

which was far more popular, surviving in twelve known manuscript copies, as against only one for the other.³⁵ Both are composed almost entirely of citations, arranged to show that the current system of the Roman Church was the opposite of the system of the Primitive Church: the Decretals and the glosses on the canon law provide most of the documentation for Romanism, while the Primitive system is presented chiefly through quotations from the New Testament, as well as the Fathers and certain selected post-patristic writers, with the *Decretum* serving as a great repertory of source material. Perhaps by 1412 the antitheses of the "Tables" were illustrated, and the picture-text combinations that resulted gave the work its present form, which preserves the texts as they were grouped in the pictures.³⁶ While the "Customs and Rites," as well as the similarly constructed "Puncta" composed perhaps in 1413, have a somewhat discursive, even exploratory character, the "Tables" are sharp and propagandistic, hard-hitting and fast-moving: it may be conjectured that all three originated as topical collections of authorities for future use—medieval codices are full of such informal repertories—but that the "Tables" evolved further, with the help of the pictures, into a genuine polemic.

The doctrines expressed in these works do not go beyond those of contemporary radical Hussitism, and if there is one influence that seems most important it is that of Wyclif, who, we may suppose, provided not only the idea behind the "Tables" but much of the documentation for both works.³⁷ The "Tables" begin

³⁵ See the bibliography of Nicholas's works, below.

³⁶ See the Preface to the edition, below.

³⁷ Wyclif developed the antithesis between Christ and the Pope in his *De Christo et suo adversario Antichristo*, ed. R. Buedensieg (Gotha, 1880), pp. 47-58; *Expositio textus Matthei xxiv*, in *Opera minora*, ed. J. Loserth (London, 1913), p. 361 f.; *De ordine christiana, Op. min.*, pp. 131, 136 f. One passage in the *De Christo et . . . Antichristo*, p. 50, may even be read as a kind of command to compose the *Tabule*: ". . . videat homo scripta apostolorum, que ex fide sunt scripta domini Iesu Christi, et scripta papalia, cuiusmodi sunt bulle et decretales epistole, et potest percipere, quomodo in sententia non concordant, cum scripta papalia dicunt mundanam excellentiam, scripta autem ewangelica insinuant humilem fugam mundi." Of the texts in the *Tabule*, the following, cited by Table and note-number from the present edition, may be found in the *De Christo . . . of Wyclif*: Gal. i, 8-9 (V, 29); Luc. ix, 55-56 (III, 4); II Thes. ii, 4 (IX, 17); Mat. viii, 20 (I, 8); Mat. xix, 27 (II, 7); Mat. x, 8 (V, 11). Furthermore the texts of Table III, § 3 are clearly referred to by Wyclif, p. 57, and the antithesis between Christ washing the disciples' feet and the pope having his feet kissed is also in Wyclif, p. 57. Another antithesis, between Christ riding an ass and the pope riding splendidly on a horse (Wyclif, p. 56), was used by the Dresdeners (see Preface, p. 35), but appears in a different form in the *Tabule* (Table I, §§ 1-2). However these particular correspondences are only illustrative; the *Tabule* consists almost entirely of authorities, while Wyclif's discussion uses authorities only to support generalizations, and it would require a reading of both texts to appreciate the way in which the *Tabule* seems obviously to be a working out of Wyclif's general thesis.

with a picture of Christ on his cross, opposed to one of the Pope riding a horse and decked out with the insignia of the papal office, a contrast which contains the theme of the whole work.³⁸ Christ was poor and humble, he suffered without complaint, but the Pope is wealthy and pompous, and he rigorously punishes disobedience. Peter, the prototype of the follower of Christ, followed his master in poverty and martyrdom, but the Pope, who claims to be Peter's successor, leads an entirely different life. The whole apparatus of the Roman Church's hierarchy, authority, and legal system stands in contrast to the inspired freedom of the Primitive Church. The simony and fornication prevalent among the Roman clergy are held up to attack with appropriate citations, some of which, in this case, come from the Church's orthodox reform tradition. The rags in which the infant Jesus was clothed are contrasted with the gorgeous vestments of the Roman prelates. Then the picture of Jesus washing the feet of the disciples is opposed to the picture of the Pope having his feet kissed, and finally the Pope appears as Antichrist surrounded by whores. Through these contrasts the original point, the dissimilarity between the *conversacio* of Christ and of the Pope, is amplified into a contrast between the Church of Christ—the Primitive Church—and the Church of Rome, and is then lifted to an eschatological level of meaning with the identification of the Pope as the Antichrist who will come in the last days to seduce the faithful. Jakoubek of Střibro had expressed similar ideas, including the last one,³⁹ but in the "Tables" we see something new, not a new doctrine but a new mode of thought, one that projects in sharp and positive form what is implicit, dispersed, or attenuated by qualifications in the works of Wyclif, Matthew of Janov, and even of Jakoubek. In this mode of thought all the standard criticisms of the Roman Church are presented as parts of a single concept of that church as the mystical body of Antichrist, and the counter-image of the Primitive Church appears not as an ideal to guide criticism but as a real system, capable of being reborn among men. Earlier criticisms of the Roman system expressed the point of view of men *within* a church that had been taken over by the minions of Antichrist; Nicholas's point of view is that of one who stands outside the criticized institution.

