

For one thing, the Dresden School continued to function, with Peter of Dresden now joined by the English Wycliffite Peter Payne.<sup>134</sup> Apart from one manuscript text, a set of glosses on a copy of Nicholas of Lyra's postil on the New Testament,<sup>135</sup> we have no evidence of the School's scholarly activity, but we know that its members played a role in Hussite agitation in this period—carrying the antithetical posters of the *Tabule*<sup>136</sup>—and we may presume that the very continuity of Nicholas's manuscript tradition, including codices that may be described as collected editions of the master's works, attests to the continued action of his German disciples.<sup>137</sup> Nor can it have been an accident that some of the latter would appear side by side with Czech radicals in one of the crucial episodes of the development of the Hussite reformation: on 6 March 1417 a large number of radical leaders were ordained priests by titular Bishop Herman of Nico-

<sup>134</sup> The only direct source is a rhymed chronicle that names the masters at the Dresden School as "Mistr Petr, mistr Mikuláš, / Engliš, a Nikolaus Loripes" (*Starí letopisové češti*, ed. F. Palacký, *Scriptores rerum Bohemicarum* (Prague, 1829) 3: p. 472); Sedlák, p. 3 n. 1, observes that the verses are best understood as referring not to four men but to two, the second line being in apposition to the first. At the same time, Sedlák supposes that the chronicler had made a mistake, naming Peter "English"—i.e., Payne—where he should have named Peter of Dresden. Bartoš, p. 134, accepts the source's evidence, which is indeed bolstered by what seems to be a relationship between Payne and Nicholas of Dresden, manifested in Payne's *De iuramento* (Bartoš, p. 136). To this I would add the following curious bit: a manuscript codex now in the Herrnhut Unitätsarchiv, No. 220, contains some items associated with the Dresden School (Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 85 n. 13), including what is either an early draft of the *Tabule* or excerpts from it (f. 93'-97'); the next leaf (f. 97') has three paragraphs concerning the election of a Holy Roman Emperor, his coronation, and, finally, the oath that he must swear—all according to texts in the Decretals and Clementines; the last paragraph, on the oath, ends with, "Ad idem est discipulus M. Joh. W[iklef] in suis oracionibus tangens Iuramentum tale." If anyone in Bohemia was known as Wyclif's disciple it was Peter Payne, who indeed functioned as a prime expert in Wyclifism for the Hussite Left (see Bartoš, *Literární činnost . . . M. Petra Payna* (Prague, 1928), Nos. 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, etc.). Thus we have another link between him and the Dresden School, although due appreciation of the value of this evidence is impossible without full examination of the codex (I have used photographs of only a few pages).

<sup>135</sup> A. Neumann, "Glossy v Drändorfově postile," *Hlídka* 41 (1924): pp. 457-465, with texts on pp. 460-465. The postil itself was copied by John Drändorf, and Konrad Stoeklin, members of the Dresden School, in 1412; the glosses, which reflect a doctrine identical with Nicholas of Dresden's, were written sometime after 1414 but before 1417.

<sup>136</sup> *Chronicon Procopii notarii pragensis*, ed. K. Höfler, *Geschichtschreiber der husitischen Bewegung in Böhmen*, I. *Fontes rerum austriacarum* (Vienna, 1856) I. Abt., 2: p. 72. The context seems to refer to events of 1415/1417.

<sup>137</sup> Such codices are: Kraków, Jagiellon Library, 2148; Prague University Library, IV G 15; Mikulov, II. 123; Bautzen, VIII 8; the now-lost original of Basel University Library MS. A X 66. Each of these codices also has material not by Nicholas, but each also groups enough of his work so that we can infer a conscious effort of collection.

polis, held prisoner for the purpose in Lord Čeněk of Vartemberk's castle of Lipnic. This event was the result of a deliberate program through which the University masters and the Hussite nobility sought to stabilize the reform, by securing ordinations and parochial livings for the younger Hussite clerics, who for the past two years had been making trouble as leaders of extremist movements in the provinces and as partisans of extremism in Prague; as it turned out, most of those who passed through Herman's hands emerged a few years later as leaders of Tabor.<sup>138</sup> It is therefore most interesting to learn that when candidates for ordination were being rounded up, some of the students at the Dresden School were included; two of these, John Drändorf and Bartholomew Rautenstock, eventually fell into the hands of the Inquisition and their confessions provide us with our only detailed, particular knowledge of the Lipnic affair. In the present context the most noteworthy bit of information is that although the candidates were asked to swear the usual ordinee's oath, neither John nor Bartholomew did so: the latter simply said that he had refused, the former that he had uttered not a *iuramentum* but only a *votum*, of poverty and chastity.<sup>139</sup> It is indeed otherwise clear from their confessions that they held to a radical doctrine similar to that of Nicholas. Bartholomew, who named Nicholas and Peter as his teachers, confessed to not believing in Purgatory (he held to the doctrine of the Two Paths) or in the cult of saints or in the use of holy images; he was a utraquist and attacked the secular dominion and simony of the hierarchy.<sup>140</sup> Drändorf did not name Nicholas, only Frederick and Peter, as his teachers, and his doctrine, as preserved in his (fragmentary) confession, seems somewhat milder: his protest was more against the jurisdictional aspects of the Church—its property, dominion, excommunications, hierarchical authority, etc.—than its doctrines, although he did refuse to swear an oath and he did declare his belief in utraquism.<sup>141</sup>

