the Parisian professor, Marsilius' thought was heretical, which he explicitly states.⁵⁰

Thus, it is seen that Mikołaj, although he claims like Gerson that the position of the pope and bishops is different from that of the lower clergy, which results from a different apostolic succession, does not go further in concluding what the consequences of this are. While Gerson states that although the *plenitudo potestatis* does indeed reside in the pope, it is important to recognise that it does not reside in him alone. He alone, as Gerson concedes, possesses it *formaliter*, or in an absolute sense, for Christ conferred it 'supernaturally' on Peter and his legitimate successors for the edification, or building, of the Church.⁵¹

Let us look in more detail at the issue of administering the sacraments that Mikołaj developed in *Sacramentale*. Gerson, unlike the papalists and in accordance with the canonical and theological practise established at that time, divides ecclesiastical authority into ordering authority (*potestas ordinis*) and the authority of ecclesiastical jurisdiction (*potestas iurisdictionis*). The first is sacramental power, which both bishops and priests possess (albeit to varying degrees) by virtue of the sacrament of Holy Orders. Centrally embracing the priestly power of consecration, it is power over the *corpus Christi verum*, or the Eucharist. But it also extends to the *corpus Christi mysticum*, or the corporate body of the Church, because it also includes the complementary power of administering other sacraments to faithful Christians as well. It is a power that, once bestowed, cannot be relinquished or taken away. Mikołaj notes this difference and indicates it as significant, but he emphasizes that the *potestas ordinis* is given to priests by the pope.

Therefore, there is no doubt that Mikołaj was likely familiar with Gerson's writings, which were known in Poland at least from the time of the Council of Constance. The writings of Gerson were known for Piotr Wolfram,⁵² a professor at the University of Kraków, who was in Constance with a Polish delegation and probably met Gerson there. *De potestate ecclesiastica* was known and read in Poland in the 1430s, as evidenced by manuscripts in Polish archives (Wrocław, Kraków), e.g. the codex from the very beginning of the Council of Basel in 1432 (Wrocław

⁴⁹ Fois, "Ecclesiologia del conciliarismo", pp. 23–24.

⁵⁰ Kern, "Beyond Borders", p. 33.

⁵¹ Jean Gerson, *Tractatus de potestate ecclesiastica*, in *id.*, *Opera omnia*, Antwerpen: Sumptibus Societatis, 1706, pp. 227–228; F. Oakley, "Gerson as Conciliarist", in *A Companion to Jean Gerson*, ed. by B.P. McGuire, Leiden 2006, p. 199.

⁵² Wolfram had Gerson's three tracts copied in his library (*Forma visitandi subditos per prelatum et quomodo idem prelati debet se habere; Examinatio et interrogatio de peccatis mortalibus*; and – probably – an extension of *De statu curatorum*). Cf. W. Szelińska, "Piotr Wolfram, profesor Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego i jego nieznaný rękopis", *Prace Historyczne* 8 (1977), p. 56.

University Library, Mil. II 77).⁵³ Although there are some elements in Mikołaj's arguments (especially those concerning hierarchical order in the Church or the importance of the Roman Church) that could be a distant echo of Gerson's writings, there is no evidence that he embraced the entire conciliarist theory of the Paris professor. When explaining what *plenitudo potestatis* means to him, Mikołaj uses the arguments of the papists emphasizing that no authority can challenge papal power, making no exceptions to this rule. No scholar has more power in the Church than the pope, but this cannot be seen because Mikołaj does not believe that no one can straighten the path of an erring pope. He simply ignores the question of papal fallibility.

Yet more evidence indicating that Mikołaj uses pro-papal arguments are the authorities he refers to both in his sermons and in his treatise. Mikołaj most often refers to the writings of the papists, such as those of Enrico of Susa,⁵⁴ Giovanni d'Andrea, Huggucio, etc.⁵⁵ Mikołaj in the analysed above fragment from *Sacramentale* also refers to the authority of Thomas Aquinas, as if disregarding discussions that had persisted over the previous two centuries. The Thomists perpetuated the arguments of the papists, and it seems unquestionable here that the clear use of Thomas's argument in this aspect is very significant.

Hussite question

In the sermon quoted above, Mikołaj refers to the Hussite issue, which he uses to connect with the question of power in the Church. The Hussites rejected papal primacy, so linking the *plenitudo potestatis* in the sermon with the question of the Hussite heresy was typical of polemics with the Hussites.

Polish intellectuals were keenly involved in polemics with the Hussites.⁵⁶ Numerous treaties testify to this commitment e.g. *Tractatus de communion sub utraque specie* by Andrzej of Kokorzyn, *Determinatio contra sectatores Wycklif et Ioannis Hus* by Stanisław of Skarbimierz, the sermon-treatise *Vivamus per eum* by Piotr Wolf-ram, and *Questio de hereticis* by Mikołaj of Jawor. In the years 1432–1433, a Polish-Hussite military alliance was concluded, which was beneficial for king Władysław II

⁵³ Three copies of *De potestate* exist in Polish libraries: BJ 4962 fols. 114v–131; BUWr I F 776, fols. 29–45; Bibli. Milichiana 77 9426, fols. 274–293. Cf. W. Seńko, Z. Włodek, "Dzieła Gersona zachowane w bibliotekach polskich", in *Materiały i Studia Zakładu Historii Filozofii Starożytnej i Średniowiecznej*, vol. 7, series A: *Materiały do Historii Filozofii Średniowiecznej w Polsce*, Wrocław 1967, p. 109.