The "Customs and Rites" carries a similar message, in three main parts.⁴⁰ It begins with texts documenting the nature of the Primitive Church as a fellowship of the Holy Spirit, without a formally defined sacrament of ordination. Hence, one infers, clergy was a function rather than an office. In this church all things were common, but the modern doctors have

³⁸ Here and elsewhere in this discussion of the *Tabule* the reader is referred, generally, to the printed text.

³⁹ In his *Posicio de Antichristo* of January 1412; most of it has been published by V. Kybal, "M. Matěj z Janova a M. Jakoubek ze Střibra," *ČCH* 11 (1905): pp. 22-37.

⁴⁰ See, generally, the printed text below.

glossed this provision away, and the Roman Church, with its distinction between bishops, priests, and monks, has restricted the originally universal communism to a single group, the monastic order. The early church had been a band of preachers wandering throughout the world, without hierarchic offices, but the Roman Church has a legally defined system of parishes and dioceses, a fixed and privileged hierarchy, and a legal code that takes cognizance of differences in wealth. In the Primitive Church all were brothers, but the Pope does not allow any but the bishops to call him brother. In Part Two the Roman Church's theory and practice of excommunication is on the one hand contrasted with the Primitive Church's, and on the other hand exposed to doubt by judicious citation of the canonistic texts defining the precise conditions under which a sentence of excommunication is valid or not. In Part Three the argument turns against the monastic orders—their clothing and settled way of life, their immoral actions, their withdrawal from work among the people, their renunciation of individual responsibility, their refusal to earn their keep, their hypocrisy. The final text of Part Three seems out of place: it is a passage from St. Jerome, suggesting that priests have as much power as bishops. Indeed the whole work suffers from diffuseness. It is probably not an accident that it survives in only one copy; nonetheless it amplifies the idea of the "Tables" by carrying the critique of the Roman Church into a wider field and by presenting an even more detailed portrait of the Primitive Church. Later in 1412 Nicholas wrote a more specialized tractate, *De quadruplici missione*—"The Four Kinds of Mission"—defending freedom of preaching against the restrictions of the canon law; it uses a sizable amount of material from the "Tables" to attack the "doctors" of the opposing side, and its argument, that preaching is licit for all, even laymen and women, if they have the call from God, fits into the framework of ideas we have just been considering.⁴¹

A fourth major work of this early period was the *Puncta* ("Points"), again a collection of authorities against the Roman system, but even looser in structure than the "Customs and Rites."⁴² It is noteworthy for its extensive use of the *Speculum aureum*, an anti-simoniac work written in 1404, perhaps by Matthew of Cracow,⁴³ and for the historical material it draws from the chronicle *Flores temporum*.⁴⁴ It attacks or casts doubt upon the endowment of the church with property, upon compulsory tithes, the sacramental acts of simoniac and otherwise sinful priests, the elaborately developed

Roman liturgy, the necessity of auricular confession, and the power of the keys in its Roman form.⁴⁵ The fundamental attitude of the "Tables" and "Customs and Rites" is given more extensive expression, and there is a perhaps more urgent insistence on the idea of the Church as a community based on virtue rather than on laws and offices, but the most striking feature of the *Puncta* is its use of history to fill out the contrast between the two churches by showing how the unwholesome practices of the Roman system came into being through papal legislation and human custom. Some of this had been shown before, but not as thoroughly as in the *Puncta*, which supplements the basic historical scheme, centering around the Donation of Constantine, with material showing when the various elements of the Roman liturgy were adopted, when the various monastic orders were founded, and the like.⁴⁶ Thus the Roman system, already seen to be the contradiction of the Primitive Church, now appears as a conglomeration of historical innovations; the formal antithesis is seen as a real one that has developed through time, and the psychology of reform is thereby set on more solid foundations.

