MASARYK UNIVERSITY
Faculty of Arts
Department of Classical Studies

THE CASE OF THE OTHER HUSSITES: REVISITING A HISTORIOGRAPHICAL CONSTRUCT OF THE CZECH REFORMATION

Habilitation Thesis

Brno 2018 Petra Mutlová

Table of Contents

Introduction

The Czech Reformation and a wider social-political context of its preconditions have been a central issue of Czech history for centuries. This complex and multilayered process and the development of individual postulates of the Hussite reformers have motivated generations of historians to voice their arguments.[1] The appraisal of the subsequent period of the Hussite wars has undergone many changes.[2] Jan Hus remains to keep a distinctively symbolic value not only for the part of Czech and European history that bears his name but he also represents a moral and philosophical attempt at reforming a contemporary society and the Church.[3] The past few years marked by the anniversaries of the Council of Constance (2014), the death at stake of Jan Hus (2015), or the year of the Protestant Reformation (2017) are all witnesses to an unflagging interest in this period.[4]

The history of ideas and the much debated problem of the "ideological" background of the Hussite movement have been subjects to a long-lasting discussion mostly between Czech and

[1] See e.g. a recent study by Olivier Marin, *L'archevêque, le maître et le dévot. Genèses du mouvement réformateur pragois (années 1360–1419)* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2005).

[2] Peter Morée, "Not Preaching from the Pulpit, but Marching in the Streets: The communist use of Jan Hus," in *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*, vol. 6, ed. Zdeněk V. David and David R. Holeton (Prague: Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, 2007), 283–296; a useful summary of relevant debates can be found in František Šmahel, *Jan Hus. Život a dílo* (Jan Hus. Life and Work) (Prague: Argo, 2013); more detailed treatement of the historiography of the Czech Reformation is Petr Čornej, *Historici, historiografie a dějepis* (Historians, historiography and history) (Prague: Karolinum, 2016), esp. 31–201.

[3] A general history of this period in the Czech language with a survey of the historiographical perspectives of the Hussite movement is František Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce* (The Hussite Revolution), 4 vols. (Prague: Karolinum, 1995–1996), which is available also in German: František Šmahel, *Die Hussitische Revolution*, 3 vols. Translated and edited by Thomas Krzenck and Alexander Patschovsky (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2002). In English, the best work remains Howard Kaminsky, *A History of the Hussite Revolution* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967). See also Reginald Robert Betts, *Essays in Czech History* (London: The Athlone Press, 1969); Ferdinand Seibt, *Hussitica. Zur Struktur einer Revolution* (Cologne and Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1965); Thomas A. Fudge, *Jan Hus. Religious Reform and Social Revolution in Bohemia* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2010); Stanisław Bylina, *Rewolucja husycka*, 3 vols. (Warsaw: Neriton – Polskie Towarzystwo Historyczne – Instytut historii PAN, 2011–2016).

[4] A number of publications appeared in connection with the above-mentioned events: e.g. *Das Konstanzer Konzil als europäisches Ereignis*, ed. Gabriela Signori and Birgit Studt (Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2014); *A Companion to Jan Hus*, ed. František Šmahel in cooperation with Ota Pavlíček (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2015); *Jan Hus. 600 Jahre Erste Reformation*, ed. Andrea Strübind and Tobias Weger (Munich: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2015); Pavel Soukup, *Jan Hus* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2014); Phillip N. Haberkern, *Patron Saint and Prophet. Jan Hus in the Bohemian and German Reformations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016); *A*

German researchers. These debates naturally reflect various approaches to the crises of the 14th and 15th centuries. This study covers a topic connected to the interactions between the Czechs and (mostly) Germans at the beginning of the 15th century, yet it does not aim to address general questions relevant for the history of ideas. It has one specific goal that will supply contemporary historical research with singular evidence: The main focus of this study is placed on a group of people who were active in Prague at the beginning of the 15th century. During the early and formative years of the Hussite movement in Bohemia, roughly from 1412 to 1417, a group of Germans who, as has been suggested, ran a "School" located at the Black Rose House in Prague played an important role in the scholarly disputes of that time.[5] This group was apparently centred around Peter and Nicholas of Dresden, two well-educated theoreticians with extreme ideas concerning the contemporary state of affairs in the Church and society. Sometime it is believed that they were active at Prague University before the so-called Kutná Hora decree was issued (1409), after which they left for Dresden where they supposedly taught at the *Kreuzschule*, a local school of minor character. Being expelled from there due to their antipapal ideas, they allegedly came back to Prague where they were welcomed by the Czech representatives of the reformist party, settled down in a house called "At the Black Rose" and continued their unspecified teaching activity. The sources record some more names – both teachers and students – connected one way or another to the School, but in a rather obscure and confusing manner. A few incidents in pre-Hussite Prague are also traditionally connected with the School and its supporters. These incidents include inciting the crowds during certain street riots or, on a theoretical level, the defence of the necessity of administering the Eucharist to the laity under both kinds (i. e. under the forms of consecrated bread and wine), a demand that later became the most tantalizing symbol of the whole Hussite movement. The activity of this School, sometimes referred to as the Dresden School due to its alleged place of origin, supposedly proved to be a stimulating element in religious

Companion to the Reformation in Central Europe, ed. Howard Louthan and Graeme Murdock (Leiden: Brill, 2015), and many others.

[5] Perhaps the most important fact in the "afterlife" of the Dresden School is that its existence was implied in the modern syntheses of the Hussite revolution by Howard Kaminsky, *A History*, 204–220; František Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 58–61; and Petr Čornej, *Velké dějiny zemí koruny české* (The Great History of the Czech Lands), vol. 5, *1402–1437* (Prague and Litomyšl: Paseka, 2000), 413–422. The opinions of Romolo Cegna, who pays long-lasting attention to the most famous representative of the Dresden School, Nicholas of Dresden, will be examined below.

developments in Prague up until the year 1417 and is said to have exerted a strong influence on the radical Hussite parties thereafter.

However, how we can understand this particular School remains unclear. The assumption that the members of the School moved from Prague to Dresden and back – either alone or together as a group – is unsubstantiated by the source evidence. Neither is it obvious what kind of School this was, whether in Prague or Dresden, or whether any link existed between these two phases, or, indeed, whether these two phases had anything at all in common. The fundamental bulk of information pertinent to this School is represented by, more or less, contemporary narrative sources that contradict each other in a grand manner, a few mentions of the members' opponents naturally biased by their antipathy, supplemented by a few treatises that some members of the School left to posterity. More importantly, there is an inquisitional protocol surviving in the case of the School disciples' John Drändorf and Peter Turnau, and a fragment of Bartholomew Rautenstock's protocol, which add further confusion to the story of the School. Therefore, it should not be surprising that no comprehensive picture of this School has been gleaned from the available sources. In modern historiography, there have been a number of mentions and references to this group.[6] As will be discussed later, the majority of these contributions were primarily concerned with the Waldensian orientation of the Dresden School, or more precisely of some of the people connected with it, thereby acknowledging the very existence of the School without due analysis of the problem.[7] A case in point is also the question of the German Hussites, as some of the Dresdeners were perceived, and their influence over the radical Hussites.[8] In all of these studies, nevertheless,

[6] References to the Dresden School were made in numerous studies that are mentioned throughout this study and are listed in the final bibliography. References to the Dresden School appear in several biographical tools, for example František Šmahel mentions the School in the entry on Nicholas of Dresden in the *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 6, 1993. CD–ROM (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag, 2000); Siegfried Hoyer in the *Sächsische Biographie* in the entry on Peter of Dresden, [http://isgv.serveftp.org/saebi/saebi.php]; Josef Tříška in *Literární činnost předhusitské pražské univerzity* (Literary work of the pre-Hussite University) (Prague: Universita Karlova, 1967), 72; idem, *Životopisný slovník předhusitské pražské univerzity 1348–1409* (Biographical dictionary of the pre-Hussite Prague University 1348–1409) (Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1981), 388; and elsewhere.

[7] Amedeo Molnár, *Valdenští. Evropský rozměr jejich vzdoru* (Waldensians. European extension of their opposition) (Prague: Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1973), 206–214; see also Robert Kalivoda, *Husitská ideologie* (Hussite ideology) (Prague: Československá akademie věd, 1961), 292–316.

[8] One of the most recent and concise study is Franz Machilek, "Von der 'Dresdner Schule' in Prag zu Friedrich Reiser und Stephan von Basel – 'Deutsche Hussiten' im 15. Jahrhundert," in *Jan Hus. 600 Jahre Erste Reformation*, 59–69; idem, "Deutsche Hussiten," in *Jan Hus zwischen Zeiten, Völkern, Konfessionen: Vorträge des internationalen Symposions in Bayeruth vom 22. bis 26. September 1993*, ed. Ferdinand Seibt (Munich: R.

the Dresden School was only marginal addenda to research that focused on other problems.[9] Only a few studies concentrated on the School itself, and these raised many questions needing clarification.

In 1965, Howard Kaminsky wrote a short study on the School in his foreword to the edition of a treatise by one of the members of this School, Nicholas of Dresden.[10] Although he could not rely on evidence of edited and critically assessed material, many of his hypotheses still hold. He rightly determined the reason behind the expulsion of some German masters from Dresden and described some of their subsequent activities in Prague. Lacking evidence of further sources, Kaminsky connected the two phases of the School, i.e., in Dresden and Prague, as pertaining to a group of the same people. He associated a few names with the Dresden School – alongside Peter of Dresden, Nicholas of Dresden, Friedrich Eppinge, or John Drändorf are mentioned. As an editor of two of Nicholas's treatises, Kaminsky naturally focused on Nicholas of Dresden and his works. Based on the close reading of relevant treatises, Kaminsky primarily analyzed Nicholas's contribution to the Hussite ideology and the possible influences of and connections with the teachings of John Wyclif, with the influential Czech reformer Matthias of Janov, or with popular sectarianism, above all the Waldensians. His comprehensive analysis resulted in the conclusion that Nicholas cannot be identified as a Waldensian heretic; nevertheless he characterized his doctrine as "Waldensianist." In another study on Hussite radicalism, Kaminsky examined the most radical university circles in Prague around Nicholas of Dresden and pointed out their connection to a radical Taborite faction of

---

Oldenbourg Verlag, 1997), 267–282; Ferdinand Seibt, *Hussitica*, 92–97; Božena Kopičková, *Jan Želivský* (John of Želiv) (Prague: Melantrich, 1990), 22.

[9] Apart from the contributions mentioned previously, many modern historians touched upon this topic on more than one occasion and accepted the existence of the Dresden School. Influential contributions include for example František Šmahel, "The Faculty of Liberal Arts 1348–1419," in *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007), 269; idem, *Dějiny univerzity Karlovy 1348–1990* (A history of the Charles University 1348–1990), vol. 1, *1347/48–1622* (Prague: Karolinum, 1995), 129; Heinrich Butte, *Geschichte Dresdens bis zur Reformationszeit* (Köln and Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1967), 100–120; a recent book on the Hussite movement promoted the existence of the Dresden School in the English-speaking environment, see Thomas A. Fudge, *The Magnificent Ride. The First Reformation in Hussite Bohemia* (Ashgate: Aldershot, 1998), 67, 135.

[10] *Master Nicholas of Dresden: The Old Color and the New. Selected Works Contrasting the Primitive Church and the Roman Church*. Ed. by Howard Kaminsky, Dean Loy Bilderback, Imre Boba, and Patricia N. Rosenberg. (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s. 55) (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1965), 5–28.

the Hussites, thereby emphasizing the impact of the Dresden School on the religious developments in Prague at the beginning of the Hussite movement.[11]

The Italian historian Romolo Cegna directed his attention to issues connected with the person of Nicholas of Dresden, who was by this time considered to be the leading member of the Dresden School.[12] As the editor of some of Nicholas's treatises, Cegna greatly contributed to general knowledge about this prolific author.[13] The focus of Cegna's interest was the beginnings of the practice of Utraquism. To prove Nicholas's primacy in this matter, he explored vast amounts of material and put forward several attractive hypotheses concerning Nicholas's life and work. Although the origins of administering the Eucharist to the laity under both species in the Hussite period is nowadays linked with Jacobellus of Misa and not with Nicholas, Cegna's numerous studies provided a sound basis for further analysis of Nicholas's teachings. Cegna argued that Nicholas was a typical representative of the medieval Catholic reform movement and denied his affiliation with Waldensian heresy. As far as the Dresden School is concerned, Cegna's examination of the spread of Nicholas's treatises in the literature of the Waldensians in France, Italy, and Germany is immensely important. Nevertheless, as in Kaminsky's case, Cegna implicitly assumed that Nicholas was affiliated with the Dresden School and, thus, acknowledged the existence of the Dresden School itself.

Other supplementary information was added in the course of time to these seminal studies. However, most of these contributions were concerned mainly with doctrinal matters related to the Dresden School and its influence. Such polemics have produced a variety of opinions and many unresolved propositions since the ideological orientations and origins of doctrinal concepts are very hard to distinguish in the complex early-fifteenth century intellectual setting. However important these issues might be, to approach the phenomenon of a school or group of scholars is a different matter.

---

[11] Howard Kaminsky, "Hussite Radicalism and the Origins of Tábor 1415–1418," *Medievalia et Humanistica* 10 (1956): 102–130. See also his "The Problematics of later-medieval Heresy," in *Husitství – reformace – renesance. Sborník k 60. narozeninám Františka Šmahela*, vol. 1, ed. Jaroslav Pánek, Jaroslav Boubín, Miloslav Polívka and Noemi Rejchrtová (Prague: Historický ústav, 1994), 133-156; or "The Problematics of 'Heresy' and 'The Reformation'," in *Häresie und vorzeitige Reformation im Spätmittelalter*, ed. František Šmahel (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1998), 1–22.

[12] His best synthetic contribution to the history of this group was published in a study preceding an edition of Nicholas's treatise, the *Puncta*, see *Nicolai (ut dicunt) de Dresda vulgo appellati de Čerruc (De Černá růže id est de Rosa Nigra [†1418]) Puncta*. Ed. Romolo Cegna. *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 33 (1996): 5–28. Cegna publishes many of his studies online: http://nicolausdrazna.xoom.it/virgiliowizard/home [accessed 12. 1. 2017].

[13] Cegna edited Nicholas's treatises *De reliquiis et de veneratione sanctorum: De purgatorio*, *Expositio super Pater noster* (together with Jana Nechutová), *Puncta*, *Nisi manducaveritis*, *Tractatus de iuramento*.

Even though this analysis aims to discuss whether this group can legitimately be called the "Dresden School," this term will be used throughout the study. The reason for this is clarity as well as respect for tradition – an attempt at inventing or introducing a new name to the scholarly literature would be rather misleading than benefiting this already intricate issue.[14]

Therefore, the main objective of this study is to reassess the existence of the Dresden School based on available sources. Scrutinizing the information extracted from primary material from the point of view of the people involved shall bring a new perspective for the matter at hand: it will help discover whether the Dresden School existed as a well-defined group or whether it was rather a random cluster of people who happened to be working in the same place at the same time. I will attempt to look for the reasons why these people were later perceived as a group. As a first step, the period when the Dresden School was allegedly in operation will be analyzed. This will comprise several stages: firstly, compiling references to the group or its members made by external contemporary sources, be they well-known narrative sources or unresearched manuscript material; subsequently combining this information with the biographies of the people involved and the data they provided about themselves, including their literary output; and lastly, looking for indirect evidence for the existence of the group, which will mean looking for activities that the School members might have shared. Another set of questions will be centered around the later stages of the School's existence and its "afterlife." The existence of the School will be considered through the prism of its possible influence, namely, whether there are signs that the School had an ideological influence on anyone, whether its disciples or supporters markedly shared or promoted identical ideas, or whether there existed any activities that could be generally linked with the consequences of the Dresden School's existence.

Accordingly, a general framework for research into the history of the Dresden School will be provided by questions concerning the existence of a group: Did any special bonds exist between the people connected to the Dresden School? What are the parameters that define a late medieval group? As Gerd Althoff showed in his study on medieval groups, bonds between

[14] The group is sometimes labelled the „Black Rose House School" because its members dwelled in a house of this name in Prague. The title "Rosa Nigra" or "Rosa Nera" is used by Romolo Cegna, the Czech variant "Černá Růže" often appears also in the Czech scholarship. Moreover, a corrupted variant "Czerucz" was used by Cegna on several occasions, which was criticized by František Šmahel in his review of *Nicola della Rosa Nera detto da Dresa (1380?–1416?. De reliquiis et De veneratione sanctorum: De purgatorio)*, by Romolo Cegna, *Husitský Tábor* 2 (1979): 158–159.

medieval people were far more important than in our times.[15] He examined the three most important group bonds in the life of a medieval person – those constituted by kinship, co-operation, and lordship. In his opinion, "historiography is generally the most useful source if one is looking to understand the consciousness of a medieval individual or a group."[16] Althoff illustrated this fact using a number of examples taken from upper social strata, and thus, his findings cannot be of much use for a study of a group of persecuted heretics mainly from the lower orders. Nevertheless, contemporary historiography related in any way to the Dresden School should provide grounds for the first level of analysis. All available contemporary sources and information about the Dresdeners shall be presented as the first step in the analysis.

Concerning the co-operative element of medieval bonds, a comparison of this group to groups of university students seems to be more promising. Rainer-Christoph Schwinges showed that clustering into advantageous circles was very much favoured and widespread among university students in the Middle Ages.[17] Despite the fact that we know very little about the educational background of the Dresden masters, the question should be posed as to whether the Dresden School can be perceived as a travelling group of students. The so-called travel-groups were usually formed by well-to-do students who came from neighbouring areas and brought their social status with them. Schwinges argued that poor students formed such groups mainly in periods of crises or for definite purposes under external pressures. For the group in question, the moment of crisis, or rather the external pressure, seem to be present although this will have to be decided upon only closer examination of the personal background of its members. Compiling all available biographical information about each member of the School will therefore present a next step in the investigation.

Such information must be complemented by data provided by the people themselves. Since some of the members of the Dresden School were active in the literary disputes in Hussite Prague, several texts survive as an outcome of their activities. These will be duly

[15] Gerd Althoff, *Family, Friends and Followers. Political and Social Bonds in Early Medieval Europe*, transl. Christopher Carroll (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
[16] *Ibid.*, 16.
[17] Rainer Christoph Schwinges, "Zur Prosopographie studentischer Reisegruppen im Fünfzehnten Jahrhundert," in *Medieval Lives and the Historian*, 333–341. See also *Gelehrte im Reich. Zur Sozial- und Wirkungsgeschichte akademischer Eliten des 14. bis 16. Jahrhundert*, ed. Rainer Christoph Schwinges and Markus Wriedt (Berlin: Duncker&Humblot, 1996); Rainer Ch. Schwinges, "Das Reich im gelehrten Europa. Ein Essay aus

analyzed in order to see whether they provide indirect evidence for the Dresden School's existence. Is it possible that certain common elements can be traced in the writings of the members of the Dresden School, or were any distinct ideas shared by all of its members? I mentioned earlier that this group has been in focus of scholarly attention mostly due to doctrinal matters related to the origins of the Czech Reformation. The affiliation of the Dresdeners to Waldensianism, or rather contemporary accusations or connections with it, seems at first sight to be the one distinct moment shared by all members of the Dresden School. Can this heretical link possibly be the only parameter consistently applicable to this group? Propaganda of certain ideas towards the German lands, of which there are traces within the Dresdeners' treatises, could be seen as another link between the people in question.

All these attempts will primarily rest on the contemporary written data available for each member of the School. It must be stressed at the very beginning that such surveys are almost exclusively based on sources coming from ecclesiastical institutions,[18] as no other types of sources, such as charters or memorial sources, survive or are at our disposal for the Dresden School. For this reason, the facts that will be extracted from these sources cannot be taken at face value, and their potential biases will have to be carefully considered. This warning is even more pertinent for the next stage in the investigation into the "afterlife" of the Dresden School. Whatever the biases of the contemporary material may be, the subsequent phases of the School's historical existence are subject to fabrication on much larger scale. Whether the Dresden School only actually came into existence later and whether the only bonds that tie the members of this group together only existed in later historiography is a question that inevitably must be asked.

Last but not least, the question of the Dresdeners' influence and the radiation of their beliefs is another important aspect of the existence of a bond between persons. Traditionally, historians have recognized the influence of some of the Dresden masters on the radical Hussite parties. Nevertheless, these influences mostly comprise isolated cases of an individual's influence over another individual, such as the fact that Nicholas Biskupec of Pelhřimov (died ca. 1460), an important figure within the radical faction in Tábor, drew largely on the works of

---

personengeschichtlicher Perspektive," in *Heilig – Römisch – Deutsch. Das Reich im mittelalterlichen Europa*, ed. Bernard Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter (Dresden: Michel Sandstein Verlag, 2006), 227–250.

[18] This is a general problem of most prosopographical studies, as was noted by Althoff, *Family, Friends and Followers*, 19, note 52.

Nicholas of Dresden, a leading member of the Dresden School.[19] These cases of influence of the Dresden School need to be considered carefully. They can be seen only through an intricate net of textual borrowings producing evidence of various and delicate quality. There exist other sources that could shed more light on this matter – it has been argued that the teachings of Nicholas of Dresden were very soon after the termination of the School's teaching practice in Prague promoted on a theoretical level.[20] A few so far un-researched sources that could attest to a later influence of this School which would in turn prove the existence of the School itself will be scrutinized as well. The existence of the School's followers would present further evidence for the argument that the Dresden School was a definable group. Apart from individuals who profess that the Dresden masters inspired them, there may be other signs attesting to this future influence. Collecting the masters' treatises can be regarded as the best example of conscious activity by a group's followers. The existence of such testimonies would bolster the hypothesis that the Dresden School was a clearly defined entity.

The study will address the possible bonds between the members of the Dresden School from several different angles. The main goal of the analysis is to find out whether the Dresden School existed as a clearly defined group and if so, what kind of group it was, or where did its concept originate from. A thorough examination of the problems mentioned above will facilitate a better understanding of the phenomenon of the Dresden School which has been perceived in many various ways since the 15th century.

[19] *Confessio Taboritarum*, ed. Amedeo Molnár and Romolo Cegna (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1983).
[20] Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 26–28.

Evidence of Contemporary Narrative Sources

Basic information concerning the Dresden School can be extracted from a number of primary historiographical sources from the early fifteenth century, that is, from a period that is coeval with the existence of the Dresden School.[21] These provide information as to how the School was established, where and when it was active and who its leading members were. Along with treatises written by the members of the Dresden School and in some cases with their interrogation protocols, these constitute the most important source of information about the presumed existence of the Dresden School and will, therefore, be duly analysed here. It is all the more necessary to take a closer look at them because apart from being the most important primary information they also cause the greatest confusion as they contradict each other in many different ways. In case a critical edition for the below sources exists, their reliability and only basic information are summarized. Special attention will be paid to the question of whether these texts really come from the period of the Dresden School's activity or whether their information is of later date; it should be stressed that precise dating of these sources is not of crucial importance as far as the history of the School is concerned. Naturally, this is not the case for various manuscript notes and other un-researched material where all available data will be presented in detail.

Laurence of Březová, Hussite chronicle

Master Laurence of Březová (1370/1371–ca. 1437), a contemporary of Jan Hus who studied at Prague University, was a personal eyewitness to all the important events that he described and one of the most valuable chroniclers of the Hussite period, as he related the events of the years

[21] A general introduction and overview of the historiographical sources pertinent to the Hussite period can be found in Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 1, 11–15, who summarizes older findings and provides references to older literature; see also Marie Bláhová, "Česká historiografie v husitské revoluci" (Czech historiography in the Hussite revolution), in *Husitství – reformace – renesance. Sborník k 60. narozeninám Františka Šmahela*, vol. 2, ed. Jaroslav Pánek, Jaroslav Boubín, Miloslav Polívka and Noemi Rejchrtová (Prague: Historický ústav, 1994), 439–448; Petr Čornej, *Rozhledy, názory a postoje husitské inteligence v zrcadle dějepisectví 15. století* (Views, opinions and attitudes of the Hussite intellectuals in the mirror of 15th-century historiography) (Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1986); idem, *Tajemství českých kronik: cesty ke kořenům husitské tradice* (The secrets of the Czech chronicles. Ways to the roots of the Hussite tradition) (Prague – Litomyšl: Paseka, 2003).