⁵⁴ J.A. Watt, "The Use of the Term *plenitudo potestatis* by Hostiensis", in *Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Medieval Canon Law, Boston College, 12–16 August 1963*, ed. by S. Kuttner, J.J. Ryan, Vatican City 1965, pp. 161–187.

⁵⁵ Recchia, *Luso della formula*.

⁵⁶ P. Kras, *Husyci w piętnastowiecznej Polsce*, Lublin 1998; *Polskie echa husytyzmu. Materiały z konferencji naukowej, Kłodzko, 27–28 września 1996*, ed. by S. Bylina, R. Gładkiewicz, Warsaw 1999; S. Bylina, *Rewolucja husycka. Przedświt i pierwsze lata*, Warsaw 2011.

Jagiello in many ways.⁵⁷ Jagiello repeatedly declared his willingness to negotiate with the Hussites.⁵⁸ In March 1431, a discussion with the Hussites took place in Kraków in which all Kraków professors of theology, i.e. Eliaż of Wąwelnica, Franciszek of Brzeg, Mikołaj of Kozłów, Andrzej of Kokorzyn, Benedykt Hesse of Kraków and Jakub of Paradyż,⁵⁹ took part. The Hussites were also invited to Basel, because after the defeat of the Fifth Crusade near Domažlice on August 14, 1431, the papal legate Giuliano Cesarini decided to change the strategy of the holy war, replacing it with the concept of open theological debate. The Council of Basel became a forum for discussion with the Hussites. In May 1432 the council and the Hussites held a meeting in Cheb, and they agreed on the Compact of Cheb.⁶⁰ Negotiations in Basel started on January 1433, although many opponents of Hussites saw this as an improper act. The Hussite delegation was guaranteed inviolability. The result of the debates was that permitting the reception of communion under both kinds was allowed for the Hussites, which aroused objections among Polish theologians and others.

Cusanus, still a conciliarist at the time, prepared *De usu communionis* after the Hussite delegation left Basel (mid-1433), declaring in harsh words that the Hussites had cut themselves off from the Church and undermined its unity.⁶¹ Although this does not lead him directly to papism, it does not allow him to avoid the question of papal authority. He must admit that the pope is the sole legitimate successor of Peter and Paul.⁶² Thus, opposition to the Hussites in some way leads to the use of an argument in favour of papal authority.

Mikołaj of Błonie also connects the topic of hierarchy and power in the Church with the question of heresy. He emphasizes in the quoted sermon that the error of the Hussites and Wycliffes consists, among other things, of denouncing obedience to the pope (f. R4v). One of the postulates of the Czech and English reform movements was the revision of the concept of the church hierarchy. The reformers pointed out that the Church should be composed of equal members, and they especially denied the authority of the papacy. Mikołaj also draws attention to this problem. He starts by presenting the hierarchy in the Church (the pope and bishops are the successors of the apostles, and ordinary priests – other 72 envoys, the pope has the greatest power

⁵⁷ P. Kras, "Polityczne i ideowe aspekty przymierza polsko-husyckiego z lat 1432–1433", *Nowe Studia Grunwaldzkie* 1 (2015), p. 8.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁵⁹ M. Markowski, "Wydział teologiczny Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego w wiekach średnich", *Analecta Cracoviensia* 23 (1991), p. 368; W. Iwańczak, "Dysputa religijna z husytami w Krakowie w 1431 roku", in *id.*, *W poszukiwaniu lepszego świata, czyli prawdy i nieprawdy o husytyzmie*, Kraków 2021, pp. 53–68.

⁶⁰ Decaluwé, *Successful Defeat*, p. 126; S. Bylina, *Podróż husytów do Bazylei*, Warsaw 2013; F. Šmahel, *Basilejská kompaktáta – Příběh deseti listin*, Prague 2011, pp. 27–30; D. Coufal, *Turnaj viry. Polemika o kalich na basilejském koncilu 1431–1433*, Prague 2020.

⁶¹ T. Woelki, "Theological Diplomacy? Cusanus and the Hussites", in *Wycliffism and Hussitism: Methods of Thinking, Writing, and Persuasion, c. 1360–c. 1460*, ed. by K. Ghosh, P. Soukup, with the assistance of C. Gillhammer, Brepols 2021, pp. 415–417; J.C. Levy, "Interpreting the Intention of Christ: Roman Responses to Bohemian Utraquism from Constance to Basel", in *Europe after Wyclif*, ed. by J.P. Hornbeck, M. van Dussen, New York 2017, p. 189.

⁶² Levy, "Interpreting the Intention", p. 190.

in the Church) and then he draws attention to the issue of preaching, the content of which is defined in detail by the writings of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church and which should be universally accepted by the Church. He then emphasizes that Hus and Wycliffe (whom he calls the perpetrators of Bohemian heresy – ‘bohemic perfidie auctores’, p. R4v) oppose the authority of the papacy. He uses a wide range of discrediting terms, ascribing to both reformers impudence, buffoonery, wickedness, and perfidy. He tries to explain that the exhortations to disregard papal authority are wrong, and therefore all the followers of Hus and Wycliffe are in error. Mikołaj metaphorically presents the Roman Church as a spring of truth, which heretics turn into reservoirs and brooks – that is, they are perverse doctors and frauds (‘Qui dimisso fonte veritatis, scilicet sede Romane Ecclesie, querunt sibi cisternas et riuulos, id est, prauos doctores, vel potius seductores, cum quibus periter damnabuntur’, f. R4v). Mikołaj, therefore, notes that not only *potestas ordinis* and *potestas iurisdictionis* are related to papal authority, but also that the truth, i.e. the doctrinal teaching of the Church, is related to the Roman Church. Again, he refers to the concept that appeared very widely in the above-mentioned treatise by Stanisław of Znojma and in the so-called dispute of 1430. *Romana Ecclesia* in this sense would be identical not only with the pope but also with the cardinals who are to form the mystical body.⁶³ In the sermon of Mikołaj, the Roman Church is important not only in the jurisdictional and institutional sense but also as a source of truth and dogma.