In 1414 and 1415 the ideas and attitudes expressed in these works were focused on a new issue, that of the lay chalice. The cult of the Eucharist had received much attention in the works of Matthew of Janov, who believed that due reverence for that sacrament and its frequent, even daily, reception by the laity would serve to unify and reform the church from the inside out. Matthew of Cracow had also championed frequent communion, and the Hussites absorbed this sort of eucharistic piety along with other ideas of their teachers, including John Wyclif's rejection of transubstantiation. The more conservative Hussites were conservative in these matters also, and it is probable that not even John Hus was willing to go all the way with Wyclif, but the radicals, especially Jakoubek of Střibro not only accepted Wyclifite remanence but also took over Matthew of Janov's intensely emotional exaltation of the eucharistic cult.⁴⁷ Unlike Matthew, however, Jakoubek pushed

⁴¹ See Sedlák's summary discussion, pp. 18-24.

⁴² In the text of the *Puncta* in MS. Univ. Prag. IV G 15, these historical references may be found on f. 30'-31 (Donation of Constantine), f. 31 (introduction of various orders), f. 36' (introduction of parts of the liturgy). On f. 6' there is a reference to "Cestrensis"—i.e., Ranulph Higden's *Polychronicon*, which the Hussites knew only from Wyclif's use of it.

⁴³ For the Eucharistic doctrine of Wyclif and Hus, see Paul de Vooght's "Huss a-t-il enseigné la remanentia panis post consecrationem?" & "La présence réelle dans la doctrine eucharistique de Wiclif," both in *Hussiana* (Louvain, 1960), pp. 263 ff., 292 ff. The influence of Matthew of Janov's eucharistic fervor is stressed by V. Kybal, *M. Matěj z Janova* (Prague, 1905), pp. 310 ff., and by Sedlák, "Počátkové kalicha," *ČKD* 52 (1911): pp. 497 ff.; Sedlák shows how Jakoubek, arguing for communion in both kinds, used Matthew of Janov's argument for frequent communion. For an appreciation and critique of Kybal's and Sedlák's position, see Bartoš, "Počátky kalicha," *Husitství a cizina*, p. 61 ff.

⁴⁴ See the bibliography of Nicholas's works, below.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ See the discussion in J. Haller, *Papsttum und Kirchenreform* (Berlin, 1903), pp. 483-524; cf. Bartoš, "Speculum aureum," *Věstník české akademie* 53 (1944): pp. 11-20.

⁴⁷ See Bartoš, "Německá kronika (Flores temporum) v duchovní výzbroji Táborů," *Jihočeský sborník historický* 12 (1939): pp. 82-85.

this cult to the point of insisting that the layman receive not only the consecrated bread but the consecrated wine as well—the Blood of God, which the Roman rite withheld from the laity for allegedly practical reasons.⁴⁸ It is possible that Wyclif's remanence played a role here. According to Roman doctrine, the Body of God in the species of bread also contained the Blood; thus the layman was not really denied anything. But if one followed Wyclif in supposing that the substance of the bread was not annihilated—as transubstantiation had it—but rather remained, as the only proper support for the accidents of the bread, then one might be less inclined to accept the bread alone as equivalent to the bread-wine combination. But even if this guess be rejected there are obvious reasons to suppose that utraquism, the doctrine and practice of giving communion to the laity in both kinds, may have emerged as the product of previous ideas held by the Hussite Left: on the one hand, the tradition of eucharistic piety that tended to center the *positive* religious reform around the sacrament of holy communion; on the other hand the anti-Romanism that not only regarded the Roman Church as the church of Antichrist but also viewed the former as the result of a historical process of perversion. All that was necessary was the realization that communion in both kinds had been given in the Primitive Church and that this practice, like so many other features of that Church, had been changed after the Donation of Constantine. It would of course have been possible to infer this fact from a simple comparison of current practice with the practice attested in the New Testament; such comparisons were indeed made, and they would certainly have encouraged a literal interpretation of what became the classic text of utraquist polemic: John 6: 53: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." But as Professor Bartoš has shown, all of this came relatively late in utraquist literature; in Jakoubek's first utraquist formulations we find not the text of John 6: 53 but rather the canon "Comperimus" of Pope Gelasius I, commanding that communion in the second species not be omitted.⁴⁹ It is Bartoš's suggestion that Nicholas of Dresden may have discovered this text—that is, realized its import—in the course of his canonistic research, perhaps indeed while composing the *Puncta*,⁵⁰ and that Nicholas may have drawn Jakoubek's attention to it. Although Bartoš seems to reject this possibility in favor of another—that Jakoubek became aware of the original practice of utraquist communion when he heard Jerome of Prague's report on the Orthodox rite⁵¹—it still seems most attractive.

