

one-for-one pattern of antithesis, bears witness to a principle of grouping that can best be understood in terms of the pictures. For example, §§ 7, 8, 9, and 10 of Table One all belong to the same "color," and must have been associated in a picture of Jesus. Similarly §§ 5, 6, 7 of Table Six must have been grouped in a single picture, a procession of prelates. Again, it will be noted that Table Five contains three noncontrasting pictures, and Table Nine documents a single picture.

These conclusions are confirmed by two codices, one in Göttingen, the other first found in Jena but now in Prague, which contain, along with much other material, a Czech redaction of the *Tabule*, in its pictorial form. Both manuscripts are very late, dating from the latter part of the fifteenth century or the first part of the sixteenth, but some at least of their pictures correspond precisely to the arrangement suggested by the Latin text and its titles, and it may be supposed that the pictures themselves derived from a tradition based originally on the illustrated Latin *Tabule*, either in the form of a book, or on placards used for agitation in the streets, or on wall-paintings in Bethlehem Chapel and the walls of the Dresdeners' house, "At the Black Rose."⁹ Unfortunately, it has not been possible to work with these codices directly but only with summary or fragmentary discussions of them in the literature, where a few illustrations of them may be found;¹⁰ the precise determination of the relationship between these Czech redactions and the Latin original must therefore be left to others.

Enough has been said, at any rate, to support some inferences regarding the origin of our text. Nicholas may well have prepared a final version containing instructions for the artist, but this would presumably have been much clearer in its dispositions than anything to be inferred from the surviving manuscripts. It must therefore be regarded as lost, along with the original pictures themselves. But soon after the pictures were completed, someone must have copied the textual material from them; in fact more than one such copy may have been made. The Czech redactions show that even in the pictures, the paragraphs of textual material carried their paragraph-numbers ("Primus," "Secundus," etc.), so that the order would not have been radically changed by different copyists. The original picture-text combination must therefore be considered the archetype. The stemma joining it to the sur-

⁹ See Chytil's discussion, *op. cit.*, p. 142 ff. The first antithesis of the *Tabule*, Christ carrying his cross vs. the pope riding sumptuously on a horse, was seen in Bethlehem and described by fifteenth-century observers; the recent reconstruction of the Chapel on its original site in Prague's Old Town rightly reproduces these pictures on the walls, even though we do not know what the originals looked like.

¹⁰ See Chytil, *op. cit.*, pp. 139-172, 235 f., 248-257; also Václav Husa, "O době vzniku jenského kodexu," *Sborník historický* 5 (1957): pp. 71-108; both reproduce some of the pictures. See also F. M. Bartoš, "Jenský kodex a jeho původce," *Ze zápasů české reformace* (Prague, 1959), pp. 64-74.

living texts has not, as already noted, been determined by the editors, but a few general notes may be offered instead. *B*, *K*, *L*, *S*, and *V* agree in preserving a certain number of picture-titles, and also in some other respects; perhaps they go back to a single source, copied rather early (*K* was itself copied in 1414, and *B*'s exemplar dated from that year). *R* and *T* often agree against all the others; they have only a few titles, but they correspond in some points to the text used by the author of the refutation of the *Tabule*, who wrote ca. 1417 and who had seen the pictures.¹¹ *P*, copied in 1417, has virtually no trace of the titles, but offers an excellent text; it must go back to an early copy, from which *Q* and *W* were perhaps also descended. *Z* has the most titles; it sometimes varies with *R* and *T*, but it joins *B*, *L*, *S*, and *V* in omitting a good section from the end of the Fifth Table; it may be regarded as a late copy of a text that separated from the others at an early stage. In fact, the manuscript tradition must have been very highly ramified during the first five years of the work's existence; none of our texts is copied from another, and a great number must have been lost.

Finally, it may be observed that a work such as the *Tabule*, consisting almost entirely of quotations from more or less well-known authorities, was peculiarly susceptible to meliorative contamination. In many cases, for example, *B* and *W* differ from the other manuscripts but agree with the Bible, and must have been corrected by comparison with the latter. It is for this reason that we have included the reading of the original source (designated "O") along with the variants, where necessary (although major deviations from the original are noted in the explanatory notes). By the same token, the reconstruction of the *Urtext* is not as important as it would be in an edition of some literary composition.

