

*královské české společnosti nauk* (1931), No. V: pp. 55–57; the codex was part of the estate of John of Ragusa, a leading figure at the Council of Basel: Bartoš conjectures (p. 57) that he had bought it in Prague. The codex also contains several works of John Hus, Jakoubek of Stříbro, John Wyclif, and other works of Nicholas of Dresden. The *Tabule* ends with a scribal *explicit*, “Anno domini MCCCCXIII, Dominico die post festum Sancti Bartholomei Apostoli,” but this is crossed out and was presumably copied, absent-mindedly, from the scribe’s model. The model, now unknown, can thus be dated 26 August, 1414; the copy, however, cannot be dated, except to some time after 1417, the date of composition of its latest item (Jan Čapek’s “Otázka nyní taková běžie,” f. 371’–373’).

K Kraków, Jagiellon Library, 2148, f. 111’–118.

The *Tabule* has the scribal *explicit*, “sub anno domini MCCCCXIII, Sabbato ante Esto michi”—i.e., 18 February, 1414; this is the oldest known datable text. The codex contains several other works by Nicholas of Dresden.

L Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, 346, f. 120–127’.

The codex dates from the sixteenth century, according to the catalogue, and contains, in addition to the *Tabule*: the Lollard commentary on Apocalypse, *Opus arduum valde*; a series of authorities “contra pluralitatem beneficiorum”; an anti-utraquist tractate and the answer thereto (the first is Gerson’s tractate published by Von der Hardt, *Concilium Constantiense* 3: pp. 765–780; the second is by Jakoubek of Stříbro: cf. F. M. Bartoš, *Literární činnost M. Jakoubka ze Stříbra* (Prague, 1925), No. 47). A copy of this manuscript text was obtained only after the collation of all the others; it has been consulted for certain problematical passages but not collated—the text is very close to that of S and seems to offer nothing of value.

P Prague, University and National Library, IV G 15, f. 232–240.

Catalogued by Josef Truhlář, *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum latinorum . . .* (Prague, 1905) 1, No. 747. Two of the works in this codex have scribal *explicit*s with the date 1417 (f. 99, f. 249), and since the hand seems uniform throughout, it may be supposed that the whole codex was copied in that year. Of 249 folios, 216 contain works by Nicholas of Dresden, the others works by John Hus and Jakoubek of Stříbro; the whole was evidently written by or at the order of a Hussite. Although the text of the *Tabule* here lacks all of the picture-titles and most of the references to the “old Color” and “new Color,” it is otherwise very good, and has been taken as the basis of the present edition.

Q Prague, University and National Library, V G 15, f. 84–92.

Catalogued by Truhlář, *op. cit.*, 1, No. 967. The codex is fifteenth-century and evidently Hussite; it contains works by Hus, Jakoubek, and others, through the early 1430’s; the *Tabule* is the only work by Nicholas in the codex. The scribe made many errors, a good number of which were corrected in a contemporary hand, by comparison with the model.

R Prague, Cathedral Chapter Library, A 79/5, f. 256–261.

Catalogued by A. Podlaha, *Soupis rukopisů knihovny metropolitní kapitoly pražské* (Prague, 1910) 1. The copy is the work of an anti-Hussite and seems relatively late.

S Prague, Cathedral Chapter Library, N 7, f. 30’–35.

Catalogued by Podlaha, *op. cit.* (Prague, 1922) 2. The codex is dated in the catalogue as first half of the fifteenth century; it includes works by Hus and some of his immediate predecessors at the University of Prague, as well as some standard patristic and medieval texts; the *Tabule* is the latest work in the codex.

T Prague, Cathedral Chapter Library, O 50, f. 127–132’.

Catalogued by Podlaha, *op. cit.* 2, and dated there in the first half of the fifteenth century. The codex includes many diverse items, including works by anti-Hussites; nothing seems later than the 1420’s. The *Tabule* is followed, on f. 133–137’, by a treatise refuting it, and is preceded by letters of anti-Hussite exiles.

V Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, 4902, f. 181–186.

Catalogued in the *Tabulae codicum manu scriptorum . . .* (Vienna, 1869) 3. The text of the *Tabule* is here incomplete, beginning with a short part of the third table (§§ 7 & 8) and then, with the fourth table, running through to the end. The hand looks like one of the first half of the fifteenth century.

W Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, 4488, f. 64–67’

Catalogued in the *Tabulae codd. mss. . . .* 3, but in an unusually inadequate way; the codex contains a great variety of items, many on odd sheets tipped in during the binding, and seems to have been a repertory of “authorities” and tractates compiled by a Hussite. The antitheses of the *Tabule* are actually in facing columns, thus manifesting the sense of the work, but the arrangement seems to be derived from the writer’s understanding of the material, rather than from an original model. There are no picture-titles or numberings of items, and some of the errors of quotation and reference common to W’s group have been corrected. Both before and after the *Tabule* there is more material, also arranged in the style of antitheses; on the preceding folio-side there is a reference to Pius II that sets the *terminus a quo* of the copy in ca. 1459, and this late date is con-

firmed by the handwriting. Almost the whole of the fifth table, which does not lend itself to the plan of facing columns, is lacking

Y Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, 4343, f. 181-188.

Catalogued in the *Tabb. codd. mss.* . . . 3; the text has been printed by Johann Loserth, "Ein kirchenpolitischer Dialog aus der Blütezeit des Taboritentums," *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen* 46 (1908): pp. 114-121, but not very accurately. It is in any case only a fragment of the whole, beginning with the tenth item of the first table and ending about one-quarter of the way through the fifth. The picture-titles are in part preserved, but as indications of the speakers in a dialogue, and where the titles were lacking, the scribe supplied speakers of his own, representing the "new color" by "Turista" and the "old color" by "Theologus." It is evident that the scribe's model contained more of the picture-titles than any other of our texts, except Z. Y also contains one picture, truncated in the binding and trimming, of a horseman holding a balance (at the beginning of the fifth table, f. 187), but it cannot be said whether the source was the scribe's model or a suggestion drawn from the text.

Z Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, 4875\*, f. 29-34.

Catalogued in the *Tabb. codd. mss.* . . . 3. The copy is well written in what seems to be a mid-fifteenth-century hand, but it is very erroneous. It preserves many more of the picture-titles (or instructions for drawing pictures, or descriptions of pictures) than any other known text.

H Codex 220 of the Unitätsarchiv, in Herrnhut, contains (f. 93'-f. 97) what seems to be an early sketch of what would become the *Tabule*; it is mentioned by J. Th. Müller, "Magister Nikolaus von Dresden," *Zeitschrift für Brüdergeschichte* 9 (1915): p. 85 n. 13, who calls it "ein Entwurf." It begins with a paragraph headed "Statera," and containing, in a variant form, the opening texts of the Fifth Table (up to "suo sensui coaptant"), together with some related material. The paragraph begins: "Fidelis cristianus rationis aperiens oculum debet legem Cristi et legem humanam ponere in pondere vel statera. . . ." It ends: "Pensare ergo debet ponderosius Cristi dicipulus legem Cristi quam legem humanam, ut ponitur in exemplo Cristus in sua conversacione cum discipulis et sua lege ex uno latere; et papa cum suis statum suum magnificentibus cum sua lege." There follow the two series of authorities, one headed "Pars Cristi," the other "Pars pape," and disposed on facing pages. In the second diptych (f. 94'-f. 95) the headings are amplified: "Pars Cristi que [sic] debet depingi baiulans crucem"; "Pars pape que [sic] debet depingi iuxta tenorem privilegii." A few of the authorities are not in the *Tabule*; others contain either more or less of the original passage than do their counterparts in the *Tabule*; still others, the greater number,

are identical. But with one or two exceptions, the material in Tables Five through Eight does not appear in H, which, for the rest, groups its related texts differently and in a different sequence from that of the *Tabule*. It has therefore not been included in the collation.