1414–1421 in his narrative about the Hussite movement.[22] The *Chronicle*, as it is entitled, is abruptly ended in the middle of a sentence in both of tis versions, but its value lies mostly in its beginning: it is the basic source for the early stages of the Hussite movement since many of the events described in the *Chronicle* are known only from here. When exactly Laurence composed this text cannot be said with precision, it was written sometime between the late 1420s and the year of 1444.[23] How Laurence proceeded while composing his chronicle is also unknown – he described the events in a detailed and lively way keeping to a good chronological sequence. Thus, his work gives the impression of having been composed almost concurrently with the incidents in question. Nevertheless, some references to earlier affairs, marked by *protunc* (then), make it obvious that this was not always the case. The narrative opens by relating the introduction of the lay chalice. It is worth pointing out that his short account of the origins of this practice connects it with the activities of Jacobellus of Misa, something probably widely accepted by his contemporaries. It was only some time later that the story was born that the idea had been suggested to Jacobellus by the German masters, namely by Peter of Dresden. Thus, a Wroclaw manuscript of Laurence's Hussite chronicle contained an insertion in the opening narration about the year 1414:

> "Anno incarnationis dominice MCCCCXIV, cum misericors et miserator dominus psal. 110. veritatem salutarem, que sacerdotum ignava desidia erat in practica per multa annorum curricula perniciose obmissa, suis fidelibus revelaret ac relevaret deiectam, cuidam honeste vite viro Magistro Petro de Drazdyan, tunc ante ea multis annis in civitate Pragensi moram trahenti, miraculose patefecit, unde magistri Pragenses eidem consencientes istas scripturas collegerunt et collectas ad Constanciense concilium transmiserunt, venerabilis ac divinissima ..."

Even though the presently lost Wroclaw manuscript of the Hussite chronicle was the oldest of all the manuscripts containing the whole chronicle (it bore a scribal explicit of 1467), the context shows that its beginning was interpolated. The other copies of this text read only:[24]

[22] The parallel Latin-Czech text of the chronicle was printed by Jaroslav Goll in FRB, vol. 5, 327–534, quote from page 329. The chronicle was translated into modern Czech by František Heřmanský and revised by Marie Bláhová in Vavřinec z Březové, *Husitská kronika* (Prague: Svoboda, 1979). A German translation of the chronicle with commentary was published more recently: *Die Hussiten: Die Chronik des Laurentius von Březová 1414–1421*, ed. by Josef Bujnoch (Graz, Vienna, and Cologne: Verlag Styria, 1988). For Laurencius's biography, see Marie Bláhová, "z Březové, Vavřinec," in *Biografický slovník českých zemí*, vol. 8, *Brun–By* (Prague: Academia, 2007), 260–262.

[23] Bláhová, "z Březové, Vavřinec," 261–262.

[24] Goll, 329–330.

> "Anno incarnacionis dominice MCCCCXIV venerabilis ac divinissima communio eukaristie sub utraque specie panis scilicet et vini populo communi fideli ministranda per venerandum ac egregium virum Magistrum Jacobellum de Misa, sacre theologie baccalarium formatum, et aliquos sibi tunc in hac materia assistentes sacerdotes est inchoata in urbe inclita et magnifica Pragensi…"

A new analysis of a text that was earlier considered to be a fragment or an abridgment of Laurence's chronicle was recently carried out by Helena Krmíčková. Her examination and discoveries related to a copy of this abridgement in a manuscript from a Benedictine monastery in Rajhrad showed that this was an important source for Laurence, and not an excerpt of it.[25] Even though the anonymous author of this source was better informed about the beginnings of Utraquism and related them in a more detailed manner than Laurence, the link to the Dresdeners is not mentioned here either.[26] The Wroclaw copy, therefore, remains the only source of the Dresdeners's alleged participation in this issue.

Generally, there are a number of disputable points about the information contained in the Wroclaw copy that shed some doubt on the scribe's trustworthiness or his understanding of the text, and these points consequently open the way for various interpretations.[27] The declaration of the Prague University (mentioned straight after the beginnings of Utraquism in the Wroclaw manuscript) is also dated to 1414, although it only took place in 1417,[28] a fact that further devalues its testimony. If we disregard the question of Utraquism, which is irrelevant at this point, the important information contained in this chronicle is that Peter of Dresden was active in Prague in the year 1414 where he had lived for some time. However, the passage "tunc ante ea multis annis in civitate Pragensi moram trahenti" is not unequivocal if one wants to understand it in the most evident manner, that is, that Peter lived in Prague at that moment

[25] Helena Krmíčková, "Kronikář Vavřinec z Březové," in *Pro defensa veritatis evangelice* (Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2015), 33–59. Krmíčková convincingly proved that the Rajhrad fragment (now Brno, Moravian Library, R 432) was originally a part of a manuscript P 6 from the Bohemian Nation College Library (which can be now identified with Prague, National Library, III G 6), and that it is a reliable evidence of the original form of this anonymous text that served as a source for Laurence.

[26] The anonymous author did not connect the origins of Utraqism with Jacobellus and named only two churches where the practice of the *sub utraque* commenced, St. Michael and St. Martin in the Old Town of Prague; see Krmíčková, "Kronikář Vavřinec," 43–47, where relevant passages from the accounts of the anonym and Laurence are printed.

[27] For instance, the codex reads *insidia* instead of *desidia*, *trahi* instead of *trahenti* which cannot be unequivocally explained as simple scribal abbreviations.

[28] For background on this event, see Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 295–297.

and had done so for a very long time.[29] The single occurrence leaves space for different interpretations of the passage, such as that Peter had once before that moment spent some time in Prague.

As a singular report among the other six medieval manuscripts of the chronicle, this piece of information does not provide sufficient grounds for accepting Peter's presence in Prague before 1414, his departure and subsequent return for certain. At the same time, it is important to emphasize that Laurence's chronicle is probably one of the most reliable accounts of the situation in Hussite Prague coming from the supporters of the reformist party. Therefore, information of the majority of its manuscript copies should be taken at face value, which means that the origins of the lay chalice were connected with Jacobellus of Misa, and that it is remarkable that Laurence does not mention any Germans living in Prague at that time who assisted Jacobellus in this matter.

Chronicon breve regni Bohemiae

This short account describes the events of 1310–1421 with a few additions for subsequent years, which were copied by Martin of Bílina in 1430 into a codex at present held in the library of the monastery in Schlägl, Austria. When the text addresses the origins of the communion *sub utraque*, it connects it with the year 1416 and reports the following:[30]

> "Eodem anno [i.e. 1416] magister Jacobus heresiarcha cum magistro theutunicorum de Drazdan incepit communicare populum laicalem sub utraque specie contra consuetudinem romane ecclesie et contra preceptum sinodus Constancie. Tunc multi ex sacerdotibus simplicibus eis adhesuerunt et per totam terram discurrentes populum sub utraque specie communicabant, asserentes in predicacionibus, antiquos sacerdotes fures esse huius sacramenti. Tunc eciam paruulos in baptismato sanguine et corpore Christi communicabant et alia sacramenta non curabant."

This small contemporary compilation was the source for a number of subsequent narratives about the beginnings of the lay chalice, which were however only derivative and did

[29] This is how the German translator understood the text: "Im Jahre der Menschwerdung des Herrn 1414, als der gnädige und barmherzige Herr (misericors et miserator dominus, Ps 110,4) die heilbringende Wahrheit, die durch lässige Trägheit der Priester über viele Abläufe von Jahren hinweg schädlicherweise in der Praxis aufgegeben war, seinen Gläubigen offenbarte und die verworfene Wahreit wieder erhob – er enthüllte sie auf wunderbare Weise einem Mann ehrenvollen Lebenswandels, dem Magister Peter von Dresden, der damals viele Jahre zuvor sich in der Stadt Prag aufhielt, weshalb die ihm zustimmenden Prager Magister entsprechende Schriftstellen sammelten und an das Konstanzer Konzil schickten–, began die Austeilung … usw.", *Die Hussiten*, 296.

[30] Printed by Adolf Horčička, "Ein 'Chronicon breve regni Bohemiae saec. XV'," *Mittheilungen des Vereines für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen* 37/4 (1898/9): 461–467, quotation from p. 464–465.

not alter the original report.[31] The only thing worth our attention here is that these later accounts supplied the story with a concrete name, that is, the name of Peter of Dresden, giving rise to a theory that has survived until recent times. In the same way, this Dresden theory appears for example in the so-called *Chronicle of the Prague University* that describes the history of the Prague University from its beginning in 1348 until 1421.[32] Apart from presenting the Dresden master as an instigator of the lay chalice through the advice he gave to Jacobellus, the one valuable piece of information that appears here is the mention of the communion of children, a novelty of the period.

John Papoušek's narrative

Another mention of the Dresdeners' group can be found in a description of the Basel *Compactata* composed between 1448–1451 by John Papoušek of Soběslav, which survives in the *Manual* of Ulrich of Telč from the sixties of the 15th century:[33]

> "… venerunt quidam (de) Missna (*ss.* Petrus) clerici et scolares de Drazden, alii de Pikardia, alii de Anglia qui adhuc plus quam prius infecerunt et intoxicaverunt per suos errores regnum Bohemiae. Tandem fortificata illa secta videns quoque quod Romana ecclesia non habet usum communionis eucharistie sub utraque specie quantum ad populum laicalem seu volgarem … praxim utriusque speciei inceperunt in civitate Pragensi."

Its author, Master John Papoušek of Soběslav, twice rector of the Prague University, gradually shifted from his original support of Utraquism to support the Catholic party. He met Enea Silvio Piccolomini during his journey to Bohemia in 1451 and secured several important

[31] The most important of them is the so-called *Chronicon universitatis Pragensis*, others are discussed in more detail by Heinrich Boehmer, "Magister Peter von Dresden," *Neues Archiv für Sächsische Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 36 (1915): 213–215.

[32] Printed by Jaroslav Goll in FRB, vol. 5, 565–588, who also analyzes the various layers of this compilation in the foreword to his edition (p. XL–XLII). For more about this chronicle, see Petr Čornej, "Tzv. Kronika univerzity pražské a její místo v husitské historiografii" (The so-called Chronicle of the Prague University and its place within Hussite historiography), *AUC–HUCP* 23/1 (1983): 7–25. The relevant text reads: "Eodem anno Magister Jacobellus cum Magistro Petro Theutonico de Drazdian incepit communicare populum laicalem sub utraque specie contra consuetudinem Romane ecclesie et contra preceptum sacri concilii Constanciensis. Tunc multi ex sacerdotibus simplicibus eis adheserunt et per totam terram discurrentes populum sub utraque specie communicaverunt asserentes in predicacionibus suis, antiquos sacerdotes fures esse huius sacramenti. Tunc eciam parvulos in baptismo corpore et sanguine Christi communicabant et alia sacramenta non curabant."

[33] It was printed under its incipit *Edicio Magistri Johannis Papusskonis de Sobieslaw* by Konstantin Höfler in *Geschichtschreiber der Husitischen Bewegung in Böhmen* 3. Fontes rerum Austriacarum I, *Scriptores*, vol. 7 (Vienna: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1866), 158–162 (footnote), esp. 159. The report is preserved in a single manuscript, now in the Prague National library, shelf mark XI C 8, fol. 296r–305v, which contains a scribal explicit of 1465.

books for him.[34] His description of the *Compactata*, a transcription of the Taborite articles and other anti-Hussite polemics were certainly among these books. It was argued that it was Papoušek who influenced Piccolomini on the point of Waldensian influence over the Taborites.[35]

Regarding the matter at hand, it should be pointed out that the confusion of the name of Nicholas of Dresden with that of Peter as an instigator of Utraquism in Prague is sometimes believed to have been caused by Papoušek's original report.[36] Nevertheless, as the name of Peter is only super-scribed in the only surviving copy of Papoušek's report (which was moreover copied only in 1465), this source does not provide firm evidence of Peter's stay in Prague, either. It should also be pointed out that this source is not contemporary with the activity of the Dresden School in Prague even if Papoušek did belong to the same generation as the Dresden masters. The comment that these people had infected Bohemia even more than they had before suggests that the group had already been active in Prague earlier. However, the comment does not unequivocally associate these individuals with people who came from Germany; on the contrary, it would seem more logical to understand this comment only as an allusion to the teachings of the Englishmen such as Wyclif and his followers.

In sum, this source does not provide any conclusive evidence concerning the activity of the Dresden School in Prague in the period of concern, and its main subject is the introduction of Utraquism in Bohemia and its connection with external influences.

Historia Bohemica

Enea Silvio Piccolomini, later Pope Pius II, had the possibility to observe the situation in Bohemia closely when he visited it in 1451. He undertook the challenging project of composing a history of the Czechs from their legendary beginnings until the year 1458 when he started his work. As a proponent of the Roman curia and a fervent opponent of the Hussites, he devoted more than half of his work to this period and despite, or maybe because of his demonstrated hatred of the "heretics, thieves, drunkards and rabble" he recorded a number of valuable, if controversial, observations about them and rendered their cause better known outside Bohemia. He also touched upon the influence of the Germans on the

[34] *Aeneae Silvii Historia Bohemica*. Ed. Dana Martínková, Alena Hadravová, and Jiří Matl (Prague: Koniasch Latin Press, 1998): XXXIII.
[35] Kaminsky, *A History*, 356–357.

introduction of the lay chalice in Bohemia. In his opinion, it was explicitly Peter of Dresden who convinced Jacobellus of Misa, the leading theoretician of the Czech reformist party, of the necessity for the lay chalice. Interestingly, he is the only one to openly claim that a certain group of Germans had left Bohemia some time earlier only to return there after a short period:[37]

> "Nondum error de sacramento altaris irrepserat, sed attulit novam pestem Petrus Drasensis (id est oppidum Misnae super Albim situm), qui cum aliis Theutonibus paulo ante Bohemiam reliquerat, cognitus inter suos, quia Valdensi lepra infectus esset, patria pulsus; velut haereticorum asylum Pragam repetiit puerorumque docendorum curam accepit. Apud ecclesiam sancti Michaelis per id temporis populum praedicando instruebat Iacobellus Misnensis, litterarum doctrina et morum praestantia iuxta clarus. Petrus aggressus mirari se ait doctum et sanctum virum, qui divina eloquia plebibus exponeret, errorem illum non animadvertisse communionis eucharistiae."

In accordance with his informant Papoušek, Piccolomini states that the circle of people surrounding Peter of Dresden also exerted influence on Jacobellus on the point of Utraquism. He also repeats, though in clearer words, that Peter together with other Germans had been chased away from Prague and lived in Germany from where he was again expelled because of his Waldensian views. More interestingly, after this, he says that only Peter returned to Prague where he took up teaching.

The credibility of this unique source has been the subject of long discussion.[38] What should be noted is that every piece of information put forward by this source should be treated with due respect but also with caution and meticulous consideration as regards its truth-value. Again, it needs to be stressed that this source is *sensu stricto* not contemporary with the Dresden School but was written some years later.

Anonymous tract

A short anonymous account elaborates on the very same theme and provides information on the reasons for the expulsion of the masters from Dresden as well as a list of some of their

---

[36] Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 58.

[37] *Aeneae Silvii Historia Bohemica*, 94–96. Apart from this bilingual Latin – Czech edition, the most recent critical edition with a translation and commentary in an accessible language is: Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, *Historia Bohemica*, ed. Joseph Hejnic and Hans Rothe, vol. 1 *Historisch-kritische Ausgabe des lateinischen Textes*, ed. Joseph Hejnic, German translation by Eugen Udolph, 236–239 (Köln, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2005).

[38] For a concise summary of literature on this topic, see Šmahel's foreword to the *Aeneae Silvii Historia Bohemica*, XLI–LII, LXXXV–XCVII.

other tenets.[39] This source suggests that the group left Dresden as a direct consequence of the decree by the bishop Rudolph of Meissen, issued on 18 October 1411. This decree prohibited teaching the Bible and Canon law in secondary schools,[40] and thus, establishes the *terminus post quem* of the Dresdeners' arrival in Prague:

> "Circa annum Domini MCCCCXII in civitate draznensi, Misnensis diocesis, cui tunc praesidebat in episcopatu Joannes dictus Ochmanus, vir fama optima praeclarus et in omni scientiarum genere doctissimus et maturus moribus, Petrus et Nicolaus puerorum eruditores in ipsius nominata civitatis draznensis schola plurimas curiosas moventes questiones illas non sunt veriti juxta capita sua contra auctoritatem sacrae scripturae et sanctorum decretorum sinistre definire inter quas etiam hac movebatur questio: an laicis sit porrigenda communio duplicis speciei videlicet panis et vini in eucharistie sacramento? Quibus questionibus scholarium multitudinem suorum multipliciter infecerunt. Que eorum doctrina cum ad aures viri clarissimi domini Joannis episcopi supra nominati pervenisset, mox ipsos Petrum et Nicolaum cum eorum doctrinae faventibus excludi jussit et eliminari de episcopatu Misnensi. Qui tandem Pragensem ingressi urbem lupi sub pelle ovina per fautorum suorum auxilia et novitatum amatores, quandam domum in civitate nova juxta fossam antique civitatis possederunt et pluralitatem scholarium collegerunt. Et inter alias eorum versucias dogmati faverunt: purgatorium post hanc vitam animarum non esse. Quod sanctorum suffragia non sunt invocanda. Quod papa sive Romanus pontifex sit antichristus cum clero sibi subjecto et quod communio eucharistie sub duplici specie laicis sit administranda et cetere plures eorum erant sinistre, quas docebant, fantasie."

By mistake the account identified the Meissen bishop as John Hoffmann, a fact that hindered acceptance of its reliability. John Hoffmann was a bishop in Dresden in 1427–1451, which would have moved the dating of the Dresdeners' expulsion to a later date.[41] According to Boehmer,[42] the report was written by an educated cleric who shared his views with the Roman-orientated scholars at Prague University and who possibly belonged to the same

---

[39] It was first printed by Franz Martin Pelzel, *Lebensgeschichte des Römischen und Böhmischen Königs Wenceslaus*, vol. 2 (Prague – Leipzig: in der von Schönfeldischen=Meißnerischen Buchhandlung, 1790), 156–158 (appendix), later by Konstantin Höfler in *Geschichtschreiber der Hussitischen Bewegung in Böhmen* 3, 156–158 (footnote 1).

[40] *Urkunden der Markgrafen von Meissen und Landgrafen von Thüringen 1407–1418*. Codex diplomaticus Saxoniae regiae I, Abtheilung B, vol. III. Ed. Hubert Ermisch (Leipzig: Giesecke&Devrient, 1909), 203–204, no. 220.

[41] Pelzel in his edition dated this event to 1417 and this date consequently found its way into modern literature, see for example Dieter Girgensohn, *Peter von Pulkau und die Wiedereinführung des Laienkelches*. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), 130. Romolo Cegna in *Nicolai … Puncta*, 13, argues that Hoffmann issued the decree as Bishop Rudolph's coadjutor – this assumption, however, is not probable as the source clearly talks of the residential bishop and there is no other evidence that Hoffmann assumed such an important position shortly after his leaving Prague; on Hoffmann's life see Blanka Zilynská, "Johann Hoffmann: Prager Student, antihussitischer Repräsentant und Bischof von Meissen," *Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis* XLIX/2 (2009): 81–98, especially p. 89–90.

[42] Boehmer, "Magister Peter," 218–220.

generation as Prokop (1392/3–ca. 1482), a scribe of the Prague New Town. Nevertheless, this cleric was independent of Enea Silvio Piccolomini, Laurence of Březová or of any other well-known sources although he was not very well informed about the situation outside Bohemia.

The anonymous tract is preserved in a single manuscript that the cataloguer dated to the second half of the 15th century and this dating cannot be specified with more precision.[43] The content of this manuscript is rather interesting. It is entitled *Articuli Picardorum* and it does indeed contain anti-Hussite material aimed against the Táborite faction, starting with a tract by John of Příbram against Utraquism. This tract is followed by another one on the same topic composed by John de Palomar, a Spanish theologian active at the Council of Basil, and by other works concerned with the question of administering the communion *sub utraque*. Interestingly, the report on the Dresdeners in this manuscript is recorded immediately after the text of the decree of the Council of Constance prohibiting this practice. This decree is also a coherent part of one of Nicholas of Dresden's works in support of Utraquism.[44] The connection with the question of Utraquism stresses the intention of this report on the Dresdeners. Therefore, the fact that the story of the Dresdeners is recorded here can only be understood as another testimony concerning Peter's role in the introduction of the lay chalice. The report would otherwise not fit in with the context of the manuscript. At any rate, the content also attests to a later origin for this manuscript. Thus, the original source of this story cannot be considered contemporary with the activities of the Dresden School in Prague.

What is more interesting, nevertheless, is that this anonymous report is the first to provide a deeper insight into the scope of activities of the Dresdeners. It claims that Peter and a certain Nicholas already discussed "interesting" questions at the school which they ran in Dresden and due to which they were expelled from that city. In Prague, they attracted *pluralitas scholarium*, which is a unique note on the scope of the Dresdeners' impact in Prague. The

[43] The manuscript XIX C 17 is presently housed in the National Library of the Czech Republic in Prague, see Alena Richterová, *Děčínské rukopisy ze sbírky Františka Martina Pelcla (1734–1801), nyní ve fondech Národní knihovny České republiky* (The Děčín manuscripts from the collection of František Martin Pelcl (1734–1801), now in the National Library of the Czech Republic) (Prague: Národní knihovna, 2007), 197–201. The information provided by Pavel Spunar, *Repertorium auctorum Bohemorum provectum idearum post Universitatem Pragensem conditam illustrans*, vol. 2 (Warsaw and Prague: Academia Scientiarum Polona – Academia Scientiarum Bohemica, 1995), 217, no. 463 erroneously connects this report with manuscript XIX A 50, a copy of the Old Czech Annals written at the beginning of the 17th century.

[44] The *Apologia*, as this tract is usually entitled, is available in a critical edition: *Nicolai Dresdensis Apologia. De conclusionibus doctorum in Constantia de materia sanguinis*. Ed. Petra Mutlová (Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2015).

concrete questions and opinions of the Dresdeners that are mentioned in this report will be examined in detail later.

The beginnings of Hussitism (Počátkové husitství)

The so-called Czech rhymed chronicle "Počátkové husitství" (The beginnings of Hussitism),[45] a short anti-Hussite piece of work reports that a group of scholars together with their students, upon their expulsion from Dresden, settled down in Prague, where they had at their disposal a house called At the Black Rose that belonged to the Czech university nation. The reason for their expulsion from Dresden was apparently their administration of the sacrament under both species. The Czech text reads:[46]

> "Na příkopě u Černé ruože
> mistři a bakalářové drážďanští bydléchu
> a tu bursu mějíchu,
> mistr Petr, mistr Mikuláš,
> Engliš a Nikolaus Loripes.
> Ti z Drážďan vyhnáni bíchu,
> neb tajně boží krev rozdáváchu.
> To počechu mistru Jičínovi raditi,
> aby počal krev boží rozdávati,
> a Jičín se toho přichopi
> a mistra Jakúbka k sobě namluvi
> a jiných kněží mnoho,
> aby se drželi toho."