For Mikołaj, not supporting the pope or undermining his authority is tantamount to taking the side of heresy since it is heretics who challenge papal authority. It sounds similar to the words of Eugene IV, who condemned those delegates who stayed in Basel after the council transfer to Florence.⁶⁴ Is it aimed at university doctors who undermine papal authority? European universities that adhered to the conciliar idea (Paris, Cologne, Vienna, Erfurt, Kraków) created a hermetic environment focused entirely on proving canonical and theological theses related to power in the Church. Mikołaj, who had been operating outside the university environment for many years, had a different, pragmatic attitude toward reforms in the Church. Moreover, Mikołaj intended his collections for the needs of the lower clergy, but he was undoubtedly aware that they could also be used by the intellectual elite, which he expressed in the introductory sermon, emphasizing on the extensive topic of modesty and *refutatio* that his collection would not satisfy those who are looking for sophisticated literature.⁶⁵ Nevertheless, his sermons did not provide space for ecclesiological polemics. Certainly, this is a typical style of argumentation related to recognizing the addressee. It must be said that even the most ardent supporters of conciliarism acted in a similar way, and in their talks with the Greeks, they emphasised the strength of the papal authority, not because they were inconsistent in their

⁶³ Włodek, “Eklezjologia krakowska”, pp. 394–400.

⁶⁴ Florencja, sessio 9/sesja 9, transl. by A. Baron, T. Wnętrzak, in *Dokumenty soborów powszechnych*, p. 553.

⁶⁵ E. Av. Cf. Grzybowska, *Kazania de tempore i de sanctis*, p. 74.

views, but because they were able to recognise the effectiveness of arguments in the right way and see that internal problems of the Church should be discussed within the Church. Presenting complex conciliarist arguments to Hussites or Greeks would be a contradiction of all efforts for unity.

Polish conciliarism and papalism in the 1430s

The environment in Poland did not explicitly opt for conciliarism, although in the university environment such an option was dominant. Many universities in Europe were hotbeds of conciliarist thought due to the fact that they had a corporate structure and their operating model was based on principles opposed to absolutist or monarchical assumptions.⁶⁶ From the beginning of the existence of the renovated university, the University of Kraków had professors associated with conciliarist sympathies among its staff. The important figure for the intellectual life in Kraków was also Piotr Wysz, who collaborated with Mateusz of Kraków on the creation of the work *De praxi Romanae curiae*⁶⁷ and was the author of the reformist work *Speculum aureum*.⁶⁸ However, this was an attitude that was very different from radical conciliarism. Under the influence of the Council of Constance, the Polish conciliarist orientation began to take shape. A typical philosophical orientation at the University of Kraków was, as Mieczysław Markowski demonstrates, *via communis*, a common road that connected *via antiqua* with *via moderna*, but consequently led to the adoption of a perspective closer to conciliarism.⁶⁹ Polish intellectuals saw in conciliarism the power that, at the Council of Constance, made it possible to end the schism and effectively fight for the unity of the Church.

In the *Sacramentale* Mikołaj refers directly to two professors of the University of Kraków, namely Stanisław of Skarbimierz (whom he calls *dominus meus*) and Franciszek Krzysowicz of Brzeg.⁷⁰ Therefore, their views on the issues of conciliarism are important context. Although Thomas Wünsch counts among the conciliarists Franciszek of Brzeg and Stanisław Ciołek,⁷¹ Franciszek of Brzeg's views on conciliarism are difficult to reconstruct. There is a little more evidence of the views of Stanisław of Skarbimierz, and he is considered, along with Piotr Wysz and Paweł Włodkowic,

⁶⁶ A. Black, *Council and Commune: The Conciliar Movement and the Council of Basle*, London 1979, pp. 10–12.

⁶⁷ Mateusz z Krakowa, *O praktykach kurii rzymskiej oraz 2 kazania synodalne o naprawie obyczajów kleru*, transl. and introd. by W. Seńko, Warsaw 1970.

⁶⁸ W. Seńko, *Piotr Wysz z Radolina i jego dzieło „Speculum aureum”*, Warsaw 1996; Z. Kałuża, “Autor ‘Speculum aureum’”, *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 28 (1980), no. 1, pp. 203–232; Markowski, “Doktrynalne podstawy”, p. 83.

⁶⁹ Markowski, “Doktrynalne podstawy”, pp. 86–87.

⁷⁰ Nicolaus de Plove, *Tractatus sacerdotalis*, p. 68.