#### THE EDITION

The problem of establishing a text for the *Tabule* has been resolved by a compromise between the two classical methods, of reconstructing an *Urtext* and of following the "best" manuscript copy; like all compromises this one has both virtues and defects, and the latter require some justification. First of all, it must be admitted that, after wasting many delightful hours in the attempt to determine a *stemma*, the editors have had to accept failure, and with it the inability to reconstruct the lost original. On the other hand, the dated manuscripts closest to the time of the composition (*ca.* 1412, as we shall see)—B and K, one copied from a 1414 text and the other itself copied in 1414—are not the best: they contain errors that are probably not those of the author, and they do not have the fullest number of picture-titles. Manuscript P, copied in 1417, has what seems to be the best text, but no picture-titles at all; manuscript Z has by far the most picture-titles, but is very inaccurate and, probably, late. Persuaded, for reasons that will be discussed below, of an original close association between the text and the now-lost pictures, the editors have decided to print the text of P with the addition of picture-titles from Z (and others), and with the correction of what seemed to be obvious errors. The result is a text including all the important elements that were associated in the tractate during its period of circulation and significance; the objectionable aspects of this artificial conflation are mitigated by the *apparatus criticus*, which allows the reconstruction of every manuscript copy collated, except for textually insignificant variants. The spelling of the edition is that of P, unimproved and unhomogenized. To facilitate use of the edition by scholars unfamiliar with English, the editorial material in the apparatus and notes is in Latin, spelled in the medieval manner in order to make formally clear the otherwise obvious fact, that the editors can lay no claim to classical elegance of Latin style.

The relation between the textual material and the pictures that embodied it is not precisely clear, but that the pictures existed is known from several sources. A treatise refuting the *Tabule* and written perhaps *ca.* 1417 refers to the pictures, not only by using the word "depingunt" but by describing the relationship of various figures in pictures that the author had, evidently, seen.<sup>1</sup> From his description it is obvious that these

<sup>1</sup> The text of the refutation has been printed incompletely and badly, from MS. Prague, Cathedral Chapter Library, O 50, f. 133-137, by K. Chytil, *Antikrist v naukách a umění středověku a husitské obrazné antithese* (Prague, 1918), pp. 237-247. The anonymous author complains about the Hussites who

pictures were in fact those of the *Tabule*.<sup>2</sup> A chronicle written as late as 1476 but embodying much circumstantial material,<sup>3</sup> tells how the Germans of the Dresden School in Prague carried "written and painted tables" (*tabulas . . . scriptas et pictas*) attacking the papacy; the only example he gives, the antithesis between Christ riding on an ass, the apostles following barefoot, *vs.* the Pope and cardinals riding, sumptuously clothed, on mules, does not correspond to anything in the *Tabule*, which opposes Christ carrying his cross to the Pope on horseback, but the "many other tables" he mentions probably included those of the *Tabule*. The context seems to refer to events of 1415/1417, and we may thus be fairly sure that by this period the pictures were in existence.

But were they in existence from the first, from *ca.* 1412? Here we must begin by disqualifying one line of inference used by some scholars before: the words *tabula* and *color* did not necessarily refer to pictures, nor did the word *cortina*, with which Nicholas himself designated his work.<sup>4</sup> *Tabula* can mean a picture but it can also mean a collection of authorities, a compendium or structured florilegium,<sup>5</sup> and this is clearly the

attack the Roman Church, "scrutantes in omnibus scripturis veteris et novi testamenti, in decreti canonibus et novis iuribus, ubicunque contrarietates et repugnationes statui romanae ecclesiae potuerint invenire"—a clear reference to the *Tabule*—and goes on to say that all this "lucide apparet in tabulis et picturis ipsorum. Depingunt enim in una parte tabulae papam equitantem. . . . In alia vero parte depingunt Christum pauperem, crucem suam in humeris bajulantem. . ." (p. 237). He also describes other pictures.

<sup>2</sup> The following pictures of the *Tabule* are described: Christ carrying his cross, *vs.* the Pope riding a horse (Tab. I); Constantine and Louis the Pious making their donations to the pope, *vs.* Christ with a crown of thorns, saying "The foxes have holes. . ." etc., and *vs.* Peter on his cross (all from Tab. I); the Pope sitting on his throne and having his feet kissed, *vs.* Christ kneeling and washing the disciples' feet (Tab. VIII).

<sup>3</sup> *Chronicon Procopii notarii Pragensis*, in K. Höfler, *Geschichtschreiber der husitischen Bewegung in Böhmen*, I, *Fontes rerum Austriacarum* (Vienna, 1856) I. Abt., 2: p. 72.