⁴⁸ The issues at stake in the controversy are excellently analyzed by Emile Amann, "Jacobel et les débuts de la controverse utraquiste," *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle* (Rome, 1924) 1: pp. 375–387.

⁴⁹ Bartoš, "Počátky kalicha," *Husitství a cizina*, p. 62 f.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 68–70.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 71–74.

The problem is in fact more complex than the above discussion would indicate. Among the many theories that have been proposed to explain the origins of utraquism, one, resting on the explicit testimony of several sources, credits the Dresdeners with the innovation: utraquism was taught by the Dresden masters in Dresden, and when they came to Prague they brought their doctrine to the attention of the radical Master John Jičín, who in turn persuaded Jakoubek and others; it was then Jakoubek who actually introduced the practice in Hussite Prague.⁵² The Dresdener mentioned in these accounts is not, as we might expect, Nicholas, but Peter, who indeed must have been the senior member of the school after the death of Frederick Eppinge at the end of 1412.⁵³ Unfortunately, there is no direct literary evidence to support this account: we know of no utraquist work clearly attributable to Peter of Dresden, no mention of his name in the polemics of utraquists and anti-utraquists. Moreover the sources on which the account rests are for the most part late, tendentious, and interrelated.⁵⁴ In any case, the Dresden theory in this form would simply move the problem of origins back one stage. Again it is Bartoš who suggests a way out: rejecting the testimonies for Peter of Dresden, he observes that *Nicholas* of Dresden was demonstrably close to Jakoubek in this period, that Nicholas's research was precisely the sort that could have led him to an appreciation of "Comperimus," and that Nicholas did in fact distinguish himself as an ardent and effective polemicist in favor of the lay chalice.⁵⁵ At the very least we may say—and this is also the opinion of Sedlák⁵⁶—that on the basis of Nicholas's early and active collaboration with Jakoubek, his membership in the leading circle of utraquist pioneers,⁵⁷ he is entitled to rank as the co-originator of the lay chalice. Perhaps indeed, as Bartoš guesses, Nicholas's prominence in this work was the foundation for the later stories that attributed the innovation itself to the Dresden circle.

These possibilities, indefinite as they are, have the great value of leading us to Nicholas's utraquist work

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 75–80—a discussion, with references to the sources and to the modern literature. Cf. H. Böhrer, *op. cit.*, pp. 213–220.

⁵³ The only teachers of the school mentioned by Dräendorf as having functioned in Dresden were Frederick and Peter (Kapp, *op. cit.*, p. 38; see also Bartoš, *op. cit.*, p. 79 f.).

⁵⁴ Bartoš, *op. cit.*, pp. 75–80. Sedlák identified one utraquist tractate as the work of Peter of Dresden ("Počátkové kalicha," *ČKD* 54 (1913): pp. 708–711), but Bartoš's arguments in favor of Peter Payne's authorship seem convincing (*op. cit.*, p. 103 f.), although they did not convince Josef Pekař ("Nový Bartoš," *ČČH*, 32 (1926): p. 363; *Žižka a jeho doba* 1: p. 205).

⁵⁵ Bartoš, *op. cit.*, pp. 68–70 & *passim*.

⁵⁶ Sedlák, pp. 5–7.

⁵⁷ Sedlák, "Počátkové kalicha," *ČKD* 54 (1913): p. 407, cites the following passage from Nicholas's *Apologia* (ed. Von der Hardt, *Concilium Constantiense* 3 (1698): col. 614): "Non pro nostro libito incepimus porrigere, sed secundum primitivam institutionem filii dei, longa et matura super hoc praehabita deliberatione cum magistris et aliis legem Christi diligentibus."