

ably lost its importance as an actual grouping on the Left. Finally, it may be guessed that the form of the treatise, a highly technical canonistic and theological discussion, is evidence that the heresies it refutes were maintained on the theoretical level, not merely among popular sectarians.

Thus when we find that in 1419 John Želivský declared his sympathy with Nicholas of Dresden and that at the same time both Želivský and the Taborites were maintaining doctrines similar to those of Nicholas, we shall hardly go far wrong if we suppose that the Dresden master's works and teachings were prime factors in the history of the period 1415–1418. That Nicholas of Pelhřimov, Bishop of Tabor, later used Nicholas of Dresden's works is merely a clinching argument.<sup>152</sup> Tabor did not go all the way to sectarianism and hence did not pick up all of Nicholas's ideas, but the sociological pattern of Taboritism—the congregational community—could embody much that was too radical for the national Hussite Church centered in Prague; perhaps indeed if Nicholas of Dresden had held on for a few years longer he would not have had to leave Bohemia at all. Here, however, we come up against what must be called the mystery of the Dresden School—Tabor, which realized extreme reform in a manner that could hardly have been dreamed of in 1415, yet failed to provide a home for such Dresdeners as Drändorf and Rautenstock; then later in the 1420's, when Tabor was intensely interested in spreading Hussitism to Germany, she did not as far as we know enjoy the collaboration of those Germans, the Dresdeners, who were uniquely qualified to bridge the gap between the Czech and German nationalities. Fortunately the source material for this whole subject is so largely unexplored that we are entitled to hope for much more knowledge in the future.

#### THE WORKS OF NICHOLAS OF DRESDEN

The following list is based on the work of Jan Sedlák and F. M. Bartoš. Only one item (No. 1) has been added, and nothing new has been offered in the way of dating or attribution, except in so far as a choice between conflicting hypotheses may be regarded as a

<sup>152</sup> See note 143, above. It is possible, perhaps likely, that Nicholas of Pelhřimov drew directly on Nicholas of Dresden for other things besides just the refutation of belief in Purgatory. Thus, e.g., in his defense of Tabor's simplified liturgy, Nicholas of Pelhřimov wrote (*Chronicon Thaboritarum*, in Höfler, *op. cit.*, II, *FRA*, I. Abt. (Vienna, 1865) 6: p. 491: ". . . si sacerdotes Dei et Christi sumus, non invenimus, quem magis sequi, quam Christum et suos apostolos debeamus"—a phrase that he may well have picked up from Nicholas of Dresden's *Apologia* (Hardt 3: p. 594): "Si sacerdotes Dei et Christi sumus, non invenio, quem magis sequi debeamus, quam Christum." But a systematic comparison of texts remains to be carried through.

novelty. In any case, until more of Nicholas's works are published, no catalogue can be more than a provisional checklist.

Manuscript codices of the three major collections can be identified by their style of numbering, as follows:

- Prague National and University Library: [e.g.] IV G 15
- Prague Cathedral Chapter Library: N 7
- Vienna Nationalbibliothek: 4343.

The provenience of other codices is indicated explicitly.

The two basic works discussing Nicholas of Dresden and his literary activity are Jan Sedlák's *Mikuláš z Drážďan* (Brno, 1914), and F. M. Bartoš's "Vznik a počátky táborství," *Husitství a cizina* (Prague, 1931), pp. 113–153. They are cited as "Sedlák" and "Bartoš." Nicholas's utraquist apologetics are discussed in Sedlák's "Počátkové kalicha," *Časopis katolického duchovenstva* 52 (1911), 54 (1913), 55 (1914); this article is cited as "ČKD," with appropriate references.

The arrangement of the works in this list follows a roughly chronological scheme in Part I—works certainly or probably by Nicholas; the listings in Part II—*dubia* of various degrees—are more or less haphazard. Bartoš's division of the whole corpus into works influenced by Wyclif and works influenced by Peter Payne and Waldensianism is not followed, since it does not seem to be more than hypothetical.

#### *Part I: Works Certainly or Probably by Nicholas*

##### 1. (De iure et eius divisione)

*Inc.* Color duplex novus et vetus. . . . Ius quot duplex est. . . .