The names of the masters were sometimes understood as referring to four different persons, although more often scholars saw only two persons behind them.[47] The Peter in question was sometimes identified with Peter Payne or Peter of Dresden, both of them connected to the Dresden School in other sources as well. Peter Payne associated himself with the Dresden masters only in Prague some time after 1414, that is, after Hus's departure to Constance. Mikuláš, Czech for Nicholas, was understood to be certain Nicholas, possibly a son of Lawrence – as might be deduced from *Lorizes* as a variant of *filius Laurentii*; some

[45] "Počátkové husitství" (The beginnings of Hussitism). In *Veršované skladby doby husitské*, ed. František Svejkovský (Prague: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd, 1963), 156–163.
[46] "Počátkové husitství," 158–159.
[47] Boehmer, "Magister Peter," 216–217 thinks there were three people concerned and provides a German translation of the text: "In diesem Jahre (1415) wohnten in Prag am Graben bei der schwarzen Rose die Magister und Baccalaureen aus Dresden und hatten dort ihre Burse. Diese waren Magister Peter, Magister Nikolaus Englisch und Nikolaus Loripes. Sie waren aus Dresden verjagt worden. Denn sie hatten heimlich Gottes Blut

scholars perceive him as an otherwise unknown Nicholas with the cognomen *Loripes*.[48] The only novelty of this testimony is the mention of the university degrees, that is, that the school comprised masters and bachelors and that both Peter and Nicholas held master degrees. The question of Utraquism is not connected here with Jacobellus but with Master Jičín, a later representative of a radical Hussite faction.

The dating of this piece is impossible to establish with any precision. It was suggested that because of its textual congruence in several important details with sources from the second half of the 15th century or the beginning of the 16th century, the rhymed chronicle might have been composed around this time.[49] On the other hand, the fact that it vividly describes events of the early 15th century shifts its dating to an earlier period. Its authorship is sometimes attributed to Prokop, the author of a later Latin chronicle, with the assumption that this piece might represent a preparatory stage in his later work.

Chronicon Procopii notarii Pragensis

Another important source that mentions the Dresden School in Prague is a fragment of a chronicle written by Prokop (1392/3–ca. 1482), a scribe of the Prague New Town, who started his work around 1476. His short narrative most probably represents only a draft or preparatory notes for a chronicle and the latest events recorded here fall in the year 1419. It also mentions the story of Peter of Dresden influencing Jacobellus on the matter of the lay chalice and goes on to describe some other activities of the Dresdeners' followers:[50]

> "Tunc Theutunici de Draždan habentes scolam in Nova Civitate penes nigram Rosam, specialiter Petrus, qui suasit Jacobello communionem calicis ad populum, portaverunt tabulas contra apostolicum scriptas et pictas, qualiter Christus in asello et apostoli nudi pedes ipsum secuntur et papa cum cardinalibus in mulis et in vestibus pomposi incedunt, dicentes ad papam: Ecce vita dissimilis! et alias plures tabulas, et sic populum ab obedientia abstraxerunt et suas sectas multiplicabant, legitimis sacerdotibus tunc exclusis."

Prokop's narrative is the first source to give some insight into the activity of the School' members in Prague other than their previously mentioned teaching endeavors. The procession

---

ausgeteilt. Sie begannen dem Magister Giczin zu raten, daß er Gottes Blut austeilte. Giczin fing es an und beredete den Magister Jakobell und andere Priester, daß sie sich darnach hielten."

[48] Jan Sedlák, *Mikuláš z Drážďan* (Nicholas of Dresden) (Brno: Hlídka, 1914), 3, note 1.

[49] An overview of older hypotheses can be found in Svejkovský, *Veršované skladby*, 40–41.

[50] Printed by Konstantin Höfler, *Geschichtschreiber der Hussitischen Bewegung in Böhmen* 1. Fontes rerum Austriacarum I, *Scriptores*, vol. 2 (Vienna: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1856), 67–76, esp. 72.

where the painted boards were carried had to do with the tumultuous events in Prague in 1414 and so it seems that the Dresdeners quickly won some supporters over to their ideas.[51] In connection with the Dresdeners' supporters, Prokop also recorded the case of the so-called Lipnice ordinations, an event when a number of Hussite followers were ordained priests at the castle of Lipnice in 1417, whereby the most radical of them secured their parochial living.[52] Even though Prokop did not mention any names, we know from other sources that this group included two supporters of the Dresden School, John Drändorf and Bartholomew Rautenstock.

In his work, Prokop drew extensively on Piccolomini's *Historia Bohemica* and also incorporated several passages from the Hussite chronicle of Laurence of Březová.[53] Generally, Prokop included only a few of his personal memories and the chronological sequence of the described events is very uneven. Nevertheless, he was well acquainted with the setting of Prague University, where he himself was awarded a Bachelor of Arts by Jan Hus in 1410. Thus, he learnt about events that have a special bearing on the history of the Dresden School (such as the above-mentioned street riots in Prague or the Lipnice ordinations) from his own experience.[54] The quality of Prokop's compilation was recently discussed by Šmahel,[55] but despite its rather chaotic character it should be emphasized that Prokop was an important eyewitness to the events he described, even if he did so somewhat later and with the animosity of an opponent.

---

[51] The antithetical scenes comparing Christ with the pope mentioned by Prokop was a well-known theme at that time. In Bohemia it was often connected with Nicholas of Dresden's treatise *Tabule veteris et novi coloris* and its later adaptations in the richly illuminated Göttingen and Jena codices. The processes are described by František Svejkovský, "Divadlo raného a vrcholného feudalismu a krize divadla za husitství" (Theatre in the early and high Feudalism and the crisis of theatre during the Hussite period), in *Dějiny českého divadla*, vol. 1, ed. František Černý and others (Prague: Academia, 1968), 82. Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 25, note 136, connects the events with the period between 1415 and 1417.

[52] For a detailed explanation of this event, see Kaminsky, "Hussite Radicalism," 122–123, note 3.

[53] The places that he adopted from Enea Silvio Piccolomini were analyzed by Adolf Bachmann, "Beiträge zur Kunde böhmischer Geschichtsquellen des XIV. und XV. Jahrhunderts," *Mittheilungen der Vereines für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen* 35/3 (1896/97): 214–222. Addenda in Rudolf Urbánek, K počátkům kronikářské činnosti kancléře Nového města Pražského Prokopa písaře (On the beginnings of the chronicle of Prokop, the chancellor of the Prague New Town), in *Sborník prací k poctě 75. narozenin akademika Václava Vojtíška*, ed. Václav Husa (Prague: Universita Karlova, 1958), 157–178.

[54] Originally a mild supporter of the Utraquist practice, Prokop made his career in the Prague chancery. On his life and work, see *Lexikon české literatury. Osobnosti, díla, instituce* (Lexicon of Czech literature. Personalities, works, institutions), vol. 3/2, *P–Ř*, ed. Jiří Opelík (Prague: Academia, 2000), 1116–1117.

[55] František Šmahel, "Návraty bájné kněžny Libuše a jiné folklórní záznamy v publicistice husitského věku" (Returns of Princess Libuše and other folkloric accounts in reports from the Hussite era), in *Querite primum regnum Dei. Sborník příspěvků k poctě Jany Nechutové*, ed. Helena Krmíčková et al. (Brno: Matice moravská, FF MU, 2006), 538–539.

Addenda

There are other minor notes in the manuscript material that contain additional information about some of the members of the Dresden School, most of which are concerned with the introduction of the lay chalice.[56] These sources – which are connected with single individuals and thus, cannot be regarded as general evidence pertaining to the Dresden School – will be discussed later on in connection with the relevant men. Only one such note touches on the existence of the Dresden School and therefore should be presented here:[57]

> "Ista scripta ad hunc sensum hereticum collecta sunt redacta in hanc formam per Draznenses, qui de Drazna expulsi plurimos seduxerunt, qui eciam nec de purgatorio, quod est, nec de suffragiis sanctorum tenuerunt oppositum docendo."

This note is preserved in a manuscript in the Metropolitan Chapter Library in Prague at the end of a treatise by Nicholas of Dresden, one of the leading members of the School, known as *Tabule veteris et novi coloris*. The codex contains a number of Hussite polemics, many of which are related to the problem of Utraquism. They were copied by an opponent of the Hussites as various notes similar in tone to the one presented above reveal. Even though it was copied at a later stage (the cataloguer suggests a date between 1480 and 1490), it shows that there was widespread knowledge among the Hussite adversaries about the German circle being expelled from Dresden, understandably with an underlining resentful note on their having settled in Prague and having had such a strong influence in the events there.

[56] Such as a note in the manuscript of the Prague National Library, XI D 8 where a text entitled *Articuli sacerdotum hereticorum et Pikharditarum* mentions the name of Peter of Dresden in connection with Utraquism. This short text was printed by Konstantin Höfler, *Geschichtschreiber der Hussitischen Bewegung in Böhmen* 1, 508–514, esp. 509. Another interesting note appears in an old catalogue of the Bohemian Nation College Library from ca. 1420: manuscript B 53 is described as "Item glosa ordinaria Draznensis super prophetas", see *Catalogi librorum vetustissimi universitatis Pragensis. Die ältesten Bücherkataloge der Prager Universität*, ed. František Šmahel and Zuzana Silagiová. Corpus christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 271 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2015), 64.

[57] Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, A 79/5, fol. 261r. Catalogued by Adolf Patera and Antonín Podlaha, *Soupis rukopisů knihovny metropolitní kapituly pražské* (Catalogue of manuscripts of the Metropolitan Chapter Library in Prague), vol. 1 (Prague: Česká akademie císaře Františka Josefa pro vědy, slovesnost a umění, 1910), 103–105.

Summary

The contemporary primary material contains information about certain Germans who, upon being expelled from Dresden, settled in Prague some time at the beginning of the 15th century, more precisely around 1414. Nevertheless, this seems to be the only positive evidence that can be gleaned from the sources as the remainder of the events is not at all clear. The majority of the sources mention that they came from Dresden. Only Enea Silvio Piccolomini claims that Peter along with some other Germans was already active in Prague earlier – he does not specify the reason why they left, but if it really happened it might have been connected with the so-called Kutná Hora Decree issued in 1409.[58] Since he drew much on John Papoušek, it is striking that Papoušek's own words about the Dresdeners' earlier activity in Prague are rather vague. As a matter of fact, he only says that the Germans influenced the Bohemians "plus quam prius". Nevertheless, the passage is not explicit as it can be understood as referring to the previously mentioned "heretici de Anglia" who might have "infected" the kingdom in a more substantial manner than they had earlier as the result of, for example, Wyclif's teachings. The insertion in Laurence of Březová's chronicle is even more doubtful, but even if we accepted its testimony, it refers only to Peter's stay in Prague. Given the contradictory state of the facts, the issue cannot be resolved and will require comparison with the biographical data of the relevant individuals. Therefore, the question of the Dresdeners' movements between Bohemia and Germany must be left open for the time being.

Peter of Dresden's name appears in the majority of the sources and his role as a school master in Dresden is positively confirmed. There are mentions of other Germans, but the only other name that we encounter is that of a certain Nicholas. In connection with the pre-Prague period, however, his name is reported only in the anonymous account. The Czech rhymed chronicle talks about Peter and Nicholas in connection with the *bursa* in Prague and does not necessarily state that both Peter and Nicholas were active in Dresden. Moreover, the reference

[58] This decree secured three out of the total four votes at the Prague University for the 'Bohemian nation' and as a result, a number of teachers and students of other nationalities, mostly Germans, left Prague. It is still debated how high this number actually was. Nevertheless, it is generally accepted that the numbers must have been between 700–800 individuals, even though there are opinions that it may have been even smaller. See Ferdinand Seibt, "Von Prag bis Rostock: Zur Gründung der Universitäten in Mitteleuropa," in *Festschrift für Walter Schlesinger*, ed. Helmut Beumann (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1973), 406–426; or more recently František Šmahel, "The Kuttenberg Decree and the Withdrawal of the German Students from Prague in 1409: A Discussion," in *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter*, 159–171; Martin Nodl, *Das Kuttenberger Dekret von 1409. Von der Eintracht zum Konflikt der Prager Universitätsnationen* (Köln – Weimar – Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 2017).

may point at Peter Payne as well. He certainly could have joined the group only later in Prague. Therefore, except for Peter of Dresden, no other person can be clearly connected with the School in Dresden if only the primary narrative sources are taken into account.

It is also indicated that the agitation activity of the group inspired and moved many people and that it was precisely because of the anti-papal character of this activity that the group was expelled from Dresden. The date of their expulsion is fixed as of 18 October 1411. Most of the sources connect the expulsion with their support of the lay chalice, but we hear of other tenets supported by them, too. Only in one case are these tenets proclaimed specifically Waldensian. Even though among the *curiosas questiones* that the Dresden masters debated we can find a denial of purgatory, the authority of the Holy Scripture and other controversial issues, the discussion without exception always revolves around the role of the Dresdeners in the introduction of the lay chalice.

The descriptions of the group mostly resort to the use of terms such as *scholars* or sometimes *clerics*. The sources equally stress the erudition of the members of the group. As for their teaching activities, we hear that they had a school in Dresden. As for Prague, we are told that they lived in a *bursa* and that they attracted "pluralitatem scholarium" – which does not necessarily mean that they ran a school there. Only Enea Silvio Piccolomini says that Peter "puerorum docendorum curam accipit" (undertook the teaching of boys) in Prague but then it is worth noting that when talking about Peter being expelled from Prague, Piccolomini states that Peter left with some other Germans; but when it comes to the return, only Peter is mentioned. The teaching activity of the group as an institutional body therefore lacks a firm basis in the sources mentioned here.

Once established in Prague, the Germans quickly became associates of the Czech representatives of the Reform movement who provided the group with a refuge at the Black Rose House that belonged to the Bohemian University nation. The Dresdeners pursued some sort of teaching practice there, which was presumably very popular among the Czechs. Students or supporters of these Germans are then connected with some of the street riots and processions that had an important impact on the situation in Prague before the outburst of the Hussite wars.

All in all, the small pieces of information found in individual reports, even when put together, do not provide a clear picture of events surrounding the Dresdeners. If we take into

account the earliest sources written at the time when the Dresden masters were supposedly in Prague, we can see that they mostly refer to some Dredeners (only sometimes specifically to Peter of Dresden) and the Dresdeners' role in the introduction of the lay chalice. As it has been conclusively demonstrated that the beginnings of Utraquism in Prague are connected with the activities of Jacobellus of Misa with support from Nicholas of Dresden,[59] these statements must be regarded as misleading or not useful data for identifying the School's origins. As a matter of fact, it was only Enea Silvio Piccolomini who blamed Peter of Dresden and consequently external German sources for the dissemination of Utraquism in Bohemia. Here again it must be stressed that Piccolomini's report must be treated with caution. If we disregard the information provided by his chronicle (and those that drew on him), a slightly different, although more obscure picture of the history of the group takes shape. All of a sudden, it is clear that the only positive piece of information we possess is the one cited at the beginning of this overview: that there were some Germans around Peter of Dresden who were expelled from Dresden and who found refuge in Prague. Not a determinate group and not a school in terms of an institutional body of scholars. Therefore, the necessary next step in disentangling the riddle of the Dresden School's history is to assemble all available biographical details about the people involved in it and bring these details together with the data described above.

[59] The authoritative discussion of the origins of Utraquism in Bohemia is Helena Krmíčková, *Studie a texty k počátkům kalicha v Čechách* (Studies and texts concerning the beginnings of the lay chalice in Bohemia) (Brno: Masaryk University, 1997), where a firm chronology of the events was established.

People Involved: Biographies

The analysis of the contemporary narrative sources showed that the only piece of hard evidence related to the Dresden School is that Peter of Dresden taught in Dresden at the *Kreuzschule* and later moved to Prague, possibly accompanied by other Germans. Yet there were other names mentioned in the above texts and thus biographical data available for each of the alleged members of the Dresden School will be summarized now. This rather dim picture will be supplemented by information from another significant source type, namely the inquisitional protocols, which are available because some of the Dresdeners were burnt at the stake.[60] The most valuable information is recorded in the protocol of John Drändorf and Peter Turnau's interrogation, which contains some other names as well. Moreover, as most of the Dresdeners were considered to be educated to a higher level, university registers of relevant institutions constitute a source of primary importance. The following portraits therefore present all prosopographical data that could be gleaned from the available sources.

Peter of Dresden, Friedrich Eppinge and Nicholas of Dresden belonged to what can be called the first generation of the Dresden School and their names were (even though not in the most reliable way) recorded in the previously described narrative sources. The primary narrative sources suggest that these teachers had a number of students who can be considered the second generation of the School. However, the names of these students were not mentioned and the only source of information about them is constituted by the records of their inquisitional trials. The only exception is the name of Peter Payne, who was active in Prague only after 1414 and who is believed to have belonged to the circle of people influenced by the Dresden School in later phases. This must be mentioned in advance in order to explain the fact that the biographies of the individuals belonging to the "second generation" of the Dresden School are, in most cases, even sketchier than those of Peter and Nicholas of Dresden or Friedrich Eppinge. In all of these cases, I will concentrate on finding out which of these men can be connected to the activities of the Dresden School in Dresden and later in Prague, as

[60] This group was once called a "Märtyrerschule" by Boehmer, "Magister Peter," 228, subsequently used by Kaminsky as a "School for Martyrs", see Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 26.

well as the connections of each of these individuals to each other. My aim is to elucidate the blurred picture provided by the historiographical sources analyzed above.

Nicholas of Dresden

In spite of probably being the best known member of this group, Nicholas remains an obscure figure as concerns his life and activities. The nature of the sources does not permit firmly identifying his nationality as either German or Czech. Opinions also differ as to whether he was born in Bohemia and then left Prague for Germany, or whether he came to Prague only after having spent most of his youth in Germany. His affiliation with the Dresden School is not entirely clear either.

Most of the earlier studies on Nicholas's life were hindered by a lack of edited sources. What is known of Nicholas's adolescence is a case in point. According to one of his own treatises, the *Expositio super Pater noster*, he spent eleven years in a cathedral town.[61] Many researchers attempted to come up with a possible solution of this allusion and their dating of this period often disturbed their otherwise plausible theories concerning Nicholas's life. The fact that this passage was only a textual borrowing from Thomas of Cantimpre's treatise *Bonum universale de apibus* was elucidated only years later by Romolo Cegna.[62] There are many more pieces of this puzzle.[63]

UNCERTAINTIES CONCERNING NICHOLAS'S LIFE

Two widespread but contradicting opinions have long prevailed in Czech scholarship concerning his family background. Josef Truhlář identified him with the bachelor Nicolaus de Drossen who was promoted at the Faculty of Arts of Prague University in 1396 under the aegis of a certain Peter de Drozena, as they are called in the *Liber decanorum* of Prague University.[64] The confusion of Drossen with Dresden is suggestive but at any rate one

[61] *Nicolai Dresdensis Expositio super Pater noster*. Ed. Jana Nechutová and Romolo Cegna. Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum 30 (1990), 162: "Ego in quadam civitate episcopali annis XI adolevi, ubi LXII canonici sub prebendis pigwissimis ducentarum fere librarum pariziensium in matre ecclesia serviebant, quorum plures erant beneficiorum plurium detentores."

[62] Cegna first published his discovery in "La tradition pénitentielle des Vaudois et des Hussites et Nicolas de Dresde," *Communio viatorum* 25 (1982): 163–164.

[63] Most recent summary of Nicholas's biography is in *Nicolai Dresdensis Apologia*, 11–28.

[64] Based on an entry in *Liber decanorum facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Pragensis*, vol. 1/1, 317–318, the identification was suggested by Václav Vladivoj Tomek, *Dějepis města Prahy* (Topography of the city of Prague), vol. 3 (Prague: 1875), 623, n. 34; also Josef Truhlář, "Paběrky z rukopisů Klementinských" (Gleanings

occurrence of a similar place-name in this type of source cannot be considered conclusive. Moreover, it was argued that these two men came from Drozno in the diocese of Lubusz (Brandenburg), and not from Dresden.[65] Nevertheless, some researchers take it for granted that Nicholas studied in Prague.[66] Bartoš subsequently pointed out the many similarities in Nicholas's life with that of Nicholas of Prague, a Bachelor in Decrees.[67] He backed up his hypothesis by the argument that Nicholas was the son of an Old Town citizen, Michal Sedlář, and that he preached in St. Mary of the Lake and later perhaps worked as a vicar at the Saint Martin in the Wall's. According to Bartoš, the family moved to Prague in the 1380s and Nicholas got his cognomen "of Dresden" only upon associating himself with the German masters who came from Dresden. Nevertheless, it was later discovered that a certain bachelor, Nicholas of Prague, worked as a procurator at the Prague consistory between 1402 and 1415 and thus, his identification with our Nicholas is not possible.[68]

The other theory was voiced by Jan Sedlák, who accepted the manuscript evidence[69] and believed that Nicholas was born in Dresden and later moved to Prague. He had certain reservations as to whether Nicholas had studied at Prague University but was sure that he was a Bachelor of Arts, possibly studied law and was ordained a priest.[70] He suggested dating Nicholas's arrival in Prague to a time before 1408 because this was when there arose a controversy over swearing oaths in which, he believed, Nicholas took part by penning a sharp rejection of such a practice.[71] This suggestion was subsequently refuted since the tract in

---

from the Klementinum manuscripts), *Věstník České Akademie císaře Františka Josefa pro vědy, společnost a umění* 7 (1898): 662; this information was later taken by Tříška, *Životopisný slovník*, 388, 446.

[65] František Michálek Bartoš, *Husitství a cizina* (Hussitism and Foreign Countries) (Prague: Čin, 1931), 127–128.

[66] Joseph Theodor Müller, "Magister Nikolaus von Dresden," *Zeitschrift für Brüdergeschichte* 9 (1915): 83; Jutta Fliege, "Eine hussitische Sammelhandschrift in der Stadtbibliothek Dessau," *Studien zum Buch- und Bibliothekswesen* 4 (1986): 31; Franz Machilek, "Deutsche Hussiten," in *Jan Hus zwischen Zeiten, Völkern, Konfessionen: Vorträge des internationalen Symposions in Bayeruth vom 22. bis 26. September 1993*, ed. Ferdinand Seibt (Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1997), 271.

[67] Bartoš, *Husitství a cizina*, 125–131.

[68] Tříška, *Životopisný slovník*, 412–413; Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 157, n. 166.

[69] A manuscript preserved in the National Library, Prague, III G 9, on fol. 71r and fol. 142v reads *tractatus magistri Nycolay de Drazna*; another manuscript from the same library, V G 19, fol. 251ra reads *sermo ... factus per Nicolaum baccalarium decretorum*; and the same collection contains manuscript V F 22 which on fol. 1r reads *sermo ... factus ... per reverendum presbyterum dominum Nicolaum de Drazna etc*. Similar notes can be found in other material as well.

[70] Sedlák, *Mikuláš*, 1–7. A similar opinion was also held by Müller, "Magister Nikolaus," 83; or Matthew Spinka, *John Hus. A Biography* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1968), 150.

[71] Sedlák, *Mikuláš*, 2; the text in question is Nicholas's *De iuramento*, see Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 30, no. 10.

question can only be dated to a period after 1414.[72] Sedlák also rejected the evidence of Enea Silvio Piccolomini, later Pope Pius II, who wrote a valuable piece on the history of Bohemia,[73] and who maintained that Nicholas together with his colleagues left Prague after 1409 as a result of the so-called Kutná Hora Decree.[74] Sedlák believed that Nicholas did not leave Prague at all because one of the Dresdeners, John Drändorf, confessed that he had studied in Dresden under the masters Peter and Friedrich Eppinge, and not Nicholas.[75] Only when these two men came to Prague, which according to Sedlák happened sometimes around 1411–1412, did Nicholas become their colleague at the School at the Black Rose House.

An important editor of several of Nicholas's treatises, Romolo Cegna, contributed several valuable suggestions to his biography.[76] It was mentioned earlier that it was Cegna who refuted Nicholas's alleged autobiographical reference of having spent his youth in a cathedral town as only a textual borrowing.[77] The main novelty of Cegna's hypothesis is his argument that after 1409, that is, after the issuing of the Kutná Hora Decree, Nicholas left Prague for Wildungen, a small town in Hessen where he took up a post of as rector of a local school. There he came upon the idea of the necessity of the lay chalice, which he later convinced his colleagues of after his return to Prague. Cegna's theory was mostly inspired by his belief in Nicholas's primacy and principal merit in the dispute over the necessity of the lay chalice. Cegna's fundamental argument for this theory rested on dating Nicholas's Utraquist treatise,

---

[72] František Michálek Bartoš, "Studie k Husovi a jeho době. 1. Hus a valdenství" (Studies on Hus and his Times. 1. Hus and Waldensianism), *Časopis Národního muzea* 89 (1915): 2–5; Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 9–10, 30.