⁷¹ Wünsch, *Konziliarismus und Polen*, pp. 72–76.

one of the early representatives of conciliarism in Poland.⁷² For Stanisław, the unity of the Church was the overriding priority.⁷³ He wrote about papal *plenitudo potestatis*, but he pointed out that the pope can be wrong and that the best results are obtained by combining the papal and conciliar authority. He knew and quoted *Haec sancta*.⁷⁴ Moderate conciliarists solved the basic problems related to power in the Church in this way – they recognise that full power belongs to the pope, but they saw the danger associated with it so insist that if the pope errs, the council has the right to instruct him or even dismiss him. This precedent made it practical to hold such a position. In his writings, Stanisław combines – as Mikołaj would later do – the anti-Hussite issues with the problem of schism.⁷⁵ In his anti-Utraquist writings, he emphasizes papal authority very clearly. In the work *Contra haeresim*, he calls the pope *princeps universalis* and adds that undermining papal authority is heretical.⁷⁶

The unity of the Church had the superior value of papal authority from the point of view of the Polish *raison d'état*, which is why king Władysław II, mindful of both the effects of the Council of Constance and the danger of undermining papal authority, sent a delegation to the council of the doctor of decrees Dzierżaw of Borzymów and the knight Piotr Chełmski, who were to admonish the council in the name of the king to not seek division and to submit to the authority of the pope.⁷⁷

The milieu of Polish conciliarists had become radical during the Council of Basel. Tomasz Strzemiński, who wrote one version of the dispute from 1430 which did not have a radical anti-papal character, in 1441 drew up to kill or cure *Determinatio Basiliensis*. It was one of the most important conciliarist writings considered in Basel and also an official statement of the University of Kraków. The efforts of Eugene IV himself, who tried in every way to weaken the council, contributed to this radicalisation, but this was not the only or even the main reason. Mikołaj's sermons were probably written before Eugene IV's deposition, which took place on 25 June 1439. This act had little influence on Eugene himself, but caused many people, recalling the great schism of 1378–1417, to turn away from conciliarist issues and opt for the side of the pope.⁷⁸

It is difficult to say whether Mikołaj's lack of clear support for conciliarists meant that he did not share moderate views like those of, for example, Jean Gerson or Stanisław of Skarbimierz. On the one hand, it can be assumed that the genre of a sermon or textbook for the lower clergy did not give them space or opportunity to get involved in detailed ecclesiological issues. Moreover, emphasizing that the pope

⁷² G. Ryś, "Stanisław ze Skarbimierza o Kościele w dobie kryzysu", in *Ecclesia semper reformanda*, p. 312.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 314.

⁷⁴ Włodek, "Eklezjologia krakowska", p. 392; Ryś, "Stanisław ze Skarbimierza", p. 315.

⁷⁵ Ryś, "Stanisław ze Skarbimierza", p. 315.

⁷⁶ Stanislaus de Scarbimira, *Contra haeresim*, ed. by W. Świeboda, in W. Świeboda, *Universitas contra haeresim. Działalność antyheretycka Stanisława ze Skarbimierza jako przedstawiciela Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego*, Kraków 2021, p. 248.

⁷⁷ K. Ozóg, "Pierwsi Jagiellonowie wobec kryzysu Kościoła", in *Ecclesia semper reformanda*, pp. 328–329.

⁷⁸ M.D. Bailey, E. Peters, "A Sabbat of Demonologists: Basel, 1431–1440", *The Historian* 6 (2003), no. 6, p. 1375.

is not always the ultimate authority would not be consistent with the anti-Hussite dimension of his writings. In other words, by undermining the authority of the Pope in any way in his texts, he would be giving ready-made arguments to those whom he was fighting in his texts, namely Utraquists. On the other hand, Mikołaj did not have to share the conviction of the Polish intellectual elite about the rightness of actions and the conciliarist idea. This idea was close to the university as a corporation. Mikołaj no longer belongs to the university environment in the 1430s and is involved primarily in the reform of the clergy on the local scale.

Other circumstances may have influenced Mikołaj's attitude toward conciliarism and the Council of Basel. Undoubtedly, information about scenes ridiculing the entire Council reached Poland. As Peter L. McDermott describes, summarising Piccolomini's narrative,

On 7 May 1437, in a ritual both sad and absurd, the Council of Basel broke apart in discord and disorder. Two factions in the cathedral session that morning, each 'simultaneously reading its decree, shouting its *Placet* and singing its *Te Deum*', divided the house on the issue of selecting a site for unification talks with the Church of Constantinople.⁷⁹

No doubt this scene, and many others, must have caused confusion and embarrassment for many of the conciliarists, leaving them questioning their support for the Council. This was the case with Nicolaus of Cusa, as it was with Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini⁸⁰ and Mikołaj Lasocki a few years later. However, in Poland, the university elite was not discouraged by these scenes, which they had to know first-hand. Furthermore, the greatest minds were involved in the preparation of the conciliar treaty, among them Jan Elgot, Tomasz Strzemiński, Benedykt Hesse, Jakub of Paradyż, and Wawrzyniec Racibórz.⁸¹ Mikołaj dealt with all of them during his stay in Kraków, but when they became radicalised, he is no longer in the capital city.

After the schism of 1439, the Council was also supported by the most important representatives of the Polish clergy, i.e. Primate Wincenty Kot and Zbigniew

⁷⁹ P.L. McDermott, "Nicholas of Cusa: Continuity and Conciliation at the Council of Basel", *Church History*, 67 (1998), no. 2, p. 254.

⁸⁰ Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini stated that "the Church is as much superior to the Roman pontiff as the son is inferior to his mother" (Watanabe, "Authority and Consent", p. 229). If the pope does not listen to the church, he does not listen to Christ either and should be treated like a heathen. Piccolomini was the author of *Commentarii de gestis Basiliensis concilii* published after the coronation of Felix V on July 24, 1440, and was a book considered a propaganda piece. Still, Aeneas was perplexed by the inefficiency of the council and the lack of strong personalities around Felix, and he saw that this was leading to a new schism. Yet the schism of 1054 had only just ended (at least the Florentine union made it possible to believe it for the time being). In 1442 he became a poet crowned by Frederick II and decided to tie his career to him. He was moving towards neutrality. In 1444 he reconciled with Eugene.