*Expl.* . . . nisi papa cum cardinalibus, etc.

*MS:* III G 16, f. 127–128.

*Subject:* Brief instructions for students: the nature of the law, its divisions, how to remember them, how to cite them.

*Date:* Uncertain: 1412/1416.

*Authorship:* Its association with the Dresden School is indicated by the combination of subject and attitude (e.g., the Clementines are called "liber . . . venenosus et laqueis plenus"). The first paragraph, defining the two "colors," points to the *Tabule*, and some of the citations adduced for illustration are the same as some in the *Tabule*.

##### 2. Cortina de anticristo, or Tabule novi et veteris coloris

*Inc.* (Cristus portans crucem dicit,) Novissimus viro-  
rum. . . .

*Expl.* . . . arma sunt cristiani. Hec Ambrosius in libro de officiis.

- MSS:* 1. IV G 15, f. 232–240  
 2. VG 15, f. 84–92  
 3. A 79/5, f. 256–261  
 4. N 7, f. 30'–35  
 5. O 50, f. 127–132'  
 6. 4343, f. 181–188 (incomplete)  
 7. 4875,\* f. 29–34  
 8. 4902, f. 181–186 (incomplete)  
 9. 4488, f. 64–67'  
 10. Kraków, Jagiellon Library, 2148, f. 111'–118  
 11. Basel, University Library, A X 66, f. 296–304  
 12. Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, 346, f. 120–127  
 13. Herrnhut, Unitätsarchiv, 220, f. 93'–97 (variant redaction)  
 14. I D 9, f. 137'–138' (excerpts)

*Subject:* Quotations arranged to contrast Christ and the Pope, the Primitive Church and the modern Roman Church.

*Date:* ca. 1412. See the preface to the present edition.

*Authorship:* Certain, from Nicholas's own references to the work in his other compositions.

*Editions:* 1. The text of MS. 6 has been published by Johann Loserth, "Ein kirchenpolitischer Dialog aus der Blütezeit des Taboritentums," *Mittheilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen* 46 (1908): pp. 114–121. The text is only a fragment, and the edition is not good.

2. In the present volume.

*Literature:* Sedlák, pp. 8–14; Bartoš, pp. 131 f., 147; K. Chytil, *Antikrist v naukách a umění středověku a husitské obrazné antithese* (Prague, 1918), pp. 139–172 & passim; H. Preuss, *Die Vorstellungen vom Antichrist im späteren Mittelalter . . .* (Leipzig, 1906). A contemporary refutation of the *Tabule* has survived in a number of manuscripts; one text is published incompletely and badly by Chytil, pp. 237–247.

### 3. Consuetudo et ritus primitive ecclesie et moderne seu derivative.

*Inc.* Primus. Et cum complerentur dies penthecosti. . .

*Expl.* . . . ut sitis dominantes in clero. Amen. (Anno domini 1417.)

*MS:* IV G 15, f. 240–249

*Subject:* Same as that of No. 2, but different themes are taken up and developed at greater length.

*Date:* Perhaps 1412.

*Authorship:* The work is very much like the *Tabule* and has many of the same citations; it follows the *Tabule* directly in the manuscript.

*Edition:* In the present volume.

*Literature:* Sedlák, p. 15; Bartoš, p. 147.

### 4. De libera verbi dei predicacione

*Inc.* Ve michi, quia tacui . . . Is. vi. Quia vergente mundi vespere. . . .

*Expl.* . . . coronam, quam dignetur.

*MS:* D 52, f. 227–234, 173–174.

*Subject:* Same as that of No. 5.

*Date:* 1412/1414

*Authorship:* Probable, because of style.

*Literature:* Bartoš, p. 148.

### 5. De quadruplici missione

*Inc.* Viri eciam perfecti et iusti. . . .

*Expl.* . . . inter filios eius se non computet.

*MSS:* 1. IV G 15, f. 85'–96'

2. X F 8, f. 136–143'

3. D. 19, f. 217–224

4. 4673, f. 1–8

5. Bautzen, VIII 8, f. 166–183

6. Mikulov (Nikolsburg), II 123, f. 88'–99' (*Inc.* Quidam iurista ponit. . . .)

7. XXIII F 204

*Subject:* The four ways in which one may have a mission to preach; ecclesiastical authorization is only one way.