AUTHORSHIP AND DATING

Although two of the manuscripts (*T* and *Z*) ascribe the *Tabule* to John Hus, and no manuscript identifies it as the work of Nicholas of Dresden, there can be no doubt that Nicholas was in fact its author. He refers to it in three of his known works and, as we have seen, calls it the *Cortina* or *Cortina de Anticristo*.¹² In manuscripts *B*, *K*, and *P* the *Tabule* appears together with other works by Nicholas, and its style is very much like that of some works indubitably by him.¹³ *R* notes at the end of the work:¹⁴

¹¹ See the text in Chytil, *op. cit.*, p. 237; it would seem to be the First Table that the subtitle referred to ("... huic tabulae asscribunt titulum 'Incipit conversatio Christi opposita conversationi anticristi'").

¹² See note 4 above.

¹³ Sedlák, *op. cit.*, p. 8: a characteristic feature of Nicholas's style is that it is always full of citations from the canon law and its expositors.

¹⁴ For the Latin text see the *Apparatus criticus*; for the history of the Dresdeners and their school see the Introduction.

These texts, collected in this heretical sense, were compiled in this form by the Dresdeners, who, having been expelled from Dresden, seduced many; they did not believe in the existence of Purgatory or in the suffrages of the saints, but taught the opposite.

Since, as we have seen, the pictures containing and illustrating the text were carried in the streets by the Dresdeners, it was natural for others to regard the *Tabule* as the work of the group as a whole; thus understood, *R*'s testimony reinforces the attribution to Nicholas, virtually the only member of the Dresden group who published work.

As for the date, all that can be said with certainty is that the *Tabule* must have preceded Nicholas's *De quadruplici missione*, which refers to it, and which was written in September or October of 1412.¹⁵ The *terminus a quo*, however, cannot be fixed so clearly. Sedlák dated the work in 1410, but for reasons that have since been invalidated,¹⁶ and it would be safest

¹⁵ The date is established by Bartoš, "Studie k Husovi a jeho době," *Časopis českého musea* 89 (1915): pp. 5 f.; he shows that Nicholas was refuting a sermon preached by Stephen of Pálec on 4 September, 1412—which for its part was an attack on John Hus's defense, earlier that summer, of Wyclif's position on freedom of preaching. See also the following note.

¹⁶ Sedlák's argument ("Vlivy valdské," *Studie a texty* (Olomouc, 1914) 1: pp. 82 ff.) was that the *De quadruplici missione* must have been composed before Hus's defense of Wyclif's article on free preaching, in July/August, 1412, because the two works have substantial portions in common and this circumstance can be best explained by supposing that Hus copied from Nicholas. The other possibility is less probable, he argues, because Hus habitually copied from others, while Nicholas was an independent, original spirit. On this line of reasoning, the *De quadruplici missione* must have been finished by mid-1412, and since Nicholas in that work refers to the *Tabule*, this work must have been written before then. Doubtless motivated by the momentum of this argument, Sedlák guessed that the *Tabule* was written in 1410, an early dating that he reinforced by the observation that the *Tabule* must have

to suppose that Nicholas began to function as a literary figure in Hussite Prague only with the advent of the Dresden School, in late 1411 or early 1412.¹⁷ Thus the work can be most reasonably dated in the first part or middle of 1412, a year filled with the turbulence and popular agitation that could have prompted Nicholas to produce so outspoken an instrument of mass propaganda. Since as we have seen, the structure of the work presupposes the association of text and pictures, it would seem probable that the latter also existed in 1412, and perhaps were used in street processions, even though no other source provides evidence of this. The alternative possibility, that the work Nicholas referred to in 1412 and again in 1413 was only a first draft of the *Tabule*—i.e., a collection of contrasting texts that had not yet been prepared for illustration, deserves mention; the version in manuscript *H* seems indeed to be such a collection. But this is only a possibility. By 1414, at any rate, the *Tabule* as we know it was in existence, and if the above speculations about the manuscript tradition are correct, manuscript *K*, copied on 18 February, 1414, must have been flanked or preceded by several lost copies of the pictorial archetype.

been among Nicholas's earliest works, for in it he does not refer to any of his others (*Mikuláš z Dráždán*, p. 14). But as Chytil noted (*op. cit.*, p. 150), the nature of the *Tabule* as a series of quotations made reference to other of Nicholas's works unlikely in any case, and as Bartoš argued (see note 15 above), the *De quadruplici missione* was written after Hus's defense of Wyclif, from which Nicholas drew substantial passages. Bartoš also rejected Sedlák's high opinion of Nicholas's originality—Nicholas, Bartoš argued, was not a Waldensian, as Sedlák believed, but a follower of Wyclif and the common Hussite tradition. Thus there is no reason to push the date of the *Tabule* back earlier than mid-1412.

¹⁷ See the discussion in the Introduction; cf. Bartoš, "Vznik a počátky táborství," p. 129.