<sup>4</sup> None of the manuscript copies nor any contemporary source refers to the work as the *Tabule*, but the subdivisions of the work are called *tabule* in the manuscripts. The alternations between the old and new dispensations in the Church are often signalled in the manuscripts by the phrases "de novo colore" and "de antiquo (or veteri) colore"; both *B* and *K* end with the phrase, "Finitus est novus color et antiquus," while *P* ends with "Finis est novi et antiqui coloris." Thus the work as a whole was thought of as "The New and Old Color." As for Nicholas's own title, we know it from his citation of certain passages in the work in his later tractates, the "Puncta" and the "Super Pater Noster"—he calls it the "Cortina" or the "Cortina de Anticristo" (see J. Sedlák, *Mikuláš z Dráždán* (Brno, 1914), p. 8).

<sup>5</sup> Chytil, *op. cit.*, p. 148, understands the word "tabule" as "painters' terminology," but in fact a *tabula* was merely a "table" in the sense of "the tables of the law," and any more specific meaning would be acquired according to the use to which the table was put. Cf. Master John Příbram's *Apologia*, written *ca.* 1427 (MS. Prague, Cathedral Chapter Library, D 49, f. 333'): "Magister Petrus [*scil.* Payne, or "Anglicus"]

meaning of the word in our context, for the "Prima tabula," "Secunda tabula," etc. were not single pictures but rather groups of citations, each *tabula* including material for more than one picture. *Cortina* means tapestry or banner, but also, figuratively, a collection of authorities,<sup>6</sup> and we may equate it here with *tabula*. Similarly the phrases, *de novo colore* and *de veteri colore*, refer not to actual colors but to the new and old systems, that of the modern church and Primitive Church respectively.<sup>7</sup> These considerations, however, do not end the matter; the case for an original picture-text association rests on other foundations. If we suppose that Nicholas began by compiling "tables" of authorities for his own use—a practice attested by some of his other works<sup>8</sup>—and arranged them under topical headings to show the contrast between the two "colors," we can easily imagine him being struck with the idea of presenting the contrast in pictures that could get his point across to the illiterate laity. It would seem to be the first stage of this idea that is represented by manuscript *H*, which envisions the two pictures now at the beginning of the First Table, documented respectively by the left and right halves of a diptych extending through three sets of facing pages in the codex. At the beginning there may have been a picture of the Apocalyptic rider with his scales (now at the beginning of the Fifth Table), and at the end, perhaps, a picture of Antichrist (now at the beginning of the Ninth Table).

Having gone this far, Nicholas was in a position to bring his plan to the higher stage of development represented by the *Tabule* as it appears in the other manuscripts. More pictures were imagined; these allowed him to regroup his authorities in more telling antitheses, to add new authorities (and drop one or two), and, perhaps, in the process, to think up still other pictures. The result was a union of texts and pictures that can be inferentially reconstructed from the surviving textual part: the picture-titles tell their own story, and the sequence of authorities, which do not follow a simple

fecit plurima opuscula seu tabulas abbreviatis ex sententiis pociorum librorum Wikleph, quasi quedam comentariolla et explanationes breves ipsorum librorum. . ."—here is a meaning of the word *tabula* that corresponds to the sort of thing represented by Nicholas's work. Cf. Sedlák, *op. cit.*, p. 13 n. 3, for a similar view: *tabule* means "tractate."

<sup>6</sup> For the first meaning see Sedlák, *op. cit.*, p. 8, n. 4, and F. M. Bartoš, "Vznik a počátky táborství," *Husitství a cizina* (Prague, 1931), p. 131; for the second see Chytil, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

<sup>7</sup> Thus MSS *R* and *T* have a note, at the end of the Fourth Table: "Lex divina antiquus color, lex humana novus color." A short discussion of the nature and divisions of the law—anonymous but probably by Nicholas of Dresden—has at its head the following: "Color duplex, novus et vetus. Novus qui noviter est inventus, vetus qui ab antiquo. Et secundum hoc etiam duplex lex" (MS. Prague, University and National Library, III G 16, f. 127'). Sedlák, *op. cit.*, p. 9 n. 6, rightly interprets the "old and new color" as "the old and new system," but Chytil, *op. cit.*, p. 148 refers it to painters' terminology.

<sup>8</sup> Above all the *Puncta*: cf. Sedlák, *op. cit.*, p. 18 f.