*Date:* 1412, perhaps in the Autumn (according to Bartoš, "Studie k Husovi a jeho době," *Časopis českého musea* 89 (1915): 5 f., where it is argued that the work is a reply to a sermon of Štěpán of Pálec, delivered on 4 September 1412.). Sedlák dates it earlier.

*Authorship:* Nicholas cites it as his in later works.

*Edition:* by J. Sedlák, *Studie a texty* (1914) 1: pp. 95–117 (from MS. 1, collated with MS. 4).

*Translation:* into Provençal, by the Waldensians; cf. Bartoš, p. 148.

*Literature:* Sedlák, p. 16; Bartoš, p. 148; Sedlák, *Studie a texty* 1: pp. 79–85; Bartoš, *ČČM (supra)*.

### 6. Puncta

*Inc.* Pax fratribus et caritas. . . .

*Expl.* . . . Et tantum de isto triplici iudicio.

*MSS:* 1. III G 28, f. 140–163' (incomplete)

2. IV G 15, f. 1–43'

3. X D 10, f. 80–82', 201–208', 208'–211' (excerpts)

4. Kraków, Jagiellon Library, 2148, f. 120–157'

5. Bautzen, VIII 8, f. 35–90'

6. Basel, University Library, A X 66, 306–319 (incomplete).

*Subject:* Various Roman doctrines and practices are refuted or called into question by various quoted authorities; the work is not a unity.

*Date:* Sedlák: not before end of 1414, although parts may have been composed earlier. Bartoš: written very early (1413?), but in its present form probably put together after Nicholas's death.

*Authorship:* Certain: it cites Nicholas's works and is cited by them.

*Literature:* Sedlák, pp. 18-24; Bartoš, pp. 132-134, 148; Bartoš, "Počátky kalicha v Čechách," *Husitství a cizina*, pp. 68-70.

### 7. Sermo ad clerum de materia sanguinis

*Inc.* Nisi manducaveritis. . . Hec Joh. vi sunt intitulata.

*Expl.* . . . angelis dei in vita eterna. (In MSS. 1, 2, 6, & 8 there follow authorities for the chalice.)

- MSS:* 1. III G 28, f. 165-179'  
 2. IV G 15, f. 198-213'  
 3. XI D 9, f. 221-235  
 4. V F 22, f. 1 (fragment)  
 5. V G 19, f. 251 (fragment)  
 6. A 163, f. 225-231'  
 7. 4940, f. 255-271  
 8. Basel, University Library, A X 66, f. 320-336'

*Subject:* An argument that the lay chalice is necessary for salvation.

*Date:* (Shortly) before 12 November, 1414, date when the sermon was copied (Bartoš).

*Authorship:* Attributed to Nicholas in MS. No. 5; style and content also stamp it as his.

*Literature:* Sedlák, *ČKD* 52 (1911): pp. 786-789; Bartoš, pp. 135, 151; Sedlák, p. 17 f.

### 8. Sermon on text, "Quod fuit ab inicio"

*MS:* Kraków, Jagiellon Library, 2148, f. 34'-39'

*Subject:* Necessity of communion in both kinds.

*Date:* Neither Sedlák nor Bartoš suggests a date; the text (I Joh. i, 1) is a lesson for the Sunday of Ascension Week, and perhaps the sermon should be dated 12 May, 1415.

*Authorship:* Sedlák & Bartoš: probable.

*Literature:* Sedlák, p. 50; Bartoš, p. 153.

### 9. Contra Gallum

*Inc.* Nisi manducaveritis. . . Secundum Thomam. . .

*Expl.* . . . quam prestare dignetur unus et trinus optimus pater et filius et spiritus s. Amen.

- MSS:* 1. IV G 15, f. 142-157'  
 2. VII E 6, f. 107-111' (incomplete)

*Subject:* Argument that communion is necessary *ex mandato Christi*, and not, as the preacher Havlík had written, just *ex statuto ecclesie*.

*Date:* July/August, 1415.

*Authorship:* Apparent from style and references to earlier works by Nicholas.