[73] Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, *Historia Bohemica*, 3 vols., ed. Joseph Hejnic and Hans Rothe (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2005). More about this source in the preceding chapter.

[74] See above, 25.

[75] Drändorf's inquisitional protocol was edited by Hermann Heimpel, ed., *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren aus dem Jahre 1425: Akten der Prozesse gegen die deutschen Hussiten Johannes Drändorf und Peter Turnau, sowie gegen Drändorfs Diener Martin Borchard* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1969), 55–97, 145–195.

[76] Cegna directed his attention to Nicholas's life in a number of studies, among others see: Romolo Cegna, "Appunti su Valdismo e Ussitismo. La teologia sociale di Nicola della Rosa Nera (Cerruc)," *Bollettino della Società di Studi Valdesi* 130–131 (1971–1972): 3–34, 3–42; idem, "Ancora un incontro con Nicola di Cerruc detto da Dresda," *Communio viatorum* 20 (1977): 17–32; idem, "Początki utrakwizmu w Czechach w latach 1412–1415" (The beginnings of Utraquism in Bohemia in the years 1412–1415), *Przeglad Historyczny* 69 (1978): 103–114; idem, "Encore sur Nicolas de Dresde," *Communio viatorum* 22 (1979): 277–281; idem, "La tradition penitentielle des Vaudois et des Hussites et Nicolas de Dresde," *Communio viatorum* 25 (1982): 137–170; idem, "La Scuola della Rosa Nera e Nicola detto da Dresda (1380?–1417?), Maestro tedesco al Collegio della Rosa Nera in Praga (1412–1415)" in *Nicolai Dresdensis Expositio super Pater noster*, 5–102; idem, "De fraternitate Christi (Variazioni sul pensiero di Nicola della Rosa Nera detto da Dresda)," in *In memoriam Josefa Macka (1922–1991)*, ed. Miloslav Polívka and František Šmahel (Prague: Historický ústav, 1996), 87–101; *Nicolai ... Puncta*, 5–28; idem, "Nicola della Rosa Nera e le origini del radicalismo antisimoniaco dello Speculum aureum," *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 34 (2001): 59–74. Other studies will be mentioned later.

[77] The mention can be read in *Nicolai Dresdensis Expositio super Pater noster*, 162.

the *Replica rectori scholarum in Corbach*, to a period between 1409 and 1411.[78] This, the largest Utraquist tract by Nicholas, was the cause of many disagreements and a number of contrary opinions. Most researchers[79] date the *Replica* to a period around or after the prohibition of the lay chalice issued by the Council of Constance in July 1415, and consider it a proof that Nicholas took an active part in the spread of Utraquism in Germany. At the same time, it is often stressed that the *Replica* does not bring any new arguments into the Utraquist debate. Since the text of the *Replica* survives in only one copy,[80] which is, moreover, badly preserved and still unedited, it is impossible to come up with any conclusive arguments concerning its precise dating. Nevertheless, it has been demonstrated through its textual comparison with Nicholas's other treatises that the *Replica* cannot be dated to the period around 1411, but only after 1415. Helena Krmíčková[81] compared parts of the *Replica* with the text of Nicholas's *Contra Gallum*,[82] which is firmly dated to 1415, as well as other texts. She could show conclusively that in the *Replica* Nicholas borrowed passages from his own earlier works as well as from those of his colleagues. She therefore argued that this tract should rather be seen as Nicholas's "literary Utraquist epilogue"[83] in which he compiled a huge number of authorities attesting to the necessity of the lay chalice in order to win his remaining opponents over.

NEW EVIDENCE

Even if the *Replica* is only dated to a later period in Nicholas's life, Cegna rightly pointed out one serious problem, namely that Nicholas's cognomen "of Dresden" lacks a proper explanation. Apart from a few mentions in the manuscript material and in contemporary chronicles, almost nothing is known about his family background or place of birth. This situation is hardly surprising for a medieval man of non-noble origin since the first occasion when such a person could appear in the sources might only be the time of his university

[78] Cegna developed his argument in the studies mentioned in the previous two notes. For basic data on *Replica*, see Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 31, no. 12.
[79] Sedlák, *Mikuláš*, 30; Müller, "Magister Nikolaus", 101, n. 38 even questions whether the *Replica* can be ascribed to Nicholas at all; Bartoš, *Husitství a cizina*, 153; Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 60, 157, 165.
[80] The manuscript is presently housed in Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, shelf-mark D 118 – Patera and Podlaha, *Soupis rukopisů knihovny metropolitní kapitoly pražské*, vol. 1, 407–409.
[81] Helena Krmíčková, *Studie a texty*, 62–85.
[82] The *Contra Gallum* is edited in her *Studie a texty*, 165–195. Krmíčková also compared the *Replica* with Jacobellus of Misa's *Salvator noster*, a tract that mentions Hus's death, i.e. it must have been written after July 6, 1415 at the earliest, but possibly even later.

enrolment. Neither Nicholas's childhood nor his studies can be associated with Dresden if one looks for direct evidence. Neither do previously analyzed narrative sources explicitly connect him with the Dresden period of the group. To be precise, in this context it is only the chronicle *Počátkové husitství* and an anonymous account that mention Nicholas's name. The former refers to the names of either two or four individuals, but either way presents them as members of the *collegium* in Prague, not in Dresden. The latter account explicitly refers to Nicholas as Peter of Dresden's colleague at the *Kreuzschule* in Dresden but since it also brings in other dubious pieces of information, its credibility can only be accepted with certain reservations. It must be stressed that all these reports come from an anti-Hussite milieu or from the Catholic inquisition. In sum, there does not seem to be enough evidence to connect Nicholas firmly with Dresden. Nevertheless, on historiographical grounds and due to lack of any other widespread name, it is acceptable to continue referring to Nicholas as "of Dresden".

To start with, it is necessary to consult the registers of all possible universities where Nicholas could have studied. As mentioned above, the possibility that Nicholas studied at Prague University cannot be accepted without reservation. Moreover, the condition of the primary sources for the history of Prague University hinder any conclusive explanation.[84] Until now Nicholas's name has not been located in any of the registers of the relevant neighbouring universities in Cracow, Vienna, Heidelberg, Cologne or Leipzig.[85] His name,

---

[83] Krmíčková, *Studie a texty*, 77.

[84] There is only a fragment remaining of the *matrica nationis Saxonum* from 1373–1375 and 1382–1383, edited by Ferdinand Doelle, "Ein Fragment der verlorengegangenen Prager Universitätsmatrikel aus dem 14. Jahrhundert," in *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle*, vol. 3. *Per la storia ecclesiastica e civile dell' età di mezzo* (Studi e testi, vol. 39) (Rome: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1924), 88–102; the *Liber decanorum* from 1367–1585 which only records examined students; and basically it is only the Law University register that exists in a complete form and Nicholas's name does not appear in it – *Album seu matricula facultatis juridicae universitatis pragensis ab anno Christi 1372, usque ad annum 1418*, edited in the *Monumenta historica universitatis Carolo-Ferdinandae Pragensis* series, vol. 2/1. See also the *Repertorium academicum Germanicum* that collects biographical and social data on the scholars who studied at universities in the Holy Roman Empire between 1250 and 1550: www.rag-online.org. For more on the history of Prague University and the sources, see *Dějiny Univerzity Karlovy* (History of the Charles University), vol. 1, *1347/48–1622*, ed. Michal Svatoš (Prague: Karolinum, 1995); or Jiří Kejř, *Dějiny pražské právnické univerzity* (History of Prague University of Law) (Prague: Karolinum, 1995).

[85] The foundation of Würzburg in 1402 was short-lived and it would not have been possible for Nicholas to study there – see for example, Peter A. Süß, *Grundzüge der Würzburger Universitätsgeschichte 1402–2002. Eine Zusammenschau*. (Neustadt an der Aisch: Degener, 2007). For the relevant registers, see *Album studiosorum universitatis Cracoviensis*, vol. 1, *Ab anno 1400 ad annum 1489*, ed. A. M. Kosterkiewicz (Cracoviae: Typis et impensis universitatis Jagellonicae, 1887); *Księga Promocji Wydziału Sztuk Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego z XV wieku (Liber promotionum Facultatis Artium in Universitate Cracoviensi saeculi decimi quinti)*, ed. Antoni Gąsiorowski (Cracow: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 2000); *Metryka Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego z lat 1400–1508* (Metrica Universitatis Cracoviensis a. 1400–1508), ed. Antoni Gąsiorowski, Tomasz Jurek and Izabela Skierska, 2 vols. (Cracow: Towarzystwo naukove – Societas Vistulana, 2004); *Die Matrikel der Universität*

however, is recorded in the bachelor's register of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Erfurt, a fact that has so far remained unrecognized in scholarship.[86] According to this source, "Nycolaus de Dresden" upon enrolment in the winter semester of 1402 took his BA exam in the spring semester of 1405 under dean Theodericus Leubing. His name cannot be traced in the register of the *magistri artium* and it can therefore be assumed that Nicholas continued his studies elsewhere.[87] It should be noted that the name of "Nycolaus Drosna Pragensis", mentioned above as possibly eing the same man as Nicholas of Dresden, is recorded in the registers of Erfurt University where he acquired his MA degree. Therefore these two figures cannot be identical.[88]

The gap in our knowledge therefore covers the period when Nicholas acquired further education, most importantly his profound legal knowledge. It would be most logical to assume that these were the approximately seven years Nicholas spent earning his *magister artium* or a degree in law. The manuscript material contains various hints as regards Nicholas's academic accomplishments. Several codices from Prague in which his treatises are preserved refer to him as a *magister artium* or *baccalarius decretorum*.[89]

Most striking are the following occurrences: An old catalogue of the Bohemian Nation College Library, whose origins can be dated to the 1420s, records the content of manuscript P 9 and entitles it *Tractatus magistri N[icolai] Drasnensis*.[90] Throughout the catalogue the

---

Wien, vol. 1, *1377–1450* (Graz and Köln: Böhlau in Komm., 1956); *Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg von 1386–1662*, vol. 1, *Von 1386 bis 1553*, ed. Gustav Toepke (Heidelberg: Selbstverlag des herausgegebers, 1884); *Die Rektorbücher der Universität Heidelberg 1: 1386–1410*, 3 vols., ed. Jürgen Miethke. (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1986–1999); *Die Matrikel der Universität Köln*, vol. 1, *1389–1475*, ed. Hermann Keussen (Bonn: Verlag von P. Hanstein, 1928); *Matrikel der Universität Leipzig*, ed. Georg Erler. Codex diplomaticus Saxoniae regiae, Hauptteil II, Band 16–17 (Leipzig: 1895–1897).

[86] *Das Bakkalarenregister der Artistenfakultät der Universität Erfurt 1392–1521*, ed. Rainer C. Schwinges and Klaus Wriedt (Jena and Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer Verlag, 1995), 11; the immatriculation year is recorded in Hermann J. C. Weissenborn, ed., *Acten der Erfurter Universitaet*, vol. 1, *1. Päpstliche Stiftungsbullen. 2. Statuten von 1447. 3. Allgemeine Studentenmatrikel, erste Hälfte (1392–1492)* (Geschichtquellen der Provinz Sachsen und angrenzender Gebiete, vol. 8) (Halle: Otto Hendel, 1881), 66; this man is (although with reservations) identified by Viktor Hantzsch with a person of the same name appearing in Leipzig in 1409, *Dresdner auf Universitäten vom 14. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert* (Dresden: Verlagshandlung Wilhelm Baensch, 1906), 12–13, whose list, however, contains further confusion and therefore I rely on the data recorded in the modern edition. On the wealthy family of Pistoris, see Heinrich Butte, *Geschichte Dresdens bis zur Reformationszeit* (Köln and Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1967), 104.

[87] Erich Kleineidam, *Universitas studii Erffordensis. Überblick über die Geschichte der Universität Erfurt im Mittelalter 1392–1521*, vol. 1, *1392–1460* (Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1964).

[88] *Das Bakkalarenregister*, 5. Nycolaus Drosna's record claims that he had studied in Prague in 1396. He continued his studies in Erfurt where he matriculated in 1398 and obtained his MA in 1403.

[89] See above, note 69.

[90] The manuscript in question has a new shelf-mark IV G 15 and contains several of Nicholas of Dresden's texts, see *Catalogi librorum*, 112. For more about the old catalogues, see František Šmahel, "Die Bücherkataloge des

grades are diligently corrected, as may be seen from several corrections of the titles, a fact that gives weight to its validity. This title is also consistent with manuscript III G 9 from the same library, which contains Nicholas's *Apologia* under the heading *tractatus magistri Nycolay de Drazdna*.[91] A note that reads *Expliciunt Puncta magistri Nicolai de D[razn]a* can be found in another manuscript.[92] The text of Nicholas's *Puncta* follows here a tract which can be dated by a scribal explicit to 17 February 1414, but based on its content the whole codex cannot be dated more precisely than to a time after 1419.[93] Most of the manuscripts mentioned are of Prague origin and the fact that his contemporaries regarded him as a *magister artium* could lead to the assumption that Nicholas indeed studied at Prague University and acquired his master degree here.

In this context, the evidence from manuscript V G 19, which finishes Nicholas's sermon on *Nisi manducaveritis* as "factus … per Nicolaum baccalarium decretorum", seems slightly ambiguous. It does not really seem feasible for Nicholas to have finished his master degree and acquired a bachelor degree in law between the winter semester of 1405 and the year 1412 when his presence in Prague is ascertained. Even though the testimony of this contemporary source cannot be waved aside very easily, one strong counter-argument exists. Namely, the relevant registers of the Law University of Prague, which survive in full length, do not record Nicholas's name.[94] The already complicated situation is further confused by one of the students at the Black Rose School in Prague, Bartholomew Rautenstock. Bartholomew confessed that he had studied in Prague with Nicholas whom he called "ein halber Meister, Schulmeister und Lehrer."[95] Rautenstock's statement, made before an inquisition, may suggest

---

Collegium nationis Bohemicae und des Collegium Reczkonis" in *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter*, 405–439. Helena Krmíčková, "Paběrky z rukopisů univerzitních" (Gleanings from the University manuscripts), in *Campana codex civitas. Miroslao Flodr octogenario* (Brno: Archiv města Brna, 2009), 179–211 added a number of valuable points to Šmahel's original dating.

[91] Josef Truhlář, *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum Latinorum, qui in c.r. Bibliotheca publica atque Universitatis Pragensis asservantur*, vol. 1 (Prague: Regia societas scientiarum Bohemicae, 1905), 212.

[92] The manuscript in question is Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 2148, fol. 156v. There is no modern catalogue for this codex, Basic information on it is provided by František Michálek Bartoš, "Husitika a bohemika několika knihoven německých a švýcarských" (Hussitica and bohemica from several German and Swiss libraries), *Zvláštní otisk z Věstníku Královské české společnosti nauk* 1931/1 (1932): 72–74.

[93] The *Puncta* are edited by Romolo Cegna in *Nicolai … Puncta*, 55–150.

[94] For prosopography of Prague University of Law, see (http://www1.cuni.cz/~borovic/matrika/index_en.htm), accessed 6 February 2017. See also Jiří Stočes, "Die Prager Juristenuniversität nach 1409 – Agonie, Auslaufmodel oder die Suche nach einem neuen Anfang?" *AUC–HUCP* XLIX/2 (2009): 65–70; idem, *Pražské univerzitní národy do roku 1409* (Prague University Nations until 1409) (Prague: Karolinum, 2010).

[95] This is what Rautenstock declared to his inquisitor, see *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. 2, ed. Ignaz von Döllinger (New York: B. Franklin, 1970), 628–629.

that due to Nicholas's aversion to the system of institutional education, or perhaps for other, more humble reasons, he simply never obtained any other degree.[96] It might also be possible that Nicholas, as a Bachelor of Law, was addressed as a half master as opposed to a holder of a Master of Arts degree since the faculty of law did not require its students to hold an MA degree upon entering.[97] At any rate, the conjecture that Nicholas matriculated at or graduated from the Law University in Prague rests on very uncertain grounds.

On the other hand, a strong argument for his close connection with Prague University is Nicholas's profound knowledge of the teachings of Matthias of Janov.[98] This influential Czech theologian of the previous generation (d. 1393) inspired many of the Hussite reformers although his works were spread almost exclusively in Bohemia. His main treatise, the *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, is one of the first systematic works of Czech reform theology but it came to the fore only at the beginning of the 15th century owing to Jacobellus of Misa and other Czech theologians. Janov's influence can be traced in Nicholas's works as well as in the work of Friedrich Eppinge, another member of the Dresden School. It therefore seems plausible that they learned about Janov's work in Prague. Even if this premise cannot be accepted unambiguously, it would be difficult for anyone to find evidence of Janov's works outside Bohemia and as a result, this fact adds weight to the likelihood that Nicholas really had a connection with Prague University.

In sum, contemporary documents that contain information about Nicholas's presence in Prague and regard him as a *magister artium* seemingly attest to his studies at that very university. The state of the extant registers of Prague University supports this hypothesis. Nicholas's undeniable legal erudition is evident in his rich literary production, although the place where he acquired it has not been identified. Most probably it was not at Prague University. The possibility that he was in touch with Prague University circles that kept him updated on topical issues without enrolling there may well explain his insider's knowledge. Nevertheless, that part that Nicholas played in the theological disputes is documented by the survival of numerous tracts that can only be dated to a period after 1412, a fact that somewhat weakens the supposition that he was resident in Prague before this date.

---

[96] Kejř, *Dějiny pražské právnické univerzity*, 92, declares that Nicholas's works, despite being full of quotations from Canon Law, do not correspond to the standard literature produced at the Law Universities.
[97] This explanation was voiced by Bartoš, *Husitství a cizina*, 127.
[98] On Janov, see Vlastimil Kybal, *M. Matěj z Janova. Jeho život, spisy a učení.* (M. Matthias of Janov. His life, works and doctrine) (Prague: Královská česká společnost nauk, 1905).

Therefore, the period between 1405 and 1412 remains obscure in Nicholas's biography. Since the dating of the *Replica* was shown to fall only in the period after 1415, the possibility that Nicholas spent this period as a rector of a local school in Wildungen must be rejected, too. He may have been residing in Dresden in close association with the German masters who left Prague after 1409 and pursued their teaching activities at a local school.[99] In that case, they would all have gone to Prague after the complaint of Bishop Rudolph of Meissen issued in 1411.[100] This opinion appears in the report of Enea Silvio Piccolomini and the above-mentioned anonymous account. On the other hand, the fact that John Drändorf does not mention Nicholas's name in connection with his studies in Dresden stands in the way of this supposition. Since this account was made before an inquisitor it cannot be considered fully reliable, although the omission of Nicholas's name (either as a fellow student or as a teacher) is rather curious. Consequently, the question where, if at all, Nicholas received further education after his *baccalaureatus artium* in Erfurt must be left open.

To establish when Nicholas started to live and work in Prague is equally difficult. As mentioned above, Jan Sedlák's original suggestion that Nicholas had already arrived in Prague around 1408 was shown to be false, but his dating of the group's arrival in 1411–1412 still holds true. A *de quodlibet* disputation held at Prague University in January 1412 was traditionally considered evidence of Nicholas's presence in Prague. Among the participants in this disputation, presided over by Michael of Malenice, there appears the name Nicolaus Desna.[101] The reconstruction of the participants in this disputation later showed that the listed

[99] Nicholas's activity at this *Kreuzschule* in Dresden was presented in a number of older, mostly German studies, for example Otto Meltzer, "Die Kreuzschule zu Dresden bis zur Einführung der Reformation (1539)," *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte und Topographie Dresdens unde seiner Umgebung* 7 (1886): 34; Herman Haupt, "Waldenserthum und Inquisition im südöstlichen Deutschland seit der Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts," *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 3 (1890): 356; Boehmer, "Magister Peter," 226; Horst Köpstein, "Ohlasy husitského revolučního hnutí v Německu (International reception of Hussitism)," in *Mezinárodní ohlas husitství*, ed. Josef Macek (Prague: Nakladatelství Československé Akademie věd, 1958), 234; Horst Köpstein, "Über die Teilnahme von Deutschen an der hussitischen revolutionären Bewegung – speziell in Böhmen," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 11/1 (1963): 133–134; Butte, *Geschichte Dresdens*, 107–108. One of the most recent studies on the *Kreuzschule*, however, denies that Nicholas had any association of Nicholas with this school, see Siegfried Hoyer, "Peter von Dresden und die Anfänge der Hussitenbewegung," *Dresdner Hefte. Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte* 65 (2001): 65. Despite his critical assessment of older sources, Hoyer still mentions Nicholas's childhood allegedly spent in some cathedral town (p. 68).

[100] His decree of 18 October 1411 prohibited teaching of certain tenets that might be associated with the circle around Peter of Dresden, for a more detailed account, see the preceding chapter, 18–21.

[101] Sedlák, *Mikuláš*, 4.

person was Nicholas of Desná, a different person.[102] Without being able to say whether Nicholas arrived in Prague together with the people from Dresden, it is possible to claim that he was active in Prague in 1412 at the latest. Apart from the testimonies derived from the narrative sources, a number of his treatises that survive in Prague can be dated to 1412 or to a period shortly afterwards and these treatises are tightly connected with contemporary events in Prague.

Prague provided refuge for Nicholas for a period of around three years. Nicholas certainly spent the time between 1412 and 1415 at the Black Rose House in Prague where the Bohemian nation of Prague University had a house. As one of the leading members of the Dresden masters who were active there, Nicholas quickly associated himself with the representatives of the Czech reformist party. The outcome of his interest in current issues was the production of a number of treatises which he composed during this period. Among the most important of these works were his contribution to the introduction of the lay chalice under both species, his rejection of simony and the existence of purgatory, his refusal to take oaths, his defence of the lay apostolate and his generally sharp critiques of the corrupt church.[103]

QUESTION MARKS CONCERNING NICHOLAS'S DEATH

The last question concerning Nicholas's life is the period after his departure from Prague. Some disagreement occurred between Nicholas and Prague University, represented by Jacobellus of Misa, concerning several theological topics such as the existence of purgatory. The most prevalent theory is that Nicholas's opinions became too radical for the official Czech representatives of the reformist movement, who had to coordinate the radical and the

[102] Jiří Kejř, "Z disputací na pražské univerzitě v době Husově a husitské" (On disputations at Prague University in the Times of Hus and Hussitism), *Sborník historický* 7 (1960): 65–69, esp. 68. For more about this dispute, see also František Šmahel, "Kvodlitební diskuse ke kvestii principalis Michala z Malenic roku 1412" (The *quodlibet* disputation on the *questio principalis* of Michal of Malenic from 1412), *AUC–HUCP* 21/1 (1981): 27–52. Biographical data on Nicholas of Dessna are in Tříška, *Životopisný slovník*, 388.

[103] Selected aspects of Nicholas's doctrine were analyzed by Nechutová, Jana, *Místo Mikuláše z Drážďan v raném reformačním myšlení* (Nicholas of Dresden's place in the early Reformation ideology) (Prague: Academia, 1967). His rich literary legacy comprises around two dozen treaties; the most recently compiled list of his writings is Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 28–32, updated by Cegna: *Nicola della Rosa Nera detto da Dresda (1380? – 1416?) De reliquiis et de veneratione sanctorum: De purgatorio*. Ed. Romolo Cegna. *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 23 (1977): 151–153; additions recorded by Jana Nechutová in her review of Cegna's work, see *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské university* C 13/15 (1966): 198–200; and by Pavel Spunar and Anežka Vidmanová in *Listy filologické* 90/2 (1967): 208–210. For the list of Nicholas's works, see below, 71–77.

conservative wings. Moreover, there was also a palpable shift among the Hussites from the general reform of the Church to a movement with more discernible elements of nation-oriented problems. This shift would not have appealed to Nicholas, who in consequence, left Prague. What precise events led to this end, however, is unknown.