⁸¹ *Determinatio Basiliensis*, ed. by H. Anzulewicz, in *Polskie traktaty koncyljarystyczne z połowy XV w.*, ed. by W. Bucichowski, Warsaw 1987, pp. 43–82. The treatise by Tomasz Strzemiński was created as a compilation of several other texts and was sent in 1441 on behalf of the Kraków University to the members of the Council in Basel. These texts are later than the time when the works of Mikołaj of Błonie were written.

Oleśnicki, who rejected the cardinal creation from Eugene IV and accepted the cardinal hat from Feliks V, together with Primate Kot.⁸² Nevertheless, at the synod in Łęczycza in May 1441, following the example of the German states, Poland officially adopted a neutral attitude towards the conflict between the Council and the Pope. This attitude resulted, on the one hand, from the financial claims of the Council and its eunoia towards the Utraquist proposals of the Hussites, and, on the other hand, from the Council's failure to recognize Władysław III as King of Hungary, which was against the Polish *raison d'état*.⁸³ However, not all bishops were supporters of the Council. The Bishop of Poznań, Andrzej of Bnin, was reluctant to adopt conciliarist ideas. He was elected bishop after the death of Stanisław Ciołek in 1437, and the election was approved by Eugene IV. The "counter-candidate" pushed by Oleśnicki was Mikołaj Lasocki, a well-known conciliarist, who appealed the decision to elect Andrzej to the Council. These circumstances were enough to make Andrzej of Bnin look at the Council of Basel with disfavour. When, in the autumn of 1440, deputies of the Basel Council came to Poland asking the bishop for support, he steadfastly refused.⁸⁴ The Poznań diocese included the Warsaw (Czersk) archdeaconry in Mazovia, where, after Ciołek's death, Mikołaj of Błonie held various offices. Thus, Mikołaj was directly under the jurisdiction of the Poznań bishop. Did he share with him the harsh judgment of the activities of the conciliarists? It is difficult to say, but certainly, this context cannot be omitted, although, as we know, not all clergy of the Archdiocese of Poznań were supporters of papism.⁸⁵ However, it cannot be ruled out that the participation of Ciołek's successor, Bishop Andrzej of Bnin, both in the fight against the Hussites and in taking the side of the Pope in the conflict with the Council, almost certainly played a role in Mikołaj's attitude.

Mikołaj, therefore, leans towards the papist position, which does not mean that he dismissed the idea that reforms of the Church were necessary. One did not exclude the other. The reform of the Church *in capite* and *in membris* rested heavily on Mikołaj. His textbook and sermons are proof of this. He proposes many changes and criticises the inappropriate attitudes of priests and the behaviour of clergy. The perception of preachers and priests as role models for the community of believers and the encouragement of moral renewal among the clergy (*medice, cura te ipsum*, this is the 'motto' of *Sacramentale* of Mikołaj) were the main topics of Mikołaj's writing. In his sermons, he expands on these issues, trying to present the importance of the priestly ministry and wanting to teach the clergy the principles of the correct exercise of *cura pastoralis*.⁸⁶ The issue of reforming the Ecclesia *in capite* and *in membris* is a kind of leitmotif existing from the beginning of the Church. In the first half of

⁸² Graff, "Wokół sprawy kardynalatu", pp. 19–50.

⁸³ Graff, "Katolicki episkopat", p. 71.

⁸⁴ *Acta capitulorum nec non iudiciorum ecclesiasticorum selecta*, vol. 2: *Acta iudiciorum ecclesiasticorum dioecesium Gneznensis et Poznaniensis (1403–1530)*, ed. by B. Ulanowski, Kraków 1902, p. 519, no. 1101; T. Graff, *Katolicki episkopat metropolii*, pp. 92–95.

⁸⁵ Graff, "Katolicki episkopat", p. 92.

⁸⁶ Grzybowska, *Kazania de tempore i de sanctis*, pp. 184–187, 389–410.

the 15th century, it gained special importance, and it is hard to imagine that any representative of the higher clergy in Poland or the clerical elite in Poland would not have a strong opinion on this subject. Mikołaj inevitably turns more to the issues of reform *in membris*, ignoring at the same time the issues of reform *in capite*. He is the author of a textbook for the clergy designed to improve the qualifications of priests and to highlight the essence of the sacraments and the Holy Mass. His sermons are directed, according to the declarations made in the opening sermon to two collections, to the less educated clergy. Working as a Warsaw official was also ‘work at the grassroots.’ His sermons are full of critical remarks towards the clergy, most of them typical vituperative rhetoric, but there are also very specific accusations directed at select priests. In this respect, Mikołaj’s sermons, although they refer to a broadly used set of topics and issues characteristic of pastoral literature, are at the same time very topical and immersed in a specific situation and a specific historical time.

Mikołaj is immersed in current problems. His involvement in the Hussite issue clearly shows that he combined two goals in his sermons – on the one hand, it was to be a universal story about a good man, and on the other, that man lived in specific times that conditioned his thinking. However, the most specific contingency can be seen in his polemics with the Hussites. They focus on conciliarism. Strengthening papal power is in the interest of fighting the Hussites. The preachers had no reason to preach to the people to point out the intricacies of the discussion of the superiority of the council over the papacy and vice versa. However, this does not change the fact that Mikołaj’s statement about the church hierarchy legitimises papism, although it cannot be fully determined whether Mikołaj completely rejected conciliarism. What was most important to him was the unity of the Church.