*Literature:* Sedlák, p. 29 f.; Sedlák, *ČKD* 54 (1913): pp. 468-470; Bartoš, p. 151.

### 10. De iuramento (Extant in two redactions, the second a reworking of the first.)

#### I. *Inc.* Iuramentum secundum iura canonica. . . .

*Expl.* . . . ut supra non condemnant.

*MS:* X F 8, f. 144-147'

*Subject:* Argument that oaths may not be sworn at all.

*Date:* Sedlák: 1408; Bartoš: 1415 (this seems preferable).

*Authorship:* Clear from style and from citations (in the second redaction) of Nicholas's works.

*Edition:* By J. Sedlák, *Studie a texty* 1: pp. 86-94.

*Literature:* *Ibid.*, pp. 75-79; Sedlák, p. 39 f.; Bartoš, pp. 135-137, 151; Bartoš, "Studie k Husovi a jeho době," *ČČM* 89 (1915): pp. 1-5.

#### II. *Inc.* Nota: Jurando vane. . . .

*Expl.* . . . dissolvi et esse tecum.

*MS:* C 116, f. 159'-169' (subsequent pages have more material against oaths)

*Date:* Second half of 1415.

*Authorship:* It cites earlier works by Nicholas.

*Literature:* As above.

### 11. De usura

*Inc.* Species usure sunt due. . . .

*Expl.* . . . in casto proposito audacius loqui. Hec (autem) ad presens dicta sufficient.

- MSS:* 1. III G 9, f. 99-142'  
 2. X D 10, f. 220'-228  
 3. VIII F 3, f. 127-153 (incomplete)

*Subject:* Absolute condemnation of interest, against canonistic arguments allowing it in certain cases.

*Date:* June, 1415: Nicholas refers to the deposition of John XXIII (25 May, 1415), and he cites from this work in his *Apologia*, written at the end of June.

*Authorship:* MS. No. 1 is a collection of Nicholas's works, and a note at the end of the text names him as author.





*Literature:* Sedlák, pp. 24–28; Bartoš, p. 151; Bartoš, *Literární činnost M. Jakoubka ze Stříbra* (Prague, 1925), No. 60 (Nicholas's tractate may be a continuation and defense of Jakoubek's on the same subject).

#### 12. (Reply to Rector of schools in Corbach and Wildungen)

*Inc.* Dominus Jesus, deus et homo, cuius perfecta sunt opera. . . .

*Expl.* . . . apostolus. . . .

*MS:* D 118, f. 1–51' (incomplete).

*Subject:* Refutation of anti-utraquist arguments of the rector, who was himself refuting a utraquist letter that Nicholas had sent him.

*Date:* ca. 1415.

*Authorship:* Sedlák judges the style to be that of Nicholas.

*Literature:* Sedlák, p. 30; cf. Bartoš, p. 153.

#### 13. Apologia (or: De conclusionibus doctorum in Constancia de materia sanguinis (de communione calicis))

*Inc.* Prima conclusio: Christus post cenam. . . .

*Expl.* . . . minister meus erit.

*MSS:* 1. III G 9, f. 71–93

2. IV G 15, f. 166–192'

3. Mikulov, II. 123, f. 59–80

[etc.: neither Sedlák nor Bartoš lists the manuscripts.]

*Subject:* Defense of the necessity of communion in both kinds, against the condemnation of it by the Council of Constance.

*Date:* ca. July/August, 1415 (the Council's condemnation was issued on 15 June, 1415).

*Authorship:* Although sometimes ascribed to Jakoubek, it is claimed by Nicholas in several of his other works, and it contains references to works by him; the style is his and the canonistic citations are characteristic of him; some of the passages are the same as some in the *Tabule*.

*Edition:* by H. von der Hardt, *Magnum oecumenicum concilium Constantiense* (1698) 3: 591–647 (ascribed to Jakoubek).

*Literature:* Sedlák, p. 29; Bartoš, p. 151; Sedlák, *ČKD* 54 (1913): pp. 404–408.

#### 14. Super Pater Noster.

*Inc.* Pater noster etc. Prima peticio est. . . .