Based on evidence of Nicholas'ss treatise entitled *Replica*, it has been suggested that upon leaving Prague some time after 1415 Nicholas took up a post of a rector of a local school in Wildungen, a small town in Hessen.[104] The *Replica* is seemingly written from the point of view of rector at a school in Wildungen who replies to his fellow rector in Corbach. Its text consists of material from several of Nicholas's tracts (*Contra Gallum*, *Apologia*), as well as from the works of Jacobellus of Missa (*Responsio*, *Salvator noster*). All of these tracts are allegedly quoted by the rector in Corbach to whom the author of the *Replica* replies. The possibility that it is not a real reply to a real letter seems to have been tacitly accepted but never discussed. It is quite unlikely that the rector of a local school in Corbach in Germany would invest so much energy first to obtain the treatises in question, second excerpt from them and third put together an invective addressed to a question that in 1415 was already "out of date." It would seem somewhat misplaced to voice such a fervent rejection of the practice after the long discussion about the theological justification of the necessity of the lay chalice that took place between the representatives of the Czech reform movement and Catholic theologians that led to the subsequent prohibition of the lay chalice by the Council of Constance in 1415. Rather, it seems likely that the *Replica* is only a fictitious discussion between two German rectors, and that it is rather an excerpt from all relevant Utraquist treatises, perhaps aimed at the dissemination of the idea. In short, Wildungen in all probability did not provide a home for Nicholas after his departure from Prague.

There is a widespread opinion that Nicholas very likely died a martyr's death in Meissen.[105] In a treatise refuting Nicholas's *De purgatorio* in 1417, a further unknown canon

[104] See above, p. 31–32.

[105] Sedlák, *Mikuláš*, 7; Bartoš, *Husitství a cizina*, 141; Kaminsky, *A History*, 204; Cegna, *Nicola della Rosa Nera ... De reliquiis*, 39; Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 60, although in another study: *Idea národa v husitských Čechách* (The idea of a nation in the Hussite Bohemia) (Prague: Argo, 2000), 127, note 4, Šmahel stresses that there is no conclusive evidence related to the end of Nicholas's life. With reservations this is recorded also by Machilek, "Von der 'Dresdner Schule' in Prag," 63; Fudge, *The Memory and Motivation of Jan Hus, Medieval Priest and Martyr* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 213. A number of scholars accept Nicholas's death in Meissen as well, possibly because it is mentioned in the *Lexikon des Mittelalters*.

Šimon of Litovel referred to the esteem in which Nicholas was held due to his life and his martyrdom, although he did not specify where Nicholas died:[106]

> "Emersit in diebus nostris, scil. circa annum 1417 quidam, ut dicitur, Nicolaus de Czerrucz… cuius assercioni quam multos invenio consentaneos tum ex persone gravitate, quam non novi secundum faciem, sed pluribus audivi commendatam… Que persona eciam dicitur post vitam penitenciamque strictam dicitur duxisse et sanguinem suum fertur pro Christo effudisse."

Another small piece of evidence is an allusion made by John Želivský, a radical preacher in the New Town of Prague, who in a public speach in 1419 mentioned how Nicholas suffered martyrdom in Meissen:[107]

> "O, quantum venenum fuit porrectum magistro Iohanni Huss, Ieronimo, sive Michaheli in Polonia et Nicolao sacerdoti Cristi in Misna {et hic a magistris in Praga}, non vos nocuit, quia non consenserunt."

Želivský's position as a radical preacher, who above all was striving to attract the attention of his public, should be considered when judging his actions and proclamations. The possibility that his words may only represent the call of a fervent opponent of the Church familiar with the circumstances must be taken into consideration, too. Sadly, it is impossible to find any evidence to reinforce the truth of these statements and thus both of the above references must be treated as circumstantial evidence for Nicholas's martyrdom in Meissen. Nevertheless, the absence of other sources makes their testimony plausible.

One of the latest contributions to Nicholas's biography was presented by Jutta Fliege who discovered one of Nicholas's previously unknown sermons,[108] the *Sermo ad clerum factus per dominum Nicolaum predicatorem theutunicorum in Zacz in anno domini MoCCCCXVI* (henceforth *Sermo 1416*), in a copy presently housed in a library in Dessau, Germany. Based

---

[106] The treatise is preserved in a manuscript in the Metropolitan Chapter Library in Prague, D 52, fol. 48r–88r (above quotation from fol. 51v), following Nicholas's *De purgatorio*, which is entitled here as *Errores Nicolai de Czerucz Theotonici contra purgatorium, quos receperunt et defenderunt Thaborite cum ceteris malis*. Cegna, *Nicola della Rosa Nera … De reliquiis*, 7–9, contains longer passages from this text. Patera and Podlaha, *Soupis rukopisů knihovny metropolitní kapitoly pražské*, vol. 1, 361 note that the treatise is ascribed to Simon de Witowia in the contents of the manuscript. I have not bee able to find a person of this name in the relevant lists of canons.

[107] Jan Želivský, *Dochovaná kázání z roku 1419* (Surviving sermons from 1419), ed. Amedeo Molnár, vol. 1 (Prague: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd, 1953), 126–127. The note on the Prague masters in brackets was added in the margin of the singular extant copy of this text, most probably by the scribe while revising it.

on its heading, Fliege argued that it is possible that Nicholas worked, even if only for a short time, as a German preacher in Žatec, a royal town in north-western Bohemia. The text of the *Sermo 1416* can be found in one more copy, namely in a manuscript in Koblenz that contains two other texts by Nicholas and more importantly is of better quality as far as the wording of the text is concerned.[109] This second codex, however, lacks the heading identifying Nicholas with a German preacher in the above-mentioned town. The area of north-western Bohemia traditionally supported the Hussite movement and Žatec was an important political, economical and ecclesiastical centre of Bohemia at that time.[110] Even in earlier times the area was permeated by supporters of different heresies such as the Waldensians. Notably, Peter Payne, a colleague of the Dresden masters at the Black Rose House School in Prague, stayed in Žatec several times. Žatec was the birthplace of several leading figures of the Hussite movement and numerous alumni of its renowned municipal school became graduates of Prague University.[111] The population of the town was multifarious as far as its nationality and religion were concerned and there were nine parish churches, a number surprisingly high even in a Central European context. That is why there were preachers for the German population as well as for the Czechs. Unfortunatelly, the hypothesis that Nicholas was active as a German preacher in Žatec cannot be substantiated by the sources.[112] Yet it is quite plausible that

---

[108] Fliege, "Eine hussitische Sammelhandschrift," 25–35.

[109] Landeshauptarchiv Koblenz, shelf-mark Best. 701 Nr. 198, fol. 201ra–204vb; it contains Nicholas's *Apologia* and *Puncta*. A critical edition of the *Sermo 1416* is available in my study "Mikuláše z Drážďan Sermo ad clerum 1416, kritická edice" (Nicholas of Dresden's Sermo ad clerum 1416, a critical edition), *Studia historica Brunensia* 62/1 (2015): 295–312.

[110] For the history of the town, see for example Petr Holodňák and Ivana Ebelová, ed., *Žatec* (Prague: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2004).

[111] A case study dealing with a famous citizen of Žatec with a general introduction was presented by Petr Hlaváček, "Curriculum vitae domini Wieczemili (†1411), plebani ecclesiae beatae Mariae virginis in Zacz. Poznámky k církevnímu životu v královském městě Žatci na přelomu 14. a 15. století" (Curriculum vitae domini Wieczemili (†1411), plebani ecclesiae beatae Mariae virginis in Zacz. Comments on the ecclesiastical life in the royal town of Žatec at the turn of the 14th and 15th centuries), *Sborník okresního archivu v Lounech* X (2001): 34–47.

[112] Ludwig Schlesinger, *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Saaz bis zum Jahre 1526* (Prague, Leipzig, and Vienna: Selbstverlag des Vereines für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen, 1892) does not record any person by the name of Nicholas who could have held the post of preacher in Žatec between 1412 to 1419, when, according to Želivský, Nicholas died, and who could be identified with Nicholas of Dresden. The few mentions of this name pertain to different persons; those who remain unidentified do not fit with what we know of Nicholas of Dresden's life – for example "Nicolaus de … presb. Prag. dioc." who was confirmed as an altar priest at the St. Mary's in Žatec in June 18, 1403 (n. 273, 122). However, the futility of such endeavours, that is, attempting to identify a preacher in Žatec, can be illustrated by another reference: namely, a preacher in Žatec by the name of Nicholas is recorded in an inquisitional process against a tailor, Matthew Hagen, which took place in Berlin in April and June 1458. He confessed that he had been ordained a priest in Žatec by Friedrich Reiser in the presence of Nicholas, a bishop of the same sect. The editor of the inquisitional protocol proposed that this Nicholas could

Nicholas, on his way from Prague, stopped in Žatec where he preached to the German population. This journey of his might have then ended in Meissen, as his colleague John Želivský suggested.

Nothing more can be added to Nicholas's biography. If the testimony of the primary sources is accepted uncritically, it could be said that Nicholas was a German, who studied in Erfurt and at Prague University, from where he left for Dresden, later came back and actively participated in the theoretical disputes before the outbreak of the Hussite wars. After the split with his Czech colleagues he left Prague again and travelling through Žatec he journeyed to Meissen, where his life ended when he was burnt at the stake. If we appraise the sources critically, however, it is not possible to accept most of these suppositions. The picture of his life suddenly becomes quite blurred and the only facts that become certain are that Nicholas studied in Erfurt and subsequently worked in Prague where he composed a number of theoretical treatises calling for a change in the contemporary Church.

Peter of Dresden

Although the most frequently appearing piece of information in the above-mentioned narrative sources is that Peter was the person behind the introduction of the lay chalice in Prague, this idea has now been discarded by historians.[113] The survey of the narrative sources revealed the following: Peter was a German master who led an honest life and taught in Dresden together with Nicholas of Dresden. Because of their interest and discussion of certain heretical ideas, they were both expelled by the local bishop from the Meissen diocese. Subsequently, Peter moved to Prague and continued his teaching activities there. Two sources mention that Peter had lived in Prague before the time he spent in Dresden: Enea Silvio Piccolomini specifically relates that Peter first left Bohemia with some other Germans and accused him of having connections with the Waldensians in Germany. Taking into account the reliability of the narrative sources discussed in the previous chapter, it is necessary to reassess the validity of these statements as regards Peter's biography with extreme caution.

---

be identified with Nicholas Biskupec of Pelhřimov, see Dietrich Kurze, *Quellen zur Kerzergeschichte Brandenburgs und Pommerns* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1975) 7, 294, 300.

[113] See above, 27.

Nothing is known about Peter's family background or earlier life until the time of his studies, although it is sometimes mentioned that he was born around 1365.[114] Probably due to Piccolomini's influence, it has been widely accepted that Peter was active in Prague some time before 1409 and that he returned around 1412.[115] It is also believed that Peter's leaving Prague had to do with a change in 1409 in the administration at Prague University where he formerly studied.[116] The question of whether Peter had studied in Prague or not is crucial for the beginning of his academic career. There are ambiguities in the entries of the register of the Faculty of Arts, where more than one name appears that could theoretically be identified with the Peter in question.

STUDIES IN PRAGUE

First of all, a certain Petrus de Dreste received his bachelor degree in 1374.[117] There also appears a Petrus de Drosena, who took his bachelor exam in 1379, the same name (Petrus de Drosna) is recorded as passing his MA examination in 1386[118] and subsequently, in 1395, Mag. Petrus de Droszna entered the Faculty of Law.[119] Moreover, the list of ordinands from the Prague diocese contains the name of Mgr. Petrus Kerszner de Drosna (or Korszner-Drosna), canonicus eccl. Lubucen., who was ordained a subdeacon in Prague in 1396 and a deacon in 1397[120] while the Lubuc in question can be identified with the small city of Lebus in

---

[114] For instance by František Šmahel in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 6, 1993. CD–ROM. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag, 2000; Machilek, "Von der 'Dresdner Schule' in Prag," 60.

[115] This was accepted mostly in the older German literature, for instance Otto Meltzer, "Die Kreuzschule zu Dresden," 33–34; Otto Meltzer, "Ein Traktat Peters von Dresden," *Dresdner Geschichtsblätter* 16/4 (1907): 193–202; Otto Richter, "Dresdens Bedeutung in der Geschichte," *Dresdner Geschichtsblätter* 16/4 (1907): 185.

[116] For more detail on the Kutná Hora Decree issued in 1409, see above, 25. The opinion that Peter studied in Prague is accepted with some hesitancy by a number of scholars. His studies in Prague are accepted as fact by Haupt, "Waldenserthum und Inquisition," 356; Richter, "Dresdens Bedeutung," 185; Girgensohn, *Peter von Pulkau*, 133; Machilek, "Deutsche Hussiten," 271; others take a more cautious position and believe it only likely that he had studied in Prague: Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 58.

[117] *Liber decanorum* 1/1, 159. This person (sometimes ascribed a mistaken year for his promotion as 1373) is identified with Peter of Dresden by Mathilde Uhlirz, "Petrus von Dresden. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Laienkelches," *Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereines für die Geschichte Mährens und Schlesiens* 18 (1914): 236; Boehmer, "Magister Peter," 225; Köpstein, "Über die Teilnahme", 135; Girgensohn, *Peter von Pulkau*, 133; Butte, *Geschichte Dresdens*, 106.

[118] *Liber decanorum* 1/1, 188, 236. His name appears in 1376 as an *assessor* and examiner (*ibid.*, 312, 315, 318, 324).

[119] *Album seu matricula facultatis juridicae*, 147.

[120] Antonius Podlaha, ed., *Liber ordinationum cleri*, vol. 9/1, *1395–1399* (Prague: Sumptibus s. f. metropolitani capituli Pragensis, 1910), 25, 33; a searchable database for the *Liber ordinationum cleri* is available in Eva Doležalová, *Svěcenci pražské diecéze 1395–1416* (Ordinands of the Prague dioceses 1395–1416) (Prague: Historický ústav, 2010).

Brandenburg. The occurrences of these names came, over time, to be understood as one person, although some scholars suggested that they might refer to two or more different figures.[121] The reason why Petrus of Drosna might be different from Peter of Dresden rests on the fact that the former promoted a certain Nicholas Drossen for a Bachelor of Arts in Prague in 1397. In older literature, this Nicholas was identified with Nicholas of Dresden.[122] Although this identification is a false one, it does not disprove the identification of Peter of Drosna with Peter of Dresden. Since Peter's name cannot be located in the registers of any other university, it seems very likely that one of the above names from Prague University's registers pertains to Peter of Dresden. The question then remains which one of the Peters who studied in Prague might be identical with Peter of Dresden.

Therefore, there is no reason against accepting the data from the primary source of the university and believing that either Peter of Dreste received a BA degree from Prague University in 1374 or that Peter of Drosna who had come from Brandenburg, received an MA degree and a degree in Law from the same university. Either of them could have also been ordained a priest in 1396–1397, but the similarity of names makes it more likely that in such a case it would have been the Peter from Brandenburg. Peter's subsequent destiny, i.e. the fact that he left Prague, makes it more difficult to connect him with the ordained priest and a bachelor of law. Moreover, the fact that Peter of Dresden is addressed only as a *master* by the majority of the primary sources casts further doubts on the connection between him and a well-educated man with a degree in law such as the above-mentioned Peter from Brandenburg. On the other hand, the fact that according to the sources Peter of Dreste earned only a bachelor degree in Prague might be explained by the fragmentary nature of the university registers. At any rate, all the above presented conjectures must remain at the level of hypothesis. All that can be said is that Peter of Dresden most probably studied in Prague in the last quarter of the 14th century.

[121] Tříška, *Životopisný slovník*, 446, understood these occurrences as referring to one person with the exception of Petrus de Dreste. Doubts whether the canon of Lubusz (Lebus) diocese can be identified with Peter of Dresden were articulated by Bartoš, *Husitství a cizina*, 127–128. Hoyer, "Peter von Dresden," 63, rejects that Drosna or Drozna can be a Latin variant of Dresden. *Orbis Latinus* [http://www.columbia.edu/acis/ets/Graesse/orblatd.html], however, does not record Drosna in any variant.
[122] See Nicholas of Dresden's biography above, 29–30.

SUBSEQUENT DESTINY – THE *KREUZSCHULE*

Concerning Peter's subsequent destiny, it has been pointed out that his name can be found in a *Schenkbücher* from Nuremberg in 1405, a fact that was broadly recognized in modern scholarship.[123] There, Peter was supposedly in touch with the local Waldensians.[124] Subsequently, the oldest *Stadtbuch* of Dresden records the name of Magister Petrus Gerticz in 1406,[125] a name identified with a Peter who had studied in Prague and later had connections with the *Kreuzschule*. Another securely recorded fact is that between this date and his return to Prague some time after 1412, Peter held the position of rector at the *Kreuzschule* in Dresden.[126] His activities at the *Kreuzschule* are again not very lucidly documented. His name is found among the rectors of the above-mentioned school, although without exact information about how long he held the office. In 1407, a certain Andreas, the rector who preceded him in the office is recorded in the sources, then the office was vacant for some time and in 1413 Peter's successor, Nicolaus Thirmann, is already recorded as issuing a new school order.[127] For his predecessor Andreas there is only evidence that he held the office in 1407 without the date of his termination. The same applies to Peter but the series of rectors in Dresden is sketchy even for later periods.[128] It has not been satisfactorily explained yet how or why Peter was assigned to this post. If, as is known, Peter was not active in Dresden in the period preceding his installation, the question arises upon what grounds did the council decide to take him on. Siegfried Hoyer rightly voiced the question why a person connected to Waldensian heresy (as Peter was in Nuremberg in 1405) would be asigned such an important function.[129] He links his appointment with the evidence from the Dresden *Stadtbuch* which records Peter's donation to the poor in the above town in 1406 and puts forward a theory that Peter was

[123] Franz Machilek, "Ein Eichstätter Inquisitionsverfahren aus dem Jahre 1460," *Jahrbuch für fränkische Landesforschung* 34/35 (1975): 441. Machilek pointed to a manuscript presently in Staatsarchiv Nuremberg, Nürnberger Amts- und Standbücher, Nr. 313, fol. 96v. Peter's stay in Nuremberg is referred to in more recent literature, see Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 58; Alexander Patschovsky, "Häresien," in Walter Brandmüller, ed., *Handbuch der bayerischen Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 1, *Von den Anfängen bis zur Schwelle der Neuzeit* 2. *Das kirchliche Leben* (St. Ottilien: Eos Verlag, 1999), 766.
[124] Machilek, "Von der 'Dresdner Schule' in Prag," 60.
[125] Elisabeth Boer, *Das älteste Stadtbuch von Dresden 1404–1436* (Dresden: Historische kommission der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, 1963), 8; *Die drei ältesten Stadbücher Dresdens (1404–1476)*. Ed. Jens Klingner, Robert Mund, Thomas Kübler, and Jörg Oberste (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag 2007), 98.
[126] Meltzer, "Die Kreuzschule zu Dresden," 33–34.
[127] Meltzer, "Die Kreuzschule zu Dresden," 32–33.
[128] Otto Richter, *Geschichte der Stadt Dresden* (Dresden: Baensch, 1900), 265.
[129] Hoyer, "Peter von Dresden," 64.

connected to Dresden through "origin, kin or previous activity" or else he would not have given money to an entirely foreign place. Yet this could be also a shrewdly targeted gift aimed at securing a profitable position. The office of headmaster was often connected with that of the town scribe, but in Peter's case this was probably not so.[130] The rectors of the *Kreuzschule* were also traditionally expected to hold an MA degree, as was usual in other places at that time, and thus it strengthens the supposition that Peter received a higher degree from Prague University. This would also solve the slightly problematic point that Friedrich Eppinge, a Bachelor in Canon Law from Heidelberg and thus a holder of a higher academic degree, worked under Peter's rectorship at the *Kreuzschule*. At any rate, Peter appointed two masters as his *locati*, or under-teachers, who were known by the names of Friedrich and Nicholas; Friedrich was identical with Friedrich Eppinge. Peter's activity as rector marked a thriving period at the *Kreuzschule*.

Nevertheless, the time Peter spent in Dresden did not last too long. In October 1411, a decree regulating the curriculum in secondary schools was issued by Rudolph, bishop of Meissen, which was very likely directed at Peter's activity at the *Kreuzschule*.[131] It might also be possible that the decree was meant to strengthen the position of the newly founded university in Leipzig and not only to regulate secondary schools, as was also argued.[132] Yet it seems that Peter left Dresden under normal circumstances as his successor mentions his rectorship in a collegial tone.

From Dresden to Prague or via detour?

Around 1411, Peter possibly left Dresden with other colleagues and moved to Zittau, where he might have stopped for a few months – his student from Dresden, John Drändorf, spent here some time between 1411 and 1412. The group is subsequently traceable in Prague in the summer of 1412 at the latest.

Before the Prague period, however, Peter is believed to have done one more detour. It has been claimed that Peter worked as a teacher in Chemnitz and Zwickau at some point: According to the *Chronicon Chemicensis*, Peter held a rectorship in Chemnitz in 1414 after he

[130] This idea is also rejected by Butte, *Geschichte Dresden*, 107.
[131] For more about this decree, see above, 19.
[132] Hoyer, "Peter von Dresden," 66.

fled from Dresden.[133] However, this piece of information without doubt comes from a later source. The most likely source are the *Annales urbis Misnae* composed by Georgius Fabricius in 1569 who recorded that in 1410 *Petrus ille rediit in Misniam, et ludi moderator fuit primum in patria, deinde Chemnicii et Zuiccauiae*.[134] Thereafter, the sequence of Peter's travels has been interpreted differently in a number of sources.[135] Nevertheless, it does not seem very plausible that Peter could have left Dresden around 1411, travel through Chemnitz and Zwickau, and then return to Prague by way of Zittau in 1412 at the latest. On the other hand, from a geographical point of view, it seems acceptable that setting out from Nuremberg in 1405 Peter could have had time to spend some time in Zwickau and Chemnitz before settling for a few years in Dresden (perhaps even in 1406), from where he later moved through Zittau to Prague.

All in all, because Peter's departure from Prague was formerly connected with the Kutná Hora Decree of 1409, older scholarship accepted that Peter held the office of rector at the *Kreuzschule* only around 1409–1412.[136] Nevertheless, if the above-listed evidence is taken into account, it seems more logical that Peter already took over this office some time after 1406 and held it until 1411, or shortly before 1412. The hypothesis that Peter left Prague much earlier than 1409 is supported by other minor points, such as his stay in Nuremberg in 1405 and the evidence that he was in Dresden in 1406 (granted his identification with Petrus Gerticz is correct), and possibly also by the short interruption of his journey in Zwickau and Chemnitz. Afterwards he travelled through Zittau to Prague (a fact that none of the above sources contradicts) where he appeared at latest in 1412.

---

[133] Explicit reference to this chronicle as a source of this information appears in Cristianvs Schoettgenivs, *Dissertativncvla de Antiqvissimis literarvm in terris svperioris Saxoniae fatis* (Dresden: Harpeter 1748), 19.

[134] Georgius Fabricius Chemnicensis, "Annalium urbis Misnae liber secundus", in *Rerum Misnicarum libri VII.* (Leipzig: E. Voegelin, 1569), 140.