<sup>138</sup> See my "Hussite Radicalism and the Origins of Tabor 1415-1418," pp. 117-125.

<sup>139</sup> Kapp, *op. cit.*, p. 56: "Item queritur, an Studio Pragensi rectori suo fecerat iuramentum, Respondet quod non, sed solum promissionem, et dicit se nunquam jurasse, nec eciam in promotione ordinis sacerdotalis, sed tunc solum votum castitatis et paupertatis emisit." Cf. Jakoubek's formulation, above, n. 90, for similar distinctions; these did not vitiate the principle, at least in Drändorf's mind, for he went on to declare (*loc. cit.*), "quod iurare est contra deum et ecclesiam catholicam."

<sup>140</sup> See his confession, ed. Döllinger, *op. cit.* 2: pp. 626-629.

<sup>141</sup> Uniquely valuable are the items of propaganda composed by Drändorf and included in the inquisitional record: (1) a letter attacking *excommunicatio frivola, obedientia ceca*, and *dominatio secularis, lege evangelica sacerdotibus interdicta* (Kapp, pp. 41-46); (2) a letter to the aldermen of Weinberg, urging them to pay no attention to the Church's ban and to the clergy's jurisdiction in secular affairs (pp. 48-51); (3) two other letters to the same addressees, pursuing the issue and arranging to carry on agitation in Weinberg (pp. 51-53). (Items 2 and 3 are in German.) Of course these texts show only what points initially came to the fore when Drändorf was

But these confessions also tell us something else, that despite the close association of the Dresden School with the Hussite movement, from 1412 through 1417, the matter of nationality eventually claimed its due importance, leading the Germans onto their own, separate path. It was not a matter of ethnic hatred or dislike, but of something much more ordinary and infinitely more important: when reform of the Church was envisaged not in terms of institutional or moral reform of the clergy, but as a reform of the whole body politic, as a process of evangelization that inevitably had its center of gravity in the laity, then the passage from reform to reformation necessarily excluded whatever could not be useful in the new societal organism. The year 1417 was in fact a crucial one in this process, and the Lipnic ordinations, along with other events of the same period, inform us that henceforth the theoretical elaboration of a reform program would be less important than the realization of reform among the people. The Dresden School is not heard from after that year, nor did Drändorf or Rautenstock return to the School from Lipnic; both were assigned jobs as priests among the Germans in Bohemia, the former in South Bohemian Jindřichův Hradec (Neuhaus) and in Prague, the latter in Prague. Presumably a similar path was followed by other Germans consecrated by Bishop Herman. But this disposition was not a stable one, for reasons that are not clear; after one year Rautenstock set out to preach in Germany, and Drändorf followed him two years later. Henceforth the Dresdeners are known to us only as they fall into the hands of the Inquisition, and their school may justly be called, in the phrase of Heinrich Böhmer, a "School for Martyrs."<sup>142</sup>

Turning now from the Germans to the Czechs, we can trace the enduring effects of Nicholas's program only by hypotheses and combinations, some more convincing than others. Anchoring the whole structure will be two facts: (1) When Nicholas of Pelhřimov, Bishop of Tabor, wished to defend his rejection of Purgatory against the Prague masters in 1431, he dipped into Nicholas of Dresden's *De purgatorio* for arguments and even whole passages.<sup>143</sup> (2) John Želivský, the radical preacher of Prague's New Town, referred to Nicholas of Dresden, in 1419, as a martyr.<sup>144</sup> To these we may add an assumption: when, after 1415,

carrying on propaganda; they do not exhaust his ideology. Cf. H. Haupt, "Waldensertum und Inquisition im südöstlichen Deutschland," *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 3 (1890): 358 f., where Drändorf's (and the Dresdeners') heresy is explained as an original Waldensianism, influenced by Wycliffite and Taborite elements; emphasis is here placed on Drändorf's ideal of *paupertas Cristi*.

<sup>142</sup> Böhmer, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

<sup>143</sup> The fact was first noted by Sedlák, p. 45 (see n. 152 below).