*Expl.* . . . ut nemo sine gracia spiritus sancti percipere possit, quam nobis concedat trinus et unus in secula seculorum deus benedictus. Amen.

*MSS:* 1. IV G 15, f. 44–81'

2. Bautzen, VIII 8, f. 193–262'

*Subject:* A discussion of the seven sins and of the vices of the clergy.

*Date:* Second half of 1415.

*Authorship:* It frequently cites other works by Nicholas.

*Literature:* Sedlák, p. 31 f.; Bartoš, pp. 145, 151.

#### 15. Sermons on "Querite primum regnum dei."

*Inc.* Querite primum regnum dei et iusticiam eius. Et scribitur Mat. vi, Luc. xii. Ut adtestatur venerabilis Boecius. . . .

*Expl.* . . . cuncta conveniencia, que nobis prestare dignetur, qui vivit et regnat deus in secula seculorum benedictus. Amen.

*MSS:* 1. IV G 15, f. 100–141

2. O 73, f. 95–126

3. Mikulov, II 123, f. 110–144.

*Subject:* Various aspects of evangelical reform, including the perfectionist mandates of the Sermon on the Mount, etc.

*Date:* September/October, 1415

*Authorship:* The style and content are characteristic, and there are many references to Nicholas's other works.

*Literature:* Sedlák, pp. 31–39; Bartoš, pp. 137 f., 151.

#### 16. Dialogus de purgatorio.

*Inc.* Circa petitionem pro peccatoribus. . . .

*Expl.* . . . in laudem, gloriam et honorem in revelationem Jesu Christi.

*MSS:* 1. III G 8, f. 36–66

2. D 52, f. 21'–47'

3. Mikulov, II 123, f. 146–169

*Subject:* Arguments against the existence of Purgatory and refutation of arguments for it.

*Date:* ca. September/October, 1415. Sedlák supposes an earlier version, written by the end of 1411, but his reasons are inconsiderable.

*Authorship:* There are references to Nicholas's other works, and a contemporary writer, attacking this work, attributes it to Nicholas.

*Literature:* Sedlák, pp. 40–48; Bartoš, p. 151 f.

#### 17. De imaginibus

*Inc.* Est secundum genus reliquiarum, scil. verbum dei, de veneracione cuius vide in Punctis. . . . Tertium genus reliquiarum est sacramentum eukaristie. . . .

*Expl.* . . . Hec ille. Et tantum de huiusmodi signis, sortilegiis et aliis supersticionibus.

MSS: 1. Mikulov, II 123, f. 169-181  
2. XXIII F 204

*Subject:* Attack on contemporary cult of holy images.

*Date:* ca. September/October, 1415 (see next §).

*Authorship:* Refers to other works by Nicholas, including the *De purgatorio*, and is referred to in the *Querite primum regnum dei*.

*Literature:* Sedlák, *Studie a texty* 3, i: pp. 89-92; Bartoš, p. 152; the text in MS. 2 is mentioned by Bartoš, "Nové spisy Petra a Mikuláše z Dráždán," *Reformační sborník* 8 (1946): 64 f. Also: Jana Nechutová, "Traktát Mikuláše z Dráždán 'De imaginibus' a jeho vztah k Matěji z Janova," *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty Brněnské University* E 9 (1964), pp. 149-161.

### 18. De proprio sacerdote et casibus

*Inc.* Dominus noster Jesus Christus, lapis angularis, assit huic nostro principio. . . .

*Expl.* . . . sanguinem dedit. Hec Augustinus.

MSS: 1. Mikulov, II 123, f. 83-88  
2. XXIII F 204

*Subject:* Defense of right of Hussite laymen in Catholic parishes to take communion from utraquist priests in other parishes.

*Date:* 1415.

*Authorship:* Style and content point to Nicholas, with whose other works it appears in both codices.

*Literature:* Bartoš, p. 152 f.; Bartoš, "Nové spisy," p. 64 f.

### Part II: Works Possibly Attributable to Nicholas

1. *De Christi victoria et Antichristi casu.* *Inc.* Christus verus deus et verus homo. . . . *Expl.* . . . in pecunia divinabunt etc. Michee 3. There is no known manuscript; the text survives in Brunfels's edition (see next item). Bartoš, p. 148, attributes the work to Nicholas on the basis of its content, and dates it 1412/1414. For discussion see A. Kraus, *Husitství v literatuře* (Prague, 1917) 1: p. 172; K. Chytil, *Antikrist v naukách* . . ., pp. 182-184.