[135] Fabricius' information was challenged already in the 17th century, for example, Johann-Christophorus, *Dissertatio historica de Petro Dresdensi* (Leipzig: Ch. Michaelis, 1678), par. 17, 98–99 cites Fabricius's opinion but argues that Fabricius got the date (i.e. 1410) wrong – he maintains that Peter left Prague only once in 1409, subsequently accepted the post of teacher in Dresden, then Chemnitz and Zwickau and returned to Prague only around 1414. An obscure description is offered for example by Eduard Machatschek, *Geschichte der Bischhöfe des Hochstiftes Meissen in chronologischer Reihenfolge* (Dresden: C.C. Meinhold & Söhne, 1884), 369, 385. Butte, *Geschichte Dresdens*, 107, mentions without any reference to sources that Peter, upon leaving Prague around 1409, travelled through Zwickau where there was a Waldensian community. Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 25–26, suggests that Peter travelled the other way around, namely, that he travelled through Zwickau to Dresden.

[136] Haupt, "Waldenserthum und Inquisition," 356; Uhlirz, "Petrus von Dresden," 229; Boehmer, "Magister Peter," 227 and others. Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 158–159 discusses why a later date for the

Once in Prague, Peter's activity is better recorded by the narrative sources. He played an important role at the bursa which the German masters ran in the house at the Black Rose in the New Town of Prague. He was mentioned as a teacher by some of the students. Peter's efforts here were long associated with the introduction of the lay chalice, which is now known to be inaccurate. It seems that Nicholas of Dresden took over the role of leading ideologist of the circle while Peter continued to mostly carry out his teaching duties. This leaves the view of his reformist activities rather obscure. During the period in Prague Peter allegedly wrote several treatises, although his authorship of some of them is very questionable.[137] Most confusing is his authorship of a highly popular Aristotelian compendium which is profusely quoted in the scholarly literature.[138] His literary production will be discussed in detail below.

PETER OF DRESDEN'S DEATH

How long Peter was active in Prague is another difficult issue. Different places and years of his death are given, ranging from 1421 up to 1427. The confusion stems from two contradicting testimonies. The majority of older sources knew of a Peter who was burnt in Regensburg in connection with the processes against Ulrich Grünsleder and Heinrich Ratgebe from Gotha who were burnt at the stake in 1421 and 1423, respectively. First, the unknown author of the *Farrago historica rerum Ratisponensium*, a compilation of older and by now lost sources from after 1519, mentioned that *sacerdos magister Petrus de Dräsen* was caught and burnt in Regensburg under the authority of Bishop Johann of Streitberg (1421–1428).[139] This evidence was bolstered by Laurentius Hochwart (died 1570), bishop of Regensburg, who composed a *Catalogus episcoporum Ratisponensium*, in which he described the same story about *Petrus de Draesen*.[140] The wording of the pertinent passage in these two sources is not

---

Dresdeners arrival in Prague, mentioned in some sources, is not acceptable. He argues that Peter and his colleagues were already in Prague by 1412.

[137] One of the first, tentative overviews of Peter's works was printed by František Michálek Bartoš, "Nové spisy Petra a Mikuláše z Drážďan (New works of Peter and Nicholas of Dresden)," *Reformační sborník* 8 (1941): 66–67.

[138] Most often based on Charles H. Lohr, "Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries, Authors: Narcissus – Richardus," *Traditio* 28 (1972): 352–354.

[139] *Anonymi Ratisbonensis Farrago Historica rerum Ratisponensium ab Anno Christi DVIII usque ad Annum Christi MDXIX*. Ed. Andreas Felix Oefelius. Rerum Boicarum scriptores nusquam antehac editi 2 (Augustae Vindelicorum sumptibus Ignatii Adami et Francisci Antonii Veith bibliopolarum, 1763), 511.

[140] *Laurentii Hochwarti canonici Ratisp. Catalogus episcoporum Ratisponensium in libros III divisus*. Ed. Andreas Felix Oefelius. Rerum Boicarum scriptores nusquam antehac editi, vol. 1 (Augustae Vindelicorum sumptibus Ignatii Adami et Francisci Antonii Veith bibliopolarum, 1763), 217.

very clear and the event could have taken place any time between 1421 and 1423.[141] On the other hand, a student of the Dresden School, John Drändorf, told the inquisitors during his interrogation on February 13, 1425 that Peter and Friedrich Eppinge both died in Prague.[142] The precise wording, *ambo obierunt Pragae*, was later explained through conjecture as *ambo abierint Pragam*, i.e. that they both left Prague instead of having died in Prague.[143] The result was that scholars either accepted that Peter died in Regensburg, although they ascribed the event to different years, or maintained that he stayed in Prague and died a natural death there. This conjecture was later rejected by the modern editor of Drändorf's inquisitional protocol who found a new copy of the text. In the newly discovered manuscript the passage clearly reads *ambo obierunt Prage* and, thus, the editor concluded that the matter must be decided in favor of Peter's natural death in Prague.[144] However, subsequent scholarship still varies in its opinion concerning Peter's death.[145]

Friedrich Eppinge

Eppinge's name is not recorded in any of the above-mentioned primary sources with the single exception of John Drändorf's inquisitional protocol, in which he is named as one of Drändorf's teachers. Even though his biographical data are rather sketchy, the few events that are known indicate that Friedrich Eppinge was an influential lawyer who left a marked if short imprint on pre-Hussite Prague.

[141] Thus, the opinion that Peter's death occured in 1421 was held by Richter, *Geschichte der Stadt Dresden*, 56 and Butte, *Geschichte Dresden*, 108. Girgensohn, *Peter von Pulkau*, 133 thought that Peter might have died between 1421–1423, while Boehmer, "Magister Peter," 228 suggested that his death took place between 1421–1425 (Drandorf's death). A date of death in 1423 was accepted by Horst Köpstein, "Zu den Auswirkungen der hussitischen revolutionären Bewegung in Franken," in *Aus 500 Jahren deutsch-tschechoslowakischer Geschichte*, ed. Karl Obermann and Josef Polišenský (Berlin: Rütten&Loening, 1958), 15. Machatschek, *Geschichte*, 369 suggests an even later date – 1427.

[142] Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 69. That Peter died in Prague was accepted by Uhlirz, "Petrus von Dresden,"236. Also Haupt, "Waldenserthum und Inquisition," 358 expressed doubts whether the Peter burnt in Regensburg in 1421 is identical with Peter of Dresden who, according to Drändorf, died in Prague.

[143] Meltzer, "Ein Traktat," 197–198.

[144] Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 159.

[145] Patschovsky in the *Handbuch der bayerischen Kirchengeschichte*, 767 holds that there are grounds to believe that Peter died in Regensburg in connection with the processes that took place between 1421–1423; Hoyer, "Peter von Dresden," 68 rejects the idea that Peter died in Regensburg; Machilek, "Deutsche Hussiten," 271 also claims that contrary to earlier opinions Peter died in Prague; the same opinion is held by Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 58.

For a time, Eppinge was identified with a certain Friedrich of Dresden, who received a Bachelor of Arts at Prague University in 1401,[146] but examination of the registers of Heidelberg University has disproved this identification.[147] Friedrich Eppinge studied in Heidelberg at the Faculty of Arts in 1395, recieved a bachelor degree there on 10 January, 1398 and was promoted to *magister artium* on 2 April, 1403. Finally, he recieved his bachelor degree in law on 2 April, 1405. The registers record his name in the following forms: *Fredericus Zvelis, clericus Traiectensis dyocesis*; *Eppighen de Swele*; *Friedricus Eppinge, clericus Traiectensis dyocesis*; or simply *Fridericus Eppinghen*. The closest form to *Zwele* listed in *Orbis Latinus* is *Swollis* or *Zwolla*, that is, the capital city of the province of Overijssel in the Netherlands, which in the Middle Ages belonged to the diocese of Utrecht. Thus, *Traiectum* mentioned in the registers can be understood only as *Traiectum ad Rhenum*, that is, Utrecht, and not *Traiectum ad Mosam* – Maastricht or any other place name.[148] It was at Heidelberg University that Eppinge may have heard a dispute held by Master Jerome of Prague in April 1406, which caused quite a stir due to its defence of Wyclif's Realist ideas.[149] Heidelberg University took the necessary measures which may have resulted in Eppinge's departure. However, there is no other evidence beyond the fact that he was not active at this university after this date. Some scholars suggested that Eppinge departed to Prague where he joined university circles while others oppose this point because Eppinge was never enrolled there.[150] It has also been suggested that if Eppinge had gone to Prague, he would have left it after the Kutná Hora Decree in 1409 together with Peter of Dresden and other Germans.[151] As has been shown above, there are no grounds to believe that Peter of Dresden left Prague at this point although Eppinge might have joined other German masters leaving Prague University in

[146] *Liber decanorum* 1/1, 354–355; accepted by Meltzer, "Die Kreuzschule zu Dresden," 34, 55; Boehmer, "Magister Peter," 226; Köpstein, "Über die Teilnahme", 138 and other older literature. Also Kaminsky, *A History*, 83 mentions that "there is reason to believe that … Eppinge and Peter of Dresden had been members of the University of Prague."

[147] Already registered by Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 159–160. *Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg*, vol. 1, 60; vol. 2, 366. There is a modern edition of the register for the Faculty of Law where Eppinge's bachelor degree is recorded: *Die Rektorbücher der Universität Heidelberg*, vol. 1, 79.

[148] Ferdinand Seibt, *Hussitica*, 93 referred to him as Friedrich Eppingen and this was later explained by Jiří Kejř, *Z počátků české reformace* (From the beginnings of the Czech reformation) (Brno: L. Marek, 2006), 179 as if Freidrich was from Eppingen, a town in Baden-Württemberg in southern Germany, very close to Heidelberg.

[149] For more on this dispute, see František Šmahel, "Mag. Hieronymus von Prag und die Heidelberger Universität," in *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter*, 526–538; Thomas A. Fudge, *Jerome of Prague and the Foundations of the Hussite Movement* (Oxford – New York: Oxford Univesity Press, 2016), 79–84.

[150] Thus, for example, Kejř, *Z počátků*, 17 argues that Eppinge went from Heidelberg to Prague whereas Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 58 thinks this very unlikely.

1409. Whether Friedrich Eppinge left Heidelberg for Prague and subsequently moved on to Dresden, is impossible to decide given the lack of further sources. At any rate, his later presence in Dresden is attested by John Drändorf and thus there are two possible solutions: Eppinge went from Heidelberg to Dresden either straight or through Prague.

In Dresden, Eppinge held the position of *locatus*, a co-teacher to Peter of Dresden at the *Kreuzschule*. His activity here is supported by Drändorf's evidence, who during his interrogation declared that "magister Fridericus erat humilis et devotus … et dictum magistrum Fridericum non esse de secta Hussitarum nec fuisse."[152] This seemingly unfathomable statement has been explained as a manoeuvre made before the inquisitors. However, there was no reason for Drändorf to hope for himself at that point and it was more likely, as Howard Kaminsky suggested, that Drändorf had some other motive in mind. He may have wished to make it clear that he was a Hussite in doctrine but he was not a member of the Hussite movement, which in 1412 was far too nation-oriented to appeal to him.[153] For this reason, he described his fellow group members in hearty terms, saying that Eppinge was not a member of the Hussite movement but rather a devout and a humble man. Drändorf's other statements testify to a number of radical anti-Roman doctrines that were held and taught by Peter of Dresden and Eppinge at the *Kreuzschule* in Dresden, which later brought about their expulsion.

After the forced departure of the group from Dresden, Eppinge's activity is attested in Prague. Here, his active role in the dispute over Wyclif's teaching remains the most remarkable event in his biography. In 1412 the dispute over Wyclif's teachings flared up anew. It was triggered by an announcement of indulgences that was criticized sharply by Jan Hus and that turned out to have much graver consequences. Following the riots of July 1412, King Wenceslas IV himself decided to settle the issue and called for a meeting in the Old Town Hall of Prague where Wyclif's teachings were to be condemned.[154] Contrary to his intentions, the rector of Prague University, Master Mark of Hradec, refused to obey the royal

---

[151] Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 7; Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 25, 156; Kejř, *Z počátků*, 170.
[152] Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 69.
[153] Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 8–9.
[154] For background on this issue, see Kaminsky, *A History*, 80–85; Pavel Soukup, "Jan Hus und der Prager Ablassstreit von 1412," in *Ablasskampagnen des Spätmittelalters. Luthers Thesen von 1517 im Kontext*, ed. Andreas Rehberg (Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter, 2017), 485–500. The notarized proceedings of this meeting were published by Jan Sedlák, *Studie a texty k náboženským dějinám českým*, vol. 1 (Olomouc: Matice Cyrilometodějská, 1914), 55–65.

command and signed a petition together with two other masters, Master Friedrich Eppinge and Master Prokop of Plzeň, a future leader of the conservative wing of the Hussites.[155] Shortly afterwards, Wyclif's proponents decided to oppose this condemnation and organized a so-called "Wyclif's second tournament" at Prague University. This public defence was led by Jan Hus, who argued for six of Wyclif's articles, and who was supported by only two associates – Jacobelllus of Misa and Friedrich Eppinge. Eppinge chose to defend article eleven about unjust excommunication. His treatise, known as *Posicio de excommunicacione* or under its incipit *Credo communionem sanctorum*, met with great success as its many extant copies show. It was accepted favourably by his colleagues, too, and Master Jan Hus praised Eppinge's treatment of the subject in his own treatise *De ecclesia*.[156] Jacobellus of Misa even incorporated the whole text of Eppinge's discourse into his own *Tractatus responsivus* which was long considered Hus's work.[157] In this treatise, Eppinge showed profound knowledge of Matthias of Janov, an influential Bohemian authority, whose works were circulated only locally and who is considered to have had a major impact on the generation of Hussite theologinas, including Jacobellus of Misa. It has been mentioned that Matthias's ideas can be found also in the works of Nicholas of Dresden and thus the connection with Eppinge strenghtens the assumption that Matthias's influence was widespread in the circles of the German masters in Prague. Eppinge's literary output will be analyzed in more detail later on.

The year 1412 is the last mention of Eppinge's name in the sources. It has been suggested that he died this very year or soon after, and, accordingly to Drändorf, his death occurred in Prague.[158]

John Drändorf

Drändorf's inquisitional protocol offers a valuable insight into his biography. This source has been profusely mentioned above because it contains valuable evidence concerning other

[155] This is not included in the notarized proceedings but attested to by Jan Hus in his treatise *Contra Stanislaum de Znoyma*, see *Magistri Iohannis Hus Polemica*. Ed. J. Eršil (Prague: Nakladatelství Československé Akademie věd, 1966), 277.
[156] *Magistri Iohannis Hus Tractatus De ecclesia*. Ed. S. H. Thomson (Prague: Komenského evangelická fakulta bohoslovecká, 1958), 216.
[157] *Mistra Jana Husi Tractatus responsivus*. Ed. S. H. Thomson (Prague: s.n., 1927), 103–133.
[158] Kejř suggested 1412 as the time of his death, *Z počátků*, 171; Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 8, and Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 58, have set it as late 1412 or early 1413.

members of the Dresden School.[159] The narrative sources do not mention Drändorf's name, though Prokop's chronicle does record one event that can be associated with Drändorf's life – namely that he was ordained in the castle of Lipnice in 1417.

Born to a noble family in Schlieben,[160] Saxony, around 1390, John Drändorf came from a wealthy background. He had a considerable share of his patrimony at his disposal. However, he renounced it and inspired by *pura paupertas Christi*, he set out on his spiritual journey. Whether or not this was result of the local activity of Waldensian preachers is impossible to say.[161] He certainly did not become a Waldensian missionary, for he told his inquisitors that he was still in possession of his money in 1425.

We know more of his life after he commenced his studies. Drändorf acquired his primary education in a cathedral school in the small town of Aken in Saxony–Anthalt. Some scholars mention that he subsequently studied in Wittenberg, although this is not confirmed by any source evidence.[162] The same applies to opinions that he went straight to Dresden from Aken,[163] or that he supposedly studied at the University in Prague. The most commonly accepted opinion is that Drändorf commenced his studies in Prague before 1408 and left the university after the Kutná Hora Decree together with his teachers Peter of Dresden and Friedrich Eppinge and moved back to Germany. Nevertheless, Drändorf himself does not speak about the sequence of his study-travels or, for that matter, about being in Prague before 1409. Since the presence of Drändorf's teachers – Peter of Dresden and Friedrich Eppinge – in Prague before 1409 has been challenged above, it must be concluded that there is no evidence attesting the same about Drändorf. [164] According to his own words, Drändorf also studied at

[159] His inquisitional protocol was first printed by Johann Erhard Kapp, *Kleine Nachlese einiger, grössten Theils noch ungedruckter, und sonderlich zur Erläuterung der Reformations-Geschichte nützlicher Urkunden*, vol. 3 (Leipzig: n.p., 1730), 33–60; modern edition by Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 55–97, commentary on 145–195, biography on 25–30. For a discussion of this source, see Herman Haupt, "Waldenserthum und Inquisition," 357; Kurt-Victor Selge, "Heidelberger Ketzerprozesse in der Frühzeit der hussitischen Revolution," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 82 (1971): 167–202.

[160] *Neues allgemeines deutsches Adels-Lexikon*, vol. 2. Ed. E. H. Kneschke. (Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1996), 566–567.

[161] See Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 25; and Selge, "Heidelberger Ketzerprozesse," 184.

[162] For example in *Biographisch-bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, vol 1. Ed. F. W. Bautz. (Hamm: Bautz, 1990), 1376–1377.

[163] Otto Meltzer, "Johannes Drändorf, der erste mit Namen bekannte Kreuzschüler." *Dresdner Geschichtsblätter* 10/2 (1901): 22; similarly Haupt argued that he travelled from Dresden to Prague, after 1409 to Leipzig and then back to Prague, see Haupt, "Waldenserthum und Inquisition," 357.

[164] Drändorf's stay in Prague before 1409 is rejected by Nodl on the grounds of the time Drändorf publically objected to taking the oath, see Martin Nodl, "*Iurare vel promittere*. Příspěvek k problematice pražských univerzitních

the newly founded university in Leipzig. Since this was founded only in 1409, his studies here could only have followed his initial studies in Prague. Most probably because of his persuasion, he had not graduated from this faculty and thus, the pertinent university registers do not back up his words with indisputable evidence. Therefore, those words can be taken only at face value. To conclude, it does seem more logical to believe that Drändorf only studied in Leipzig before coming to Prague.

From Leipzig, where he may have spent only a short time, he moved on to join the circle of his acquaintances at the *Kreuzschule* in Dresden.[165] There he learnt some of the anti-Roman doctrines for which he was later tried, among them the most often repeated one that the head of the *ecclesia militans* was not the Pope, but Christ. These radical tendencies were also behind the expulsion of the group from Dresden as the result of a decree issued by the bishop of Meissen in 1411.

From the *Kreuzschule*, Drändorf moved to Zittau to avoid the consequences of the decree since Zittau belonged to the diocese of Prague. Unlike his teachers who most probably passed through Zittau straight on to Prague, he stayed there for some time and carried on with his studies. Here he met his later close fellow Peter Turnau. Together with Turnau, they studied logic with a certain Master Albertus. Afterwards they both moved to Prague where they found shelter with the other German masters at the Black Rose House in the New Town of Prague.

Drändorf's activity in Prague is positively confirmed by the fact that he possessed a codex which originated in Prague in 1412 into which he copied Nicholas of Lira's *Postil* on parts of the New Testament. His ownership is attested by an author who composed a set of glosses on this very commentary in the above-mentioned manuscript, who was most probably another member of the group, Conradus Stoecklin.[166]

The next important episode in his life was his ordination at Lipnice, an affair that has been described previously.[167] Within the general framework of the establishment of Utraquism throughout Bohemia, and more concretely in order to secure parishes for Hussite priests who

---

statut" (*Iurare vel promittere*. A contribution to the problem of the statues of Prague University), *AUC–HUCP* 47/1–2 (2007): 50–53.

[165] An idea put forward by Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 155–156 where he tried to refute earlier opinions which challenged the course of Drändorf's travels, such as Kaminsky's in *Master Nicholas*, 7.

[166] The codex is preserved in the Metropolitan Chapter Library in Prague, MS A 40/1 – on fol. 70v it reads: "*Joannes Draendorf scripsit … et complevit Prage a. d. 1412.*"; the ownership is supported by a note on the first folio of the manuscript: "Draendorfs est liber iste". For more about the glosses, see Augustin Neumann, "Glossy v Drändorfově postile (The glosses in Drändorf's Postil)," *Hlídka* 41/11 (1924): 457–465.

had been unable to acquire these posts for some time, the need arouse in 1417 to ordain a number of priests who would be installed in parishes. The leading Hussite baron, Lord Čeněk of Vartemberk, met this need by forcing Herman Schwab of Mindelheim, a suffragan of the Prague archdiocese and a titular bishop of Nicopolis, to ordain many candidates for priesthood in his castle of Lipnice on 6 March, 1417. An important detail is that, as Drändorf himself declared, he refused to swear the usual oath on this occasion and only made a promise of chastity and poverty.[168] Following his ordination he was installed as parish priest in Jindřichův Hradec (Neuhaus) in southern Bohemia where he worked for about three years. During this time he preached both there and in Prague and worked in the region until the outbreak of the Hussite wars.

Around 1424, he went back to Germany and commenced an astonishing travelling enterprise.[169] He journeyed through Prague to Vogtland which he reached in April 1424. There he met his servant and fellow countryman Martin Borchard, a weaver by profession.[170] From here he wended his way through the upper Rhine region as far as Basel where he was probably not allowed to preach and merely exhorted several people against taking oaths. Then he continued through Franconia where he took on another servant, a young tailor called Hans from the village of Marktbergel near Windesheim, who remained in his service until the end of his days in Speyer. While being tortured, Drändorf declared that both of his servants were oath-objectors by their own will and that he did not influence them on this point at all. He also confessed that he had the intention of going to Rome to obtain a pardon from the Pope for his sins. If this incredible testimony is to be believed, he probably must have changed his mind in Basel, because a short while after that he travelled down the Rhine and already in the summer of 1424 was preaching against the Beghards somewhere in Brabant.[171] Most probably alone or

---

[167] See above, 26–27, for more detailed account, see Kaminsky, "Hussite Radicalism," 121–125.
[168] Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 73.
[169] The sequence of his travels is based solely on data from his inquisitional protocol. These are summarized by Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 27–29 with links to relevant places in the protocol.
[170] Borchard was interrogated during the same process as Drändorf but was sentenced to a milder penalty. The record of his interrogation is published by Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 97–105, 196–202.
[171] This piece of information was not provided by Drändorf himself, but by his servant Borchard, see Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 99–100, 197–198. Lacking further specification, this journey was later connected with Drändorf's preaching activity in Cologne and with his stay in Bonn where he allegedly met two fellows of the same religious persuasion – see Selge, "Heidelberger Ketzerprozesse," 188; Franz Machilek, "Aufschwung und Niedergang der Zusammenarbeit von Waldensern und Hussiten im 15. Jahrhundert (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Verhältnisse in Deutschland)," in *Friedrich Reiser und die „waldensisch-hussitische Internationale"*, ed. Albert de Lange and Kathrin Utz-Tremp (Heidelberg, Ubstadt-Weiher, and Basel: Verlag Regionalkultur, 2006), 290. Nevertheless, this is not exactly in accordance with the protocol. There is only evidence

only with Hans he hurried back, since in early September 1424 he could be found in Speyer, a town in Rheinland-Pfalz. Here, he met his colleague from Zittau and Prague, Peter Turnau, who held the position of rector at the local school and might have been hoping to secure a place for his friend Drändorf, too. This eventful year, however, had not yet ended for Drändorf as both he and Turnau set out on a short journey to Heilbronn some time after September 8. They stayed there for about a month and it is very likely that during this period he made contacts with various people, not only in Heilbronn, but also in the neighboring settlements (Weinsberg or Wimpfen) in order to carry out a plan to build a network of communities. Around the end of October they both returned to Speyer and worked diligently on the manifesto *Misericors deus* criticizing the moral decline of the clergy based on three points: unjust excommunication, blind obedience, and the secular rule of the clergy. The contents and importance of this manifesto will be analyzed later on.