Bibliography

Primary sources

- Acta capitulorum nec non iudiciorum ecclesiasticorum selecta*, vol. 2: *Acta iudiciorum ecclesiasticorum dioecesium Gneznensis et Poznaniensis (1403–1530)*, ed. by B. Ulanowski, Kraków 1902.
- Codex diplomaticus Universitatis Studii Generalis Cracoviensis*, vol. 2, ed. by Ž. Pauli, Kraków 1870.
- Concilium Basiliense. Studien und Quellen zur Geschichte des Concils von Basel*, vol. 3: *Protokolle des Concils 1434–1435*, ed. by J. Haller, Basel 1900.
- Concilium Basiliense. Studien und Quellen zur Geschichte des Concils von Basel*, vol. 5: *Tagebücher un Acten 1431–1438*, ed. by G. Beckmann, R. Wackernagel, G. Coggiola, Basel 1904.
- Determinatio Basiliensis*, ed. by H. Anzulewicz, in *Polskie traktaty koncylarystyczne z połowy XV w.*, ed. by W. Bucichowski, Warsaw 1987, pp. 116–230.
- Dokumenty soborów powszechnych. Tekst grecki, łaciński, arabski, ormiański, polski*, vol. 3: (1415–1445): *Konstancja, Bazylea – Ferrara – Florencja – Rzym*, ed. by A. Baron, H. Pietras, Kraków 2003.

- Gerson Jean, *Tractatus de potestate ecclesiastica*, in Jean Gerson, *Opera omnia*, Antwerpen: Sumptibus Societatis, 1706, pp. 225–256.
- Mateusz z Krakowa, *O praktykach kurii rzymskiej oraz 2 kazania synodalne o naprawie obyczajów kleru*, transl. and introd. by W. Seńko, Warsaw 1970.
- Mikołaj z Błonia, *Sermones venerabilis magistri Nicolai de Blony decretorum doctoris, capellani episcopi Posnoniensis [!], valde deservientes populo, sed et clero utcumque docto eos digne legenti predicanti, aut audienti, de tempore, et de sanctis*, Strasbourg: Georgius Husner, 1498.
- Nicolaus de Plove, *Tractatus sacerdotalis de sacramentis*, Venezia: Franciscus Bindonus, 1560.
- Stanislaus de Scarbimira, *Contra haeresim*, ed. by W. Świeboda, in W. Świeboda, *Universitas contra haeresim. Działalność antyheretycka Stanisława ze Skarbimierza jako przedstawiciela Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego*, Kraków 2021, pp. 225–262.
- Thomas Aquinas, *Scriptum super Sententiis*, Textum Parmae 1858 editum, <https://www.corpusthomisticum.org/snp4007.html> (accessed on 10 Dec. 2022).

Secondary sources

- Bailey, M.D., Peters, E., “A Sabbat of Demonologists: Basel, 1431–1440”, *The Historian* 65 (2003), no. 6, pp. 1375–1395.
- Benson, L., “Plenitudo potestatis: Evolution of a Formula from Gregory VII to Gratian”, *Collectanea Stephan Kuttner. Studia Gratiana* 14 (1967), pp. 195–217.
- Black, A., *Council and Commune: The Conciliar Movement and the Council of Basle*, London 1979.
- Bylina, S., *Podróż husytów do Bazylei*, Warsaw 2013.
- Bylina, S., *Rewolucja husycka. Przedświt i pierwsze lata*, Warsaw 2011.
- Camargo Rodrigues de Souza, J.A. de, “Marsílio de Pádua e a ‘Plenitudo Potestatis’”, *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia* 39 (1983), pp. 119–170.
- A Companion the Council of Basel*, ed. by M. Decaluwé, T.M. Izbicki, G. Christianson, Boston 2017.
- Coufal, D., *Turnaj víry. Polemika o kalich na basilejském koncilu 1431–1433*, Prague 2020.
- Decaluwé, M., *A Successful Defeat: Eugene IV’s Struggle with the Council of Basel for Ultimate Authority in the Church, 1431–1449*, Brussels 2009.
- Ecclesia semper reformanda. Kryzysy i reformy średniowiecznego Kościoła*, ed. by T. Gałuszka, T. Graff, G. Ryś, Kraków 2013.
- Fijałek, J., *Mistrz Jakób z Paradyża i Uniwersytet Krakowski w okresie Soboru Bazylejskiego*, vol. 1–2, Kraków 1900–1902.
- Fois, M., “L’ecclésiologie del conciliarismo”, *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 42 (2004), pp. 9–26.
- Graff, T., “Biskup krakowski Zbigniew Oleśnicki wobec schizmy bazylejskiej (1439–1449)”, in *Zbigniew Oleśnicki. Książę Kościoła i mąż stanu*, ed. by F. Kiryk, Z. Noga, Kraków 2006, pp. 195–204.
- Graff, T., *Episkopat monarchii jagiellońskiej w dobie soborów powszechnych w XV wieku*, Kraków 2008.
- Graff, T., “Katolicki episkopat metropolii gnieźnieńskiej i lwowskiej wobec wyboru pseudopapieża Feliksa V przez sobór bazylejski”, *Nasza Przeszłość* 99 (2003), pp. 55–129.