2. *Processus consistorialis martyrís Joannis Huss, cum correspondentia legis gratiae ad ius papisticum.* *Inc.* Sancimus, ut nullis. . . . *Expl.* . . . ut dealbentur. Dan. xi. The text survives only in the printed edition by Otto Brunfels (Strassburg [?], 1524/25), based on a manuscript sent from Bohemia to Ulrich von Hutten and turned over by him to Brunfels. Bartoš, p. 153, attributes it to Nicholas because of its similarity to the *Tabule* and its sharp rejection of oaths; he dates it ca. 1415. For translations into German and Low German, see Bartoš, p. 153; for discussion see the works of Kraus and Chytil cited in the preceding paragraph.

3. *Sermon on "Super cathedram Moysi sederunt scribe" (De heresi).* *Inc.* Tunc Jesus locutus est ad turbas. . . . Super cathedram. . . . Hic Salvator ostendit. . . . *Expl.* . . . benedictus in secula seculorum MS: V E 28, f. 97'-102'. See Sedlák, p. 49 f.; Bartoš, p. 149.

4. *De simonia.* *Inc.* Ubi enim maius periculum. . . . *Expl.* . . . satis habetur ista materia. MS: V E 28, f. 104-129'. Sedlák, p. 49, conjectures that this is the "de simonia" referred to in several of Nicholas's works. Cf. Bartoš, p. 149 f.

5. *Questiones circa quartam partem Sententiarum.* Nicholas refers to such a work in his *De purgatorio*, MS. D 52, f. 22; Bartoš, p. 148 f., conjectures that fragments of it may be found in MS. X D 10, f. 128'-163, 196'-201'.

6. *De malicia cleri evitanda.* *Inc.* Tu es sacerdos in eternum. . . . *Expl.* . . . rex pacificus Ihesus Christus. MS: V E 28, f. 142-149'. Sedlák, p. 49; Bartoš, p. 150.

7. *De ecclesia.* *Inc.* Ecce pro vera significatione ecclesie expresse. . . . *Expl.* (indeterminate). MS: Herrnhut, Unitätsarchiv, 220, f. 121-126' (?). Bartoš, p. 150, conjectures that this may be an early (ca. 1410?) work by Nicholas, even though not in his usual style; it is strongly Wyclifian.

8. *Catechisms.* Sedlák, p. 50 f., identifies two texts in MS. Kraków, Jagiellon Library, 2148, f. 2-11, f. 11-21, as probably by Nicholas: an *Expositio decalogi* and a *De septem sacramentis*. A catechism, *Tractatus de fide catholica*, in MS. VII E 27, f. 81-90, is regarded by Bartoš, p. 150, as subsequent to these two, and also by Nicholas. This last has been published by E. Havelka, *Husitské katechismy* (Prague, 1938), pp. 192-205. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 81-109, 160-171.

9. In his "Nové spisy Petra a Mikuláše z Dráždán," *Reformační sborník* 8 (1946): pp. 64-66, Bartoš lists a number of short compositions preserved, along with some of Nicholas's larger works, in MS. XXIII F 204 (formerly Lobkovic 322), f. 38-49'; he conjectures that they are by Nicholas. They are as follows: f. 38-40, *De labore corporali*; f. 40, a note on priests' fraudulent miracles with the consecrated host; f. 41-43', a critique of various occupations; f. 43'-46, an attack on luxury in women's clothing; f. 46', on the power of the sword; f. 46'-47, an attack on sinful priests; f. 47'-49', a defense of the chalice and the concomitant neglect of the use of the kiss-of-peace plaque in the liturgy.

## TABULE VETERIS ET NOVI COLORIS

### PREFACE

#### THE MANUSCRIPTS

B. Basel University Library, A X 66, f. 296-304.

\*Catalogued by F. M. Bartoš, "Husitika a bohemika nekolika knihoven německých a švýcarských," *Věstník*