In January 1425, both of them started out again for Heilbronn but this time separately. Drändorf first visited Weinsberg, a city on which an interdict had been placed since 1422, and preached there against the clergy who denied the deceased their Catholic funerals. He also addressed three letters to the citizens of Weinsberg in which he exhorted them to reject ecclesiastical bans in secular matters. His appeal for an armed revolt was one of the reasons that compelled the representatives of the establishment to act. From Weinsberg he ventured to Heilbronn relying on the support of Turnau's local friends and helpers. Nevertheless, he was soon recognized, denounced and eventually arrested together with both of his servants some time before 4 February, 1425.[172] It seems likely that two documents were confiscated as probative evidence upon his arrest – a draft of his *Misericors deus* manifest and the letters to the citizens of Weinsberg, which were presented during his trial. His case was ultimately transferred to Heidelberg and handed over to the authority of the bishop of Worms, Johannes II of Fleckenstein. It took place in the house of the bishop of Speyer, Raban of Helmstatt, with the masters of Heidelberg University in attendance, namely Nicholas Magni de Jawor and

---

concerning Drändorf's prevarication when he was asked about his intended community networking – he had said that he knew of a priest in Cologne (number 35 in his protocol, p. 71); secondly, after being questioned about his accomplices he said that there was a priest in Bonn (number 146, 85). For this reason, it cannot be accepted that he preached in Cologne or Bonn or had found any number of accomplices there.

[172] Borchard, upon revoking all his previous beliefs, was sentenced to the usual penalty for sinners; nothing is known about the destiny of Drändorf's second servant, Hans, who probably got away with an even milder punishment.

Johannes Lagenator de Francofordia. The interrogation began on 13 February, 1425 and ended four days later, followed by his burning on 17 February, 1425.

Peter Turnau

Peter Turnau's association with the Dresden School is based solely on his connection with Drändorf and on the fact that they both fell victim to the processes of 1425. He is not mentioned by name in any of the narrative sources analyzed above and the single source concerning his life is the record of his interrogation.[173]

Peter Turnau was born in Tolkemit near Elbing in Prussia to a fairly wealthy family as his inheritance covered his wide-ranging travels, books, medical and other expenses and provided for his comfortable life. In 1411 he moved from his hometown to Zittau where he studied logic under a certain Master Albert and it was here that he met his fatal acquaintance, John Drändorf. At the beginning of 1412, together with Drändorf, he moved to Prague to study logic but he also frequented lectures at other faculties. After a year, he briefly returned home but subsequently settled again in Prague where he stayed for another two years. This time he boarded at Charles College and continued attending lectures of different teachers. He went to lectures on Bible interpretation by John Hildessen of Hildesheim, Hus's opponent and an author of a short defense of the general authority of councils, and Thomas of Silesia, but refused to ever have heard a lecture by Peter of Dresden. Although he had heard from other people that Peter of Dresden was allegedly humble, pious and a good man, Turnau did not like the doctrines to which Peter of Dresden had professed. Turnau also confessed that for a very short time he was a *commensalis* of Drändorf, yet without any precise dating or reference to a place where this occurred.[174] This has later been interpreted to indicate that they both boarded at the Black Rose House in Prague with the other German masters (such as Peter and Nicholas of Dresden) even though this was by no means explicitly expressed by Turnau.[175] Even if Turnau's denial of his connection with the circle around Peter of Dresden can be seen as manoeuvring before his inquisitors – albeit hardly understandable – the fact that he mentioned Charles College as the place he boarded and not the Black Rose House is significant. As mentioned above, his only link with the Dresdeners had been established through Drändorf

[173] Published by Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 106–144, 202–243, biography summarized on 30–33.
[174] Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 109, number 21.
[175] *Ibid.*, 207.

whom he met first in Zittau in 1411 or 1412, then in Prague and finally in Speyer. There is no evidence that members of the Dresden School other than Drändorf dwelled in Zittau; the situation in Prague is not clear; and thus it is possible that Turnau was in touch only with Drändorf (later in Speyer) and that he did not establish closer contacts with the members of the Dresden School in Prague.

At any rate, leaving Prague at the end of 1414[176] Turnau moved on to Bologna to study law. His name is not recorded in the registers of the German nation of Bologna University yet his studies there have been accepted in scholarship.[177] His stay in Bologna can only be dated based on the name of Ludovicus de Garsiis, who (as Turnau himself claimed) promoted him to Bachelor of Law and who taught in Bologna as *doctor decretorum* between 1419 and 1445.[178] It should also be mentioned that according to an older opinion Turnau studied in Prague: a certain Petrus Tornow was admitted to the faculty of law there in 1377.[179] Heimpel rejected this earlier suggestion on the grounds of Turnau's other confessions, namely because Turnau first left his homeland only in 1411 and believed that at the time of his trial (1425) his father was still alive. This clearly shows that the two figures cannot be the same person. Nevertheless, the absence of Turnau's name in the register of Bologna University still leaves space for hesitation. As it stands, we have only Turnau's own words to rely on and to believe that after seven years at the university, that is from 1415–1421, he received a BA *in decretis* from the University of Bologna.

At the beginning of 1422 he set out on a journey to the East to see – as he himself put it – the miracles of the world. Travelling through Greece he reached Crete in April 1422 where he stayed for about four months. His plan to continue to Jerusalem was abandoned and Turnau

[176] In his own words, it took place "around the beginning of the Council of Constance" which in accordance with his previous travels could only have been at the very end of 1414. Nevertheless, there are opinions that his departure from Prague might only have taken place in 1415, for example Selge, "Heidelberger Ketzerprozesse," 186.

[177] His name does not appear in Gustav C. Knod, *Deutsche Studenten in Bologna (1289–1562). Biographischer Index zu den Acta nationis Germanicae universitatis Bononiensis* (Berlin: Decker, 1899); Jürg Schmutz, *Juristen für das Reich. Die deutschen Rechtsstudenten an der Universität Bologna 1265–1425* (Basel: Schwabe, 2000). Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 208 explains this fact by Turnau's solitary character and consequently Turnau's studies in Bologna are not doubted by scholars, see Selge, "Heidelberger Ketzerprozesse," 186; Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 59 and others; Machilek, "Deutsche Hussiten," 277 holds that Turnau was a teacher of Canon Law in Bologna.

[178] Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 108–109, 208.

[179] *Album seu matricula facultatis juridicae*, 124; presented by František Michálek Bartoš, "Německého husity Petra Turnova spis o řádech a zvycích církve východní" (A treatise on the customs and rites of the Eastern Church by the German Hussite Petr Turnov), *Věstník Královské české společnosti nauk* 1 (1915): 4.

returned to Prague through Venice. The literary product of this enterprise is a short Latin tract describing the rites of the Eastern Church and comparing the most interesting of them with the Western tradition.[180]

As he was prevented from returning to his homeland by some riots, Turnau spent a few weeks in Prague where he got in touch with his friends – he mentioned Laurentius of Reichenbach, a future secretary of Prokop Holý. Before the end of 1422 he travelled to Franconia in order to teach and thus, undertook a rectorship in Heidingsfeld (part of Würzburg) where he stayed for three quarters of a year, from October 1422 through June 1423. Subsequently, he continued on to Speyer, which he reached in the summer of 1423. There, with the help of some citizens of Speyer who were well connected to the chapter, Turnau obtained the position of rector of the local cathedral school.

In Speyer he was soon joined by Drändorf who arrived there from Brabant at the latest in September 1424. In fact, Turnau confessed that he was not at all glad to meet Drändorf again and was frightened and trembled every time they met. However, because of their earlier friendship he helped him. Whatever the actual situation may have been, the two of them journeyed to Heilbronn at the end of September 1424 and again in January the following year, although this time separately. Turnau claimed that the pretext for his second visit to Heilbronn was to apply for a preaching office endowed by the rich widow Anna Mettelbach.[181] Nevertheless, at this point Turnau was warned by an unknown benefactor about Drändorf's arrest. He left Heilbronn at once but was arrested as soon as he returned to Speyer.

His process took place in the residence of Raban, the bishop of Speyer, in Udenheim (today Philippsburg) because, unlike Drändorf, Turnau as a local man belonged under his authority. The questioning started on 26 February, 1425 and was in every respect different from Drändorf's. Turnau was deemed a "milder" heretic and the judges took much more care to force him revoke his erroneous opinions. Turnau's views were less resolute and radical than Drändorf's and Turnau often backed them up by learned juristic arguments which were more familiar to the ears of his inquisitors. As the process drew close to its inevitable end, Turnau unsuccessfully attempted to escape from the prison in order to beg the bishop for mercy.

[180] Edited by Bartoš, "Německého husity Petra Turnova spis," 13–25. Jakub Jiří Jukl, "Německého husity Petra Turnova spis po řádech a zvycích církve východní" (A treatise on the customs and rites of the Eastern Church by the German Hussite Peter Turnov), *Theologická revue* 75/3–4 (2004): 437–450, dates Turnau's journey differently, but his dating is based on outdated information.

[181] Details about this endowment by Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 218–220.

Having failed in all his attempts at conveying his, as he deemed it, justified case, Turnau persevered in his views and chose not to betray the evangelical truth of which he was convinced. He was therefore burnt on 11 June, 1425.

Bartholomew Rautenstock

Rautenstock's connection with the Dresden School has been established following his own confession when he named Peter and Nicholas of Dresden as his teachers in Prague. He was caught by the inquisition in Germany some time around or after 1450 and the short record of his trial is the single source about his life.[182]

Rautenstock supposedly came from the small town of Burgbernheim in the area between Würzburg and Ansbach and was active in Bavaria.[183] There is no information available concerning his family or social background. He claimed to have studied in Prague with Masters Peter and Nicholas, though not at a college, but in a *Hof*. His reference to his teacher Nicholas, whom he called "a half-master", added confusion to Nicholas's biography and was discussed earlier. At any rate, he was undoubtedly referring to the school that the German masters allegedly ran at the Black Rose House in Prague and this testimony is the first explicit mention of this school made by one of its students. Rautenstock claimed that this was the place where he had learnt the heretical tenets for which he was later tried, but he did not specify when he studied there. The following data suggest that it was some time before 1417.

He also confessed that he was asked at the school to take holy orders and was thus consecrated a priest in the castle of Lipnice on 6 March, 1417 together with Drändorf and others. On this occasion he refused to swear the usual oath and pay the usual fee (which one of the doctors paid for him) but was nevertheless provided with the *littere*. Following his ordination he was assigned to St. Mary of the Lake in Prague where he preached, celebrated mass, heard confessions, offered communion to laymen under both species and ministered to a congregation of most probably German Hussites for over a year.[184]

---

[182] Printed in *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte*, vol. 2, 626–629. Rautenstock's connection with the Dresden School was suggested and held by Sedlák, *Mikuláš*, 3; Kaminsky, "Hussite Radicalism," 122; or Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 59.

[183] Haupt, "Waldenserthum und Inquisition," 352, note 1; Boehmer, "Magister Peter," 223; Machilek, "Deutsche Hussiten," 280.

[184] Rautenstock's reference to the church "Zum See" was interpreted as being St. Mary of the Lake by Boehmer, "Magister Peter," 228; Kaminsky, *A History*, 263.

His bad conscience about not being properly ordained made him give up this post and consequently he married and settled down with his wife in Burgbernheim. Ten years later his wife died and he set out to preach in Bohemia again. With his adult son he made several trips to Franconia. He preached in the area around Tirschenreuth, Kemnat, Pegnitz, Nuremberg and the area around Würzburg.[185] During his travels he found shelter with his friends and relatives, of whom he mentioned only his dead brother-in-law Heinz Weingarten and two others. Apparently the town of Windsheim also provided shelter for him for a while.[186] This kind of itinerant preaching and the use of the hospitality of a network of friends and believers was very much in the style of Waldensian preachers. It has also been suggested that Rautenstock was one of the twelve "apostles" sent by the Hussites from Tábor to Germany to spread their ideas and who later formed the so-called Hussite-Waldensian diaspora.[187]

While on his way back to Bohemia, Rautenstock was caught in Nuremberg and arrested. The protocol of his interrogation in Nuremberg can, with certain reservations, be dated to 1450 or 1460.[188] If we accept that he left Bohemia a year after his ordination (in 1418) and subsequently spent ten years with his wife in Burgbernheim (i.e. 1418–1428), then he would have had to spend at least twenty two years preaching in Franconia before being caught (i.e. the period between 1428 and 1450). The confessions made by Bartholomew Rautenstock are, as Franz Machilek observed, very similar to the articles recorded during a process in Eichstatt in 1460 and do not reveal any specific information that would help to date them.[189] The confessions include the denial of purgatory, intercession of saints, use of holy images, critique of indulgences and public confessions and the necessity to offer communion to the laity under both kinds. Rautenstock also generally attacked the secular dominion of the Church. Nevertheless, it must also be taken into consideration that the surviving copy of the inquisitional protocol might be of a younger date than Rautenstock's trial. For the time being, the date of Bartholomew Rautenstock's death remains unspecified.[190]

[185] Haupt, "Waldenserthum und Inquisition," 352, note 1 dates this period to 1440–1450.
[186] Machilek, "Aufschwung und Niedergang" 302, n. 125 where it is pointed out that there is a number of minor but important discrepancies between the original manuscript and Döllinger's print of the inquisitional protocol.
[187] Machilek, "Deutsche Hussiten," 280.
[188] Boehmer, "Magister Peter," 223, 228 who also states that Rautenstock died in Nuremberg.
[189] Machilek, "Aufschwung und Niedergang", 302. The proceedings of the process of Eichstatt were printed by Machilek, "Ein Eichstätter Inquisitionsverfahren," 417–446.

Conradus Stoecklin

The single mention of this name in connection with the Dresden School comes from a manuscript into which John Drändorf copied a commentary on Lira's *Postil*.[191] According to the manuscript, Lira's commentary on the gospels and on St. Paul's letters was copied in 1412, as it reads "Prage reportata per Johannem Draendorf a. D. 1412".[192] This text was subsequently commented upon in the form of marginal glosses which distinctly show the influence of Nicholas of Dresden's teachings.[193] According to a note on fol. 175r they were copied by a certain Conradus Stoecklin and their connection to Prague is expressed on fol. 6v: "sicut audivi Prage a predicatore ad sanctum Clementem, scilicet a Petro monacho" (as I heard in Prague from a preacher at St. Clement's, that is, by Peter the monk). The glossator also reflects on the actual beginnings of Utraquism in Prague. Thus their origin can be dated to a time after 1414. Without further substantiation Kaminsky suggested that they must have been written before 1417, possibly because of Drändorf's itinerary.[194] To establish the date of origin of the glosses is, however, impossible because they were not copied by Drändorf, but by his fellow Stoecklin, or perhaps even by others. The same applies to their author, about whom nothing can be found in the sources – the only seemingly pertinent occurrence of a similar name in the register of Prague University comes from a too early period.[195] Due to the contents of his commentary, Conradus Stoecklin can be considered either a member of the circle around Nicholas of Dresden and John Drändorf in Prague, or only someone who sympathised with the group and promoted their ideas in the same environment some time later.

Peter Payne

A famous English supporter of the Hussites and one of their leading diplomats is sometimes also considered a member of the Dresden School.[196] The connection rests on two vague comments in the narrative sources discussed above. The so-called *Počátkové husitství* names a

---

[190] Döllinger printed the record from Munich's Reichsarchiv but it has not been possible to reassess the dating of the manuscript. Even the names that Rautenstock gave as his friends do not help in specifying the dating.
[191] First proposed by Sedlák, *Mikuláš*, 3; noted also by Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 25, n. 135.
[192] Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, shelf-mark A 40/1, fol. 55v – Patera and Podlaha, *Soupis rukopisů knihovny metropolitní kapitoly pražské*, vol. 1, 37.
[193] The glosses were printed and analyzed by Neumann, "Glossy v Drändorfově postile, 457–465.
[194] Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 25, n. 135.
[195] "Conradus Stekelink de natione Saxonum assumptus in iure 1372" – *Album seu matricula facultatis juridicae*, 119.

certain Peter among the masters living at the Black Rose House in Prague. This Peter is sometimes identified with Peter Payne, but sometimes also with Peter of Dresden.[197] Another possible reference to Payne can be read in John Papoušek's narrative. Papoušek accused clerics and scholars from Germany and England of having "infected" the kingdom of Bohemia, especially on the point of Utraquism. This comment has often been stressed by historians in order to underline the connection between Waldensian and Wycliffite teachings with the Czech Reformation.[198]

The eventful life of Peter Payne has been described by numerous scholars.[199] Payne was born around 1380 in Hough on the Hill in Lincolnshire and educated in Oxford. He commenced his studies shortly before 1400 and graduated as a Master of Arts some time before 1406. He soon became acquainted with Wyclif's ideas and among his contacts we can name his fellow student and later opponent Peter Partridge, or Sir John Oldcastle, a Lollard dissenter who later corresponded with Jan Hus. Payne's activity is traditionally linked with the irregular proceedings at the university concerning a testimonial of Wyclif's probity issued on 6 October, 1406. Allegedly, Payne arranged for a university seal to be attached to this letter as a guarantee that Wyclif was a virtuous and pious man, who was never convicted of heresy. This letter was then delivered to the Czech sympathizers of Wyclif through the mediation of two Czech students, Nicholas Faulfiš and George of Kněhnice. The letter was made public by Jerome of Prague in dramatic circumstances at the so-called Knín-*quodlibet* disputation in January 1409.[200] The central point of this disputation, named after its principal speaker Master Matthew of Knín, was a defence of Wyclif's ideas, planned and organized by the leader of the

---

[196] Bartoš, *Husitství a cizina*, 134; Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 25; Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, n. 59.

[197] The identification with Peter Payne was assumed by authors mentioned in the previous note; on the other hand, Sedlák, *Mikuláš*, 3 believed that the chronicler had confused Peter Payne with Peter of Dresden.

[198] Thus, Payne's close relationship with Nicholas of Dresden was assumed by Jean Gonnet and Amedeo Molnár, *Les Vaudois au Moyen Age* (Torino: Claudiana, 1974), 220–229.

[199] The latest biography of Peter Payne was compiled by František Šmahel, who revised and published it on several occasions – his original entry in the *New Dictionary of National Biography* was enlarged and furnished with footnotes in his "Curriculum vitae Magistri Petri Payne," in *In memoriam Josefa Macka (1922–1991)*, ed. Miloslav Polívka and František Šmahel (Prague: Historický ústav, 1996), 141–160; another revised version was published in German: "Magister Peter Payne: Curriculum vitae eines englischen Nonkonformisten," in *Friedrich Reiser*, 241–260; the latest English version without footnotes was published in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 43 (2004), art. 21650. Previous secondary literature on Payne's biography is summarized there.

[200] The struggle over Wyclif's teachings at Prague University, which began as late as 1403, came to a climax in 1409, mainly in connection with the national undercurrent that permeated the originally academic discussion over Wyclif's extreme Realism and that resulted in the Kutná Hora Decree issued in this year. For background on the situation in Prague, see František Šmahel, "Wyclif's Fortune in Hussite Bohemia," in *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter*, 467–489.

Wycliffite party, Jerome of Prague, together with other Czech supporters of extreme Realism. The outcome of this dispute represents one minor triumph for the reformist party and contributed to making Wyclif's cause a public matter.[201]

From 1408, Payne acted as the principal of one of the Oxford Halls of residence, namely the White Hall, and in 1410 became the principal of neighbouring St. Edmund's Hall as well. St. Edmund's Hall had been already a strong Wycliffite centre, especially in connection with its previous principal, William Taylor, and thus, it is not surprising that Payne also zealously continued to discuss and spread Wyclif's tenets in Oxford, London and elsewhere. As a result of these activities, Payne entered into a controversy with Thomas Netter of Walden, the Carmelite defender of Catholic doctrine, and later with the university chancellor, Thomas Arundel, who was more than keen to purge the realm of heretics. The situation gradually became aggravated and following the arrest of Sir John Oldcastle in 1413, Payne deemed it wiser to leave England.[202] The date of his departure is not unanimously accepted in scholarship, but it most probably took place in late autumn 1413.[203]

On his way to Bohemia, Payne travelled through Germany and spent some time in the Rhineland. Here, he established contacts with the local Waldensian community and in the southern German town of Deutach he personally met a prominent Waldensian emissary, Friedrich Reiser.[204] He reached Bohemia only after Hus's departure for the Council of Constance, that is, after October 11, 1414.

In Prague, Payne quickly joined in the activities of the reformist party. His opinions are known due to a number of treatises that survived from this period in which Payne commented

---

[201] For more on Jerome and Wyclif's teachings, see a through introduction to the *Magistri Hieronymi de Praga Quaestiones, Polemica, Epistulae*, ed. František Šmahel and Gabriel Silagi, CC CM 222 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010). See also Fudge, *Jerome of Prague*, 34–72, 84–103; *Jeroným Pražský: Středověký intelektuál, mučedník české reformace a hrdina národní tradice* (Jerome of Prague. Medieval intellectual, martyr of the Czech Reformation and the hero of national tradition), ed. Ota Pavlíček (Prague: Filosofia, 2018).

[202] For background on Oldcastle's revolt and situation in England, see Robert R. Betts, "Peter Payne in England", in *Sborník přednášek věnovaných životu a dílu anglického husity Petra Payna–Engliše 1456–1956*, ed. Josef Polišenský (Prague: Universitas Carolina, 1957), 3–14, esp. 11–12; which was later reprinted in his collection *Essays in Czech History* (London: Athlone Pr., 1969), 236–246. See also Anne Hudson, *The Premature Reformation. Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 99–102.

[203] Šmahel, "Magister Peter Payne," 243 where other opinions about the date are listed, ranging from 1413 to 1416.

[204] The evidence for Payne's time in Germany is admittedly vague, mostly due to the loss of the inquisitional protocol of Friedrich Reiser and Anna Weiler, on which it is based. The protocol in question recorded their interrogation in Strassbourg in 1548, which was printed in 1822 by Andreas Jung but subsequently lost, see Šmahel, "Magister Peter Payne," 244. For more about Reiser, see *Friedrich Reiser und die „waldensisch-*

on the most topical issues.[205] In one of his numerous texts he addressed the issue of oath-taking and denied its legitimacy.[206] The denial of oath-taking was traditionally considered to be of Waldensian or Lollard origin. Most often it has been ascribed to Payne's contacts with Waldensians in Germany on his flight from England. However, Payne could have just as well been influenced by the Lollard opposition to oaths that he may have learnt in England.[207] Payne was admitted to the board of Masters of Prague University only on 13 February, 1417,[208] and consequently acted as an examiner at the bachelor exams. It has also been suggested that the conservative circles of Prague University delayed Payne's acceptance because of his contacts with the Dresden masters at the Black Rose House in Prague.[209]

Apart from the ambiguous statement of the *Počátkové husitství*, there is unfortunately no evidence concerning these contacts. During his early days in Prague, Payne composed a mnemotechnical device, which has been considered an evidence of his teaching activities and an outcome of his connection with the school of the German masters.[210] This text will be described in more detail below, but it can be mentioned already here that the alleged connection of this text to Payne's teaching activities is not substantiated.

Payne's career in Bohemia soon took on a different shape. The inner tensions at Prague University connected to the nations comprising it made it perhaps impossible for Payne to participate more actively. Nevertheless, he soon won recognition in a different field. Because of his determined defence of the lay chalice and his boldness and resolution in defending Wyclif's doctrines, he was chosen by the university masters to lead a Hussite legacy to King Sigismund in Kutná Hora in 1420. From this point on, Payne became a chief diplomat of the Hussites and participated in almost all major negotiations during the war period of 1420–1434.

---

hussitische Internationale", ed. Albert de Lange and Kathrin Utz-Tremp (Heidelberg, Ubstadt-Weiher, and Basel: Verlag Regionalkultur, 2006).

[205] His rich literary production was catalogued by František Michálek Bartoš, *Literární činnost M. Jana Rokycany, M. Jana Příbrama, M. Petra Payna* (The literary work of M. Jan Rokycana, M. Jan Příbram, M. Petr Payne). Sbírka pramenů k poznání literárního života československého, vol. 3, no. 9 (Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1928), 93–111.