- Graff, T., "Pralaci kapituły krakowskiej wobec kryzysu Kościoła w latach 1439–1449", in *Ecclesia semper reformanda. Kryzysy i reformy średniowiecznego Kościoła*, ed. by T. Gałuszka, T. Graff, G. Ryś, Kraków 2013, pp. 337–355.
- Graff, T., "Rozterki religijne biskupów monarchii jagiellońskiej w dobie tzw. II unii polsko-węgierskiej 1440–1444", in *Religijność. Wymiar prywatny i publiczny*, ed. by W. Szyborski, P. Nowakowski, Kraków 2007, pp. 129–148.
- Graff, T., "Wokół sprawy kardynałatu biskupa krakowskiego Zbigniewa Oleśnickiego", *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne* (2002), no. 129, pp. 19–50.
- Graff, T., "Wpływ kryzysu Kościoła powszechnego na społeczeństwo polskie w pierwszej połowie XV wieku. Wybrane zagadnienia", *Analecta Cracoviensia* 44 (2012), pp. 217–240.
- Grodziska, K., "Mikołaja Lasockiego pochwała Władysława Jagiełły i królowej Jadwigi na soborze bazylejskim", *Analecta Cracoviensia* 20 (1988), pp. 381–399.
- Grosse, L., *Stosunki Polski z soborem bazylejskim*, Warsaw 1885.
- Grzybowska, L., *Kazania de tempore i de sanctis Mikołaja z Błonia. Zarys monografii*, Warsaw 2020.
- Iwańczak, W., "Dysputa religijna z husytami w Krakowie w 1431 roku", in W. Iwańczak, *W poszukiwaniu lepszego świata, czyli prawdy i nieprawdy o husytyzmie*, Kraków 2021, pp. 53–68.
- Izbicki, T.M., "Indulgences in Fifteenth-Century Polemics and Canon Law", in *Ablaskampagnen des Spätmittelalters. Luthers Thesen von 1517 im Kontext*, ed. by A. Rehberg, Berlin 2017, pp. 79–104.
- Izbicki, T.M., "Papalist Reaction to the Council of Constance: Juan de Torquemada to the Present", *Church History* 55 (1986), no. 1, pp. 7–20.
- Kałuża, Z., "Autor 'Speculum aureum'", *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 28 (1980), no. 1, pp. 203–232.
- Kern, D., "Beyond Borders: Jean Gerson's Conciliarism in Late Medieval Spain", *Renaissance and Reformation/ Renaissance et Réforme* 42 (2019), no. 3, Special Issue: *Situating Conciliarism in Early Modern Spanish Thought*, pp. 23–43.
- Kras, P., *Husyci w piętnastowiecznej Polsce*, Lublin 1998.
- Kras, P., "Polityczne i ideowe aspekty przymierza polsko-husyckiego z lat 1432–1433", *Nowe Studia Grunwaldzkie* 1 (2015), pp. 7–24.
- Levy, J.C., "Interpreting the Intention of Christ: Roman Responses to Bohemian Utraquism from Constance to Basel", in *Europe after Wyclif*, ed. by J.P. Hornbeck, M. van Dussen, New York 2017, pp. 173–195.
- Mann, J.D., "The Devilish Pope: Eugenius IV as Lucifer in the Later Works of Juan de Segovia", *Church History* 65 (1996), no. 2, pp. 184–196.
- Markowski, M., "Doktrynalne podstawy krakowskiego koncyliarizmu średniowiecznego", *Folia Historica Cracoviensia* 6 (1999), pp. 77–89.
- Markowski, M., "Wydział teologiczny Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego w wiekach średnich", *Analecta Cracoviensia* 23 (1991), pp. 359–370.
- McCready, W.D., "Papal plenitudo potestatis and the Source of Temporal Authority in Late Medieval Papal Hierocratic Theory", *Speculum* 48 (1973), no. 4, pp. 654–674.
- McDermott, P.L., "Nicholas of Cusa: Continuity and Conciliation at the Council of Basel", *Church History* 67 (1998), no. 2, pp. 254–273.
- Oakley, F., "Gerson as Conciliarist", in *A Companion to Jean Gerson*, ed. by B.P. McGuire, Leiden 2006, pp. 179–204.