<sup>144</sup> Jan Želivský, *Dochovaná kázání z roku 1419*, I, ed. Amadeo Molnár (Prague, 1953), 126 f. See Bartoš, p. 141 n. 83, for evidence that in 1417 Nicholas was remembered as a martyr for Christ.

we find evidence of *intellectual* activity promoting Nicholas's program—the combination of general radical Hussite positions with the specifically "Waldensian" points—we may assume that the Dresdener's influence was at work, either through the effect of his oral teaching or through the circulation of his tractates. That the program existed as a significant element on the Hussite Left is beyond question. We find it in 1415/1416 in South Bohemia, by the end of 1416 in the area around Plzeň, and in 1418 as a set of doctrines to be rejected by the Hussite Synod of St. Wenceslas's Day (28 September); unfortunately it cannot be said with any certainty that these cases represented Nicholas's influence, since it is at least possible, in one case probable, that the influences at work stemmed from popular Waldensian sectaries in the provinces—"unlearned men and women," as they are called by one text.<sup>145</sup> But a few hitherto unused literary sources show the same program on the theoretical level. One is a parody of a confession that a heretic might have made to an inquisitor. Such confessions were indeed sought during this period, at the order of the Council of Constance, and it was no doubt in reaction to this sort of thing that the anonymous author composed his list, the style of which will be obvious from the following examples:<sup>146</sup>

*First*, I confess that I have said confession in the belief that the priest could absolve me of sins. *Item*, I have sinned because I have taken on the penance that the priest imposed, and I have done everything that the priest commanded, even though I was not bound or obligated to do so. *Item*, I have sinned because I have received the communion of the Eucharist in only one kind, which was not complete communion. . . . *Item*, I have sinned because I have paid over tithes, cheeses, eggs, etc., and the priest lived sumptuously from these and spent them on concubines. *Item*, I have sinned because I have attended the masses of concubinaires, knowing that they were concubinaires.

Some of the points were even more extreme:

I have sinned because I have said prayers for the dead, but this is neither necessary nor worth anything; each must do satisfaction for himself. I have sinned because I have given candles and a groschen, that the priest might name the names of my predecessors. I have sinned because I have believed that there was a Purgatory, but there is none, except to do well here—after my death no one will do good for me. . . . I have sinned because I have given money for church buildings and ornaments, thinking that it was for the temple of God—but prayers should be said everywhere and anywhere. I have sinned because I have believed that confession should be said to priests, but confession should not be said to anyone but God, for only God absolves of sins, so that after death the soul at once rises to Heaven or goes to hell. . . . I have sinned because I have done reverence to images, bending the knee or lighting candles before them, I have sinned because I have believed that in the mass singing and other such things were necessary, but

<sup>145</sup> For all this see my "Hussite Radicalism," p. 109 ff., p. 119 f., p. 125 ff.

<sup>146</sup> The best text is that of MS. Vienna Nationalbibliothek 4314, f. 134-135, entitled, "Sequitur confessio heretica et falsa que concordat cum valdensibus." See also the next note.

the only thing necessary is the consecration of the body and blood of Christ. I have sinned because I have believed that one priest may not ordain another, although he can indeed. I have sinned because I have believed that the pope's authority is superior, although it is not greater than that of another priest.

There are also other articles of the same tendency, forming a full conspectus of the most extreme sectarian heresy; the whole list is dated in 1418 in one codex, where the scribe names himself as a Czech, and indeed it would be impossible to date the work elsewhere than in the period after the introduction of utraquism and before the founding of the Taborite movement (1419).<sup>147</sup> Closely associated with the ideas and language of provincial extremism in this period,<sup>148</sup> the list also reminds us strongly of the works of Nicholas of Dresden, and thus suggests that the latter were not without their effect upon the emergence of the radical, Taborite reformation.

But this suggestion would not be worth very much in the present argument if it were not reinforced by other evidence of a more certain sort. Sometime around 1418, certainly before the rise of Tabor, a Catholic author addressed himself to the problem of refuting Nicholas of Dresden's *Tabule veteris et novi coloris* and the doctrines that seemed to have inspired it; he composed his work in the form of two treatises, the first refuting twenty-one errors of a sectarian Hussite stamp, the second proceeding to the refutation of the arguments of the *Tabule* itself.<sup>149</sup> Here the first treatise

is of primary concern; it is directed against the following positions:

1. The Roman Church is not the one universal church founded by Christ.
- 2a. The Roman Church became corrupted from the time of the Emperor Constantine.
- 2b. Spiritual persons should not possess temporal goods.
3. The church does not include evil people but only the good.
4. Denial of the church's power of the keys and of binding and loosing.
5. Rejection of holy orders.
6. Denial that only priests may consecrate the Eucharist, offer sacrifice, etc.
7. Opposition to the constitutions of the church and the holy canons.
8. Because of the sins of prelates and priests, their ministrations are worthless.
9. Evil prelates have no power to excommunicate.
10. The church cannot excommunicate the good, and unless sin excommunicate a man, the church's excommunication is nothing.
11. The prelates of the church should not excommunicate, persecute, or shun the evil, but should commit punishment to God alone.
12. It is not licit in the church of God to kill heretics physically and to remove the evil from amongst the good.
13. The miracles performed in the church are not of God.
14. Rejection of indulgences and assertion that offerings given for them are venal.
15. Opposition to material churches and their dedications.
16. Destruction of images of Christ and the saints in the church.
17. Denial that Purgatory exists and that suffrages for the dead are of any use.
18. Confession should not be made to priests but only to God.
19. The bread and wine remain in the Eucharist after consecration.
20. Communion to be given to newly born children.
21. Communion to be given to the laity in both kinds. [The last two chapters are directed against not just the theory but the actual practice of such communion.]

These are quite clearly the same heresies as those animating the author of the parody confession; they are also very much in the spirit of the Dresden School, and they are explicitly associated with the *Tabule*. Unfortunately the author composed his treatise as a collection of excerpts from the enormous anti-heretical work of Benedict d'Alignan, Bishop of Marseilles (1229-1267), but since he selected so little out of so much, and since he did include original elements, we are entitled to read the treatise as a refutation of actual heresies rather than a mere exercise in polemical ritual.<sup>150</sup> That the heretics under attack were Czech Hussites is apparent from the inclusion of both the practice and doctrine of infant communion in the list. This was a novelty emerging at about the beginning of 1417, among the Czechs;<sup>151</sup> in any case, by the time the treatise was written, the Dresden School had prob-

Bartoš, *ČCH* (1913) 19: p. 507, where the work is attributed to Pálec and Stanislav of Znojmo, but without argumentation.

<sup>150</sup> For Benedict see the *Dictionnaire de droit canonique* 2 (1937): pp. 761-765. I have looked at the text of his *Tractatus fidei* in MS. Univ. Prag. VII B 6, and have compared some passages with the *Collecta et excerpta*. Systematic comparison would be desirable, but without printed editions it would take more time than it was worth. Benedict's treatise really should be edited, if not for its intrinsic interest—which is often very great—then as a document; it was quite popular in the later Middle Ages, as a glance at the major manuscript catalogues will show.

<sup>151</sup> See my "Hussite Radicalism," p. 119 f.; Bartoš, "Roztržka v husitské straně r. 1417," *Sborník příspěvků k dějinám Prahy* 5 (1932): pp. 548 f.

<sup>147</sup> The text in MS. Univ. Prag. XII F 30, f. 40'-41', begins well but then drops the ironical elements and ends up as a list of heretical doctrines. It is entitled: "articuli hereticorum videlicet Wyklephistarum, anno domini MCCCCXVIII conscriptorum [sic]"; at the end the scribe has written: "Ego Magister Jacobus dictus Hnyewek. Y budess sye hnyewaty o tho, peczye zadne nemyey, przydeth tha hodyna genz wsseczko spolu zaplattyss. Conclusio" ("I am Master James, called Hněvek. And you will indeed be angry [hnevati], don't worry, when the time comes that you'll have to pay for all this! The end.") In favor of accepting the date given for this text, are the following considerations: (1) the *terminus a quo* would be the end of 1415, when the extreme radical doctrines of the "confession" emerged as actualities (denial of Purgatory, rejection of images and of the Roman liturgy, etc.); (2) the *terminus ante quem* would be 1419, when the emergence of the Taborite movement caused intra-Hussite polemic to replace anti-Romanism as the subject of Hussite literary endeavors.

<sup>148</sup> See, e.g., the report of extremism around Ústí in 1415/1416, *Documenta*, pp. 636-638; the summary in my "Hussite Radicalism," p. 111, may be compared with the translated excerpts from the "Confession" in the text above.

<sup>149</sup> The first part is entitled "Collecta et excerpta de summa Benedicti Abbatis Marsilie super capitulo Firmiter credimus . . ."; it begins, "Una est fidelium universalis ecclesia." I use the text in MS. British Museum, Arundel 458, f. 107-147', MS. Prague Cathedral Chapter D 119, f. 4-107, MS. Rome, Vatican Library, Ottob. Lat. 350, f. 209'-236. In all of these the second part, refuting the *Tabule* follows the first; each part, however, also exists alone, in other manuscripts. The second part has been published, badly and incompletely, by K. Chytil, *Antikrist v naukách a umění středověku* (Prague, 1918), pp. 237-247, with an attribution to Stephen of Pálec; cf.