- Ozóg, K., "Mikołaj z Błonia zwany Pszczółka (zm. po 1442 r.)", in *Profesorowie Wydziału Prawa Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, vol. 1: 1364–1780, ed. by W. Uruszczak, Kraków 2015, pp. 306–307.
- Ozóg, K., "Ne contrarii haberemur doctrinae et scripturis nostris. Droga Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego do złożenia obediencji papieżowi Mikołajowi V", in *Narodziny Rzeczypospolitej. Studia z dziejów średniowiecza i czasów wczesnonowożytnych*, vol. 2, ed. by W. Bukowski, T. Jurek, Kraków 2012, pp. 1185–1204.
- Ozóg, K., *Uczeni w monarchii Jadwigi Andegaweńskiej i Władysława Jagiełły (1384–1434)*, Kraków 2004.
- Polskie echa husytyzmu. Materiały z konferencji naukowej, Kłodzko, 27–28 września 1996*, ed. by S. Bylina, R. Gładkiewicz, Warsaw 1999.
- Provvidente, S., "Causa unionis, fidei reformation: les pratiques judiciaires et la définition de l'autorité du Concile de Constance (1414–1418)", *Médiévales* (2013), no. 65, pp. 155–177.
- Rabiej, P., "Uczeni uniwersyteccy w służbie i otoczeniu Zbigniewa Oleśnickiego, biskupa krakowskiego", in *Polska i jej sąsiedzi w późnym średniowieczu*, ed. by K. Ozóg, S. Szczur, Kraków 2000, pp. 199–231.
- Recchia, A., *L'uso della formula plenitudo potestatis da Leone Magno ad Ugucione da Pisa*, Roma 1999.
- Rizzi, M., "Plenitudo potestatis. Dalla teologia politica alla teoria dello stato assoluto", in *Images, cultes, liturgies. Les connotations politiques du message religieux*, ed. by P. Ventrone, L. Gaffuri, Rome 2014, pp. 49–60.
- Rosenblieh, É., "Contester la dissolution du concile, constitutionnaliser la monarchie pontificale (Église latine, premier XV^e siècle)", in *Contester au Moyen Âge: de la désobéissance à la révolte: XLIX^e Congrès de la SHMESP (Rennes, 2018)*, Paris 2019, pp. 201–217.
- Seńko, W., *Piotr Wysz z Radolina i jego dzieło „Speculum aureum”*, Warsaw 1996.
- Seńko, W., Włodek, Z., "Dzieła Gersona zachowane w bibliotekach polskich", in *Materiały i Studia Zakładu Historii Filozofii Starożytnej i Średniowiecznej*, vol. 7, series A: *Materiały do Historii Filozofii Średniowiecznej w Polsce*, Wrocław 1967.
- Serina Jr, R.J., *Nicholas of Cusa's Brixen Sermons and Late Medieval Church Reform*, Leiden 2016.
- Šmahel, F., *Basilejská kompaktáta – Příběh deseti listin*, Prague 2011.
- Świeżawski, S., *Eklezjologia późnośredniowieczna na rozdrożu*, Kraków 1990.
- Świeżawski, S., "Klęska koncyliaryzmu. Przyczynek do dziejów etyki społecznej i politycznej w późnym średniowieczu", *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 37–38 (1989–1990), no. 1, pp. 55–72.
- Szelińska, W., "Piotr Wolfram, profesor Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego i jego nieznanany rękopis", *Prace Historyczne* 8 (1977), pp. 49–59.
- Szostek, T., *Exemplum w polskim średniowieczu*, Warsaw 1997.
- Tierney, B., *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory*, Leiden 1998.
- Ulanowski, B., *Mikołaj z Błonia, kanonista polski z pierwszej połowy XV wieku*, Kraków 1888 (Rozprawy AU. Wydział Historyczno-Filozoficzny, vol. 23).
- Watanabe, M., "Authority and Consent in Church Government: Panormitanus, Aeneas Sylvius, Cusanus", *Journal of the History of Ideas* 33 (1972), no. 2, pp. 217–236.
- Watt, J.A., "The Use of the Term *plenitudo potestatis* by Hostiensis", in *Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Medieval Canon Law, Boston College, 12–16 August 1963*, ed. by S. Kuttner, J.J. Ryan, Vatican City 1965, pp. 161–187.

- Wilks, M., *The Problem of Sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages: Papal Monarchy with Augustinus Triumphus and the Publicists*, Cambridge 1963.
- Włodek, Z., “Eklezjologia krakowska w pierwszej połowie XV wieku”, in Z. Włodek, *Z dziejów filozofii i teologii na Uniwersytecie Krakowskim w XV wieku. Sylwetki, teksty, studia*, Kraków 2011, pp. 383–418.
- Woelki, T., “Theological Diplomacy? Cusanus and the Hussites”, in *Wycliffism and Hussitism: Methods of Thinking, Writing, and Persuasion, c. 1360–c. 1460*, ed. by K. Ghosh, P. Soukup, with the assistance of C. Gillhammer, Brepols 2021.
- Wohlmuth, J., *Verständigung in der Kirche. Untersucht an der Sprache des Konzils von Basel*, Mayence 1983.
- Wünsch, T., *Konziliarismus und Polen: Personen, Politik und Programme aus Polen zur Verfassungsfrage der Kirche in der Zeit der mittelalterlichen Reformkonzilien*, Schöning 1998.
- Zahajkiewicz, M.T., “Liturgia mszy świętej w świetle ‘Tractatus sacerdotalis de sacramentis’ Mikołaja z Błonia. Studium historyczno-liturgiczne”, in *Studia z dziejów liturgii w Polsce*, ed. by M. Rechowicz, Lublin 1973, pp. 22–93.
- Zahajkiewicz, M.T., *‘Tractatus sacerdotalis’ Mikołaja z Błonia na tle teologii przełomu wieku XIV i XV*, Lublin 1979.
- Zwiercan, M., “Mikołaj z Błonia”, in *Polski słownik biograficzny*, vol. 21, ed. by E. Rostworowski, Wrocław 1976, pp. 102–104.

LIDIA GRZYBOWSKA

🏠 Uniwersytet Jagielloński w Krakowie / Jagiellonian University in Kraków, Poland

✉ lidia.grzybowska[at]uj.edu.pl

🆔 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4782-8457>

Lidia Grzybowska – PhD Assistant at the Jagiellonian University. Research interests: the history of medieval literature, medieval preaching, old literary theory, biblical exegesis and pre-modern culture. Recent publications: *Kazania de tempore i de sanctis Mikołaja z Błonia. Zarys monografii*, Warsaw 2020; “Skąd wziął się w Krakowie traktat Franciszka Eiximenisa *Ars praedicandi populo?*”, *Annales Universitatis Paedagogicae Cracoviensis. Studia Historicolitteraria* 21 (2021).

This article was written with funding support from the Jagiellonian University under the Excellence Initiative – Research University program (the Priority Research Area Heritage).