[206] Bartoš, *Literární činnost M. Jana Rokycany, M. Jana Příbrama, M. Petra Payna*, 96, no. 2.

[207] Argued by Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, 371. Payne already refused to swear an oath in Oxford.

[208] *Liber decanorum* 1/1, 443. Payne's career in Prague is described at length by Bartoš, "M. Petr Engliš v zápase husitské revoluce" (M. Petr Engliš in the conflict of the Hussite revolution), in *Sborník přednášek*, 25–28, who also proposed that Payne was admitted to the University in Prague so late because of his refusal to swear an oath. This was later refuted by Martin Nodl, "*Iurare vel promittere*," 55–56.

[209] Šmahel, "Curriculum vitae Magistri Petri Payne," 145–146.

[210] Šmahel, "Curriculum vitae Magistri Petri Payne," 146.

One of his most accomplished performances was in the meeting in Bratislava in 1429, which after a nine-year-long period of wars marked the beginning of difficult peace negotiations.

In the meantime, Payne also became one of the four leading members of Prague consistory and held this position until 1434. During the war period, between 1432 and 1434, Payne lived in the monastery of *Na Slovanech* in the New Town of Prague, the only Utraquist convent with continuing Slavonic rite. It was most probably here that Payne started on his theoretical preparations for the upcoming polemics about Wyclif's teachings and for this reason he undertook or perhaps even initiated works on a catalogue of Wyclif's writings together with their indexes.[211] Payne made good use of this tool on the occasion of the Council of Basel.

Peter Payne was subsequently a leading figure in many Hussite missions, yet his momentous achievement came only during the Hussite negotiation with the Council in Basel in 1433, the final clash over the Hussite programme. Out of the concise formulation of the Hussite programme, the so-called Four articles of Prague, Payne was assigned to defend the article concerning the poverty of the clergy, which he disputed with one of the most adroit theologians of the time, John Palomar. In his sharp invective, Payne argued that both divine and human law effective in the time of the law of grace forbade clergy any temporal power or secular possessions.[212] He concentrated on the evidence of the poverty of the *ecclesia primitiva* and minutely analyzed the concepts of *possessio*, *dominio* and *ius*, supporting his conclusions by authoritative statements from the Bible, the Church fathers, modern theologians (including Wyclif) as well as from Canon Law. His polemic provoked Palomar to such an extent that he admitted the partial validity of Payne's line of argument, which he nevertheless rejected as a whole. Palomar went as far as to challenge Payne to lock themselves up in a closed room until they could reach agreement. Payne declined to do this, claiming that they would bite each other.[213]

Payne's appearance before the council provoked another reaction, namely from his own countrymen. They accused him of having been charged of heresy and treason in England in

[211] Šmahel, "Curriculum vitae Magistri Petri Payne," 150. Payne's authorship of individual indexes is discussed by Anne Hudson, "*Accessus ad auctorem*: the case of John Wyclif," in *Studies in the Transmission of Wyclif's Writings* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), no. VII, 333–337.

[212] *Petri Payne Anglici Positio, replica et propositio in concilio Basiliensi a. 1433 atque oratio ad Sigismundum regem a. 1429 Bratislaviae pronunciatae*, ed. František Michálek Bartoš (Tábor: Taboriensis ecclesia evangelica fratrum Bohemorum, 1949), esp. 1–78.

connection with the rebellion of Sir John Oldcastle. Fortunately for Payne, the Bohemian legacy took him into their protection and Payne once more escaped the charges. The dispute between the Czech reformers and the Basel theologians lasted from January 16 until April 14, 1433 and because no agreement was reached, it was subsequently moved from Basel to Prague.

Payne continued to play a leading role in the following disputes as well. The diet of October 1434 elected Payne arbiter of the doctrinal disputes that had arisen between the two most important Hussite wings, the Prague and the Tábor parties. This put Payne in a rather awkward position as his personal preference linked him with the radical Tábor party, as the only true proponent of Wyclif's ideas among the Hussites. At the same time, however, he felt the urge to respond to the need for unity of the Hussite movement. After several attempts to postpone his final statement, he was forced to bring it forward at the end of September or beginning of October 1436 after Sigismund was acknowledged king of Bohemia. In his declaration Payne agreed with the representative of the moderate party, John Rokycana, thus, angering his supporters from the Tábor party. His decision, however, did not please any of the parties involved and a new committee was elected to come up with a new statement.

During this period, another attempt was made to summon Payne to appear before the council, which he escaped by moving to Žatec, a town in north-western Bohemia, some time in 1437. The result was that King Sigismund expelled Payne as a foreigner from the country and Payne went into hiding.[214] In 1438, he was captured and imprisoned by the Catholic lord Burian of Gutenstein but was ransomed by his Taborite supporters in 1440.

Subsequently, over a long period of eight years, Payne does not appear to have been active publicly. It has been suggested that because of this coincidence, Payne might be identified with the figure of Constantinus Anglicus, an envoy of the Bohemian Utraquist consistory who appeared in Constantinople in 1452. This conjecture has not been proved and is rejected by the majority of modern scholars.[215] Payne's last public appearance can be dated to September

---

[213] This interesting incident and Payne's other witty retorts are recorded in the "Petri Zatecensis Liber diurnus de gestis Bohemorum in concilio Basileensi," in *Monumenta conciliorum generalium seculi decimi quinti*, vol. 1, ed. František Palacký and Ernestus Birk (Vienna: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1857), 335–336.

[214] A narrative source of late origin, the so-called *Brevis narratio de statu religionis in Boiemica gente* from 1562, states that at this time Payne took refuge with Peter Chelčický, the famous Czech reformer. For more detail, see Šmahel, "Curriculum vitae Magistri Petri Payne," 157, note 89.

[215] Šmahel, "Curriculum vitae Magistri Petri Payne," 158.

1452. He spent the rest of his life in the monastery of *Na Slovanech* in Prague where he died in 1455 or 1456.

Payne's late arrival in Prague (i.e. the end of 1414) is the principal objection against his active connection with the activities of the Dresden masters in Prague. As has been described above, Friedrich Eppinge, one of the leading figures connected to the bursa at the Black Rose House in Prague, is recorded in the sources for the last time in 1412. Payne might have encountered Peter of Dresden, who died in Prague at an unknown date. Nicholas of Dresden was most probably not in Prague after 1415. He could have also met some of the students or subsequent supporters of the German masters: John Drändorf was in Prague in 1412 and spent time in southern Bohemia between 1417 and 1424; Peter Turnau, who briefly stopped in Prague at the end of 1422; or Bartholomew Rautenstock, who was in Prague until ca. 1418. It has been mentioned that both Payne and before him Nicholas of Dresden had contacts with the traditionally Waldensian region in Žatec. Yet none of this amounts to actual evidence that Payne had a connection with the Dresden School. It can be assumed that as a fervent reformer of the contemporary church, Payne might have found the reformist ideas circulating in the bursa at the Black Rose House in Prague attractive. However, Payne primarily defended Wyclif's ideas and never displayed familiarity with the particular ideas or works of the German masters. Even if he very likely knew about the group, Payne neither consciously identified himself with them nor promoted their ideas. Thus, the relation of Peter Payne to the Dresden School remains an attractive proposition that is not substantiated by the source evidence.

The other "others"

Other names have sometimes been connected with the Dresden School. For these identifications, however, either insufficient or not valid evidence can be found in the source material. Yet such mentions indicate that there might have been more behind the Dresden School, and these suggestions are therefore significant.

John Drändorf during his inquisition process mentioned three names.[216] Being asked about his accomplices, Drändorf replied that he had connections with two priests by the names of

[216] Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 85.

Laurentius and Thomas of Reichenbach from Silesia, namely in the town of Reichenbach.[217] Moreover, he said to have known another priest in Bonn, whose name was Wigandus, and another one in Speyer, whose name he did not know. Drändorf was tortured when he gave this account, yet he insisted on his statement, including his legitimate ordination as priest.[218] Unfortunately, no further details concerning these names can be gleaned from the soures, with the exception of Laurentius of Reichenbach, who probably became a secretary to Prokop the Great, the priest and prominent leader of Tábor.[219] His relation to the Dresden School cannot be further clarified.

Master John of Jičín, a representative of one of the radical Hussite factions, has been also mentioned in connection with the Dresden School. His name is recorded in the Czech Rhymed Chronicle "Počátkové husitství" as a link between the Dresdeners and the Utraquism.[220] Jičín took his *magister artium* degree in 1408 and was ordained a priest in 1412. In 1410 he played an active part in the defense of Wyclif's books. Moreover, the *quodlibet* disputations of 1409, 1411, and 1412 record his name among the speakers. In 1412, he led a procession that carried the bodies of three anti-indulgence martyrs into Bethlehem Chapel.[221] Later a key figure in the Utraquist debate, Jičín was the only Prague Master to join the Taborites. He is believed to have held doctrines similar to those of Nicholas of Dresden.[222] Yet there is no further evidence that could substantiate his explicit link with the Dresden School.

An unknown canon Šimon of Litovel, who polemicized with Nicholas of Dresdens's denial of the purgatory (*De purgatorio*) around 1417, mentioned that Nicholas's opinions

[217] The town in question can be identified with Reichenbach im Eulengebirge, today Dzierżoniów in southwestern Poland. Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 187, does not comment on the identification, although he registers the (to be expected) variant spellings of the place name in the protocol. I would like to point out that there is a Reichenbach in Oberlausitz in Saxony, another possible candidate for the identification. Machilek, "Von der 'Dresdner Schule' in Prag," 60, claims that Lawrence and Thomas were brothers.

[218] The inquisitors's suspicion that Drändorf had a wider network of accomplices is subsequently confirmed by the final statement of his inquisitors who explicitly speak of "Hussites and their followers and accomplices" ("Hussite et eorum satellites ac complices"), see Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 92.

[219] Seibt, *Hussitica*, 96–97 with further references. See also Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 85, 109, 187; Machilek, "Deutsche Hussiten," 275. Nevertheless, it is not clear whether Laurentius can indeed be identified as Prokop's secretary because the various references to this suggestion that appear in scholarly literature (such as in Seibt) are based on Josef Macek, *Prokop Veliký* (Prague: Naše vojsko, 1953), 196, note 188, who in turn refers to *Johannis de Ragusio Tractatus quomodo Bohemi reducti sunt ad unitatem ecclesiae*, where it is explicitly said that Prokop sent his secretary called "Wigleff" to Prague, see *Monumenta conciliorum generalium seculi decimi quinti*, vol. 1, ed. František Palacký and Ernestus Birk (Vienna: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1857), 146.

[220] See above, 21–22.

[221] For basic biographical data, see Tříška, *Životopisný slovník*, 245.

[222] Kaminsky, *A History*, 5, 220 et passim.

resonated among many of his contemporaries.[223] Again, there are no traces in the sources that could corroborate this account. Moreover, it is difficult to judge whether Simon referred generally to the supporters of the Hussites, or specifically to those who held ideas similar to the Dresdeners. Yet the lack of further evidence does not exclude the possibility that around the time of Nicholas of Dresden's death there were wider circles who supporter or promoted his ideas.

[223] See above, 39–40.

Literary Output of the Dresden School

The previous biographical inquiry revealed that the links between the individuals connected to the Dresden School rest mostly on their literary activities. The literary output of the individuals varies to a great extent. Thus the present chapter will discuss the most important treatises that have bearing on the case of the Dresden School, with special focus on those that have not been known in the scholarship before.

Nicholas of Dresden

The most prolific author among the Dresdeners was Nicholas of Dresden. Several features of Nicholas's literary output have been discussed in connection with his biography. In his rich literary activity Nicholas paid attention to various aspects of the corrupt church and sharply criticized it as an institution. His treatises deal with the rejection of simony, the existence of purgatory, criticism of taking oaths, defence of the lay apostolate as well as with other topics. Apparently, the most important issue for Nicholas was the lay chalice – out of the twenty three treatises ascribed to him with some certainty, seven deal with this matter.

The following list records treatises presently ascribed to Nicholas, followed by the dubious attributions. It is based on the list compiled by Howard Kaminsky[224] and includes subsequent additions.[225] Where a critical edition is available, a link to it is provided without further data – with the exception of newly discovered manuscripts or copies that were unknown to the editors and therefore not registered in the previous lists.

1. De iure et eius divisione

Inc.: *Color duplex novus et vetus* … x … *nisi papa cum cardinalibus etc.*

MS: Prague, National Library, III G 16, fol. 127v–128r

Date: ca. 1412/1416

[224] Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 28–32.

[225] Apart from my own additions, the list extracts data from Cegna, *Nicolai ... Puncta*, 38–39; Nechutová, *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské university* C 13/15 (1966): 198–200; Spunar and Vidmanová, *Listy filologické* 90/2 (1967): 208–210.

2. Tabule veteris et novi coloris (Cortina de anticristo)

Ed.: *Master Nicholas of Dresden. The Old Color and the New*. Ed. Howard Kaminsky, Dean Loy Bilderback, Imre Boba and Patricia N. Rosenberg. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s. 55, 38–65. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1965.[226]

3. Consuetudo et ritus primitive ecclesie et moderne seu derivative

Ed.: *Master Nicholas of Dresden. The Old Color and the New*. Ed. Howard Kaminsky, Dean Loy Bilderback, Imre Boba and Patricia N. Rosenberg. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s. 55, 66–85. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1965.

4. De libera verbi Dei predicacione

Inc.: *Ve michi, quia tacui … Is. VI. Quia vergente mundi vespere…* x *… coronam quam dignetur*.

MS: Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, D 52, fol. 227r–234v, 173v–174r

Date: ca. 1412/1414

5. De quadruplici missione

Ed.: Sedlák, Jan. *Studie a texty k náboženským dějinám českým* 1 (1914): 95–117.[227]

MS: 1. Prague, National Library, IV G 15, fol. 85v–96v

2. Prague, National Library, X F 8, fol. 136r–143v

3. Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, D 19, fol. 217r–224r

4. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 4673, fol. 1r–8r

5. Bautzen, Stadtbibliothek, 8º 8, fol. 166r–183r

6. Brno, Moravian Library, Mk 102, fol. 88v–99v

7. Prague, National Library, XXIII F 204, fol. 62r–70r

[226] Spunar and Vidmanová, 209, add a copy from the Moravian Library, Brno, Mk 92, fol. 423sqq., to the list of manuscripts of the *Tabule*, which in my opinion is not an extract of the treatise in question; the same applies to a manuscript in Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, D 52, fol. 226r.

[227] This is not a critical edition: Sedlák collated manuscript IV G 15 from the National Library in Prague with MS 4673, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna; other five copies of this text were listed by Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 29, no. 5.

6. Puncta

Ed.: *Nicolai (ut dicunt) de Dresda vulgo appellati de Čerruc (De Černá růže id est de Rosa Nigra [†1418]) Puncta*. Ed. Romolo Cegna. *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 33 (1996): 55–156.

7. Sermo ad clerum de materia sanguinis (Nisi manducaveritis)

Ed.: *Nicolai Dresdensis Sermo ad clerum de materia sanguinis*. In *Puncta*, 157–187. Ed. Romolo Cegna.

Krmíčková, Helena. "Příspěvek k edici kázání Mikuláše z Drážďan *Sermo ad clerum Nisi manducaveritis*" (Contribution to the Edition of Nicholas of Dresden's tract *Sermo ad clerum Nisi manducaveritis*). *Listy filologické* 123 (2000): 251–299.

Add. MS: Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 2148, fol. 182r–206v

8. Collecta auctoritatum de materia sanguinis[228]

Inc.: *Thomas tercia [2ª] parte Summe sue questione LXXVI [XLVI] ...* x *... ad coronam celestis glorie pervenire. Amen.*

MS: 1. Prague, National Library, III G 28, fol. 179v–193v

2. Prague, National Library, IV G 15, fol. 213vb–230ra

3. Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, A 163, fol. 231v–240r

4. Basel, University Library, A X 66, fol. 336v–352r (Expl.: ... *pervenire etc. Et sic finis.*)

5. Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 2148, fol. 193v–206v (Expl.: ... *sangwis domini nostri Iesu Cristi.*)

Date: ca. September 1414

[228] Kaminsky included this collection of authorities testifying to the necessity of the lay chalice under no. 7 of his list, the *Sermo ad clerum de materia sanguinis*; Cegna, "Appunti su Valdismo e Ussitismo," 130 (1971): 20–21 suggested considering it an autonomous tract and that is why it was not printed in his edition of the above tract. Cegna suggested that the *Collecta* ends with a note "…omni celesti benediccione et gracia repleamur. Amen. Hec omnia de verbo ad verbum ex tractatu ubi supra breviter sunt collecta" (III G 28, fol. 190r; IV G 15, fol. 226rb; A 163, fol. 238r; A X 66, fol. 348r; BJ 2148, fol. 203r – hence the title), although the text continues in the following ca. four folios and ends with the explicit recorded above in my list. Nevertheless, there is a noticeable break in the text at this point, all manuscripts (with the only exception of A 163) start on a new line; in codex BJ 2148 the break is emphasized by a space left for an initial of the closing part (starting with *Bernardus in sermone ad Petrum*), moreover, the text stretches over another half a folio in this codex, adding a few more authorities which do not appear in other manuscripts. In IV G 15, the text continues on fol. 230ra–232rb with further Eucharistic quotations (*Nisi manducaveritis ...* x *... excelencia huius venerabilis sacramenti etc. Amen.*). It remains to be decided whether this might be another separate text of Nicholas. Basic comparison of manuscripts IV G 15 and BJ 2148 reveals that the two additions do not contain identical quotations. I am therefore inclined to believe that

9. De iuramento I.

Ed.: Sedlák, Jan. *Studie a texty k náboženským dějinám českým* 1 (1914): 86–94.

10. De iuramento II.

Ed.: Romolo Cegna, "Il *Tractatus de iuramento* di Nicola della Rosa Nera." *Aevum. Rassegna di Scienze storiche linguistiche e filologiche* 82/2 (2008): 462–489.

11. De usuris

Ed.: Paul de Vooght, "Le traité «De usuris» de Nicolas de Dresde," *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* 44 (1977): 177–210, 45 (1978): 181–235.

12. Quod fuit ab inicio

Inc.: *Quod fuit ab inicio quod audivimus quod vidimus oculis nostris ...* x *... et ultimo etc pro quo sit Deus benedictus in secula seculorum amen.*

MS: 1. Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 2148, fol. 33v–38v

2. Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Hs K 346, fol. 148r–155r

Date: ca. May 1415

13. Apologia (De conclusionibus doctorum in Constancia)

Ed.: *Nicolai Dresdensis Apologia. De conclusionibus doctorum in Constantia de materia sanguinis*. Ed. Petra Mutlová. Brno: Masarykova universita, 2015.

14. Contra Gallum

Ed.: Nicolaus de Dresda, *Contra Gallum*. In *Studie a texty k počátkům kalicha v Čechách* (Studies and texts concerning the origins of the lay chalice in Bohemia), ed. Helena Krmíčková, 165–195. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 1997.

Add. MS: 1. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 4521, fol. 156r–167v

2. Bautzen, Stadtbibliothek, 8º 8, fol. 117r–135r

15. Replica rectori scholarum in Corbach

Inc.: *Dominus Iesus, deus et homo, cuius perfecta sunt opera ...* x *... et supra intellectum apostolus...*

MS: Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, D 118, fol. 1r–51v

Date: ca. 1415

---

the text in IV G 15 might indeed be a separate text by Nicholas. A critical edition of the *Collecta* and the two

16. Super Pater noster

Ed.: *Nicolai Dresdensis Expositio super Pater noster*. Ed. Jana Nechutová and Romolo Cegna. *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 30 (1990): 113–212.

17. Querite primum regnum Dei

Ed.: Nicolaus de Dresda, *Querite primum regnum Dei*. Ed. Jana Nechutová. Brno: Universita J. E. Purkyně, 1967.

18. Dialogus de purgatorio

Ed.: 1. Paul de Vooght, "Le dialogue «De purgatorio» (1415) de Nicolas de Dresde," *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* 42 (1975): 132–223.

2. *Nicola della Rosa Nera detto da Dresa (1380?–1416?), De reliquiis et De veneratione sanctorum: De purgatorio*. Ed. Romolo Cegna. *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 23 (1977).

19. De imaginibus

Ed.: Jana Nechutová, "Nicolai de Dresda 'De imaginibus'." *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské univerzity* E 15 (1970): 211–240.

20. De proprio sacerdote et casibus

Inc.: *Dominus noster Iesus Christus, lapis angularis, assit huic nostro principio ...* x *... sanguinem dedit. Hec Augustinus.*

MS: 1. Brno, Moravian Library, Mk 102, fol. 83r–88r

2. Prague, National Library, XXIII F 204, fol. 70v–73v (Inc. *Hic notabis primo, quod in hoc sacramento ...* x *... solite in glosa. Et sic est finis.*)[229]

Date: ca. 1415

21. Sermo ad clerum factus per dominum Nicolaum predicatorem Theutunicorum in Zacz in anno Domini MºCCCCXVI (Sermo ad clerum 1416)

Ed.: Petra Mutlová, "Mikuláše z Drážďan *Sermo ad clerum 1416* (kritická edice)." *Studia historica Brunensia* 62/1 (2015): 295–312.

22. Decalogus utilis pro informacione puerorum

---

additions mentioned above should resolve this problem.

[229] Bartoš, *Husitství a cizina*, 152–153 suggested including this work among the authentic works by Nicholas although he knew only of the Brno codex; a decade later in his "Nové spisy," 65, he announced the discovery of the text in the above Prague codex. Nevertheless, the codex now in the National Library in Prague contains only very fragmentary excerpts and based on a perfunctory examination, I suspect that the Brno codex will turn out to be a *codex unicus* of this text.

Inc.: *Est ergo primum mandatum prime tabule* ... x ... *explicit decalogus utilis pro informacione puerorum* ... *erit et minister meus filius*.

MS: Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 2148, fol. 2r–21r

Date: 1410?–1412

Emil Havelka, *Husitské katechismy* (Hussite catechisms) (Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1938), 100–110.

23. Tractatus de fide catholica

Ed.: 1. Havelka, *Husitské katechismy*, 192–205.

2. Jiří Daňhelka, ed., *Drobné spisy české* (Shorter Czech writings), Opera omnia Iohannis Hus IV (Prague: Academia, 1985), 532–542.

DUBIA

24. De Christi victoria et Antichristi casu

Inc.: *Christus verus deus et verus homo* ... x ... *in pecunia divinabunt etc. Michee 3*

MS: lost, mentioned in Otto Brunfels, *Processus consistorialis martyrii Iohannis Hus*, Strassburg 1524/1525

25. Sermo super cathedram Moysi sederunt scribe (De heresi)

Inc.: *Tunc Iesus locutus est ad turbas* ... *Hic Salvator ostendit* ... x ... *benedictus in secula seculorum*.

MS: Prague, National Library, V E 28, fol. 97v–102v

26. De simonia

Inc.: *Ubi enim maius periculum* ... x ... *satis habetur ista materia*.

MS: Prague, National Library, V E 28, fol. 104r–129v

27. Questiones circa quartam partem Sententiarum[230]

Inc.: *Utrum sacerdos per potestatem clavium possit quoad penam dimittere peccatum et arguitur quod non* ... x ... (fol. 163va) *a fornicacione et adulterio excusatur* ... (fol. 201va) *iudicio confirmatur. Et sic est finis illius*.

MS: Prague, National Library, X D 10, fol. 128va–163va, 196va–201va

28. De malicia cleri evitanda

Inc.: *Tue s sacerdos in eternum* … x … *rex pacificus Iesus Cristus*.

MS: Prague, National Library, V E 28, fol. 142r–149v

29. De ecclesia

Inc.: *Ecce pro vera significacione ecclesie expresse…*

MS: Herrnhut, Unitätsarchiv, AB.II.R.1.16.a, fol. 121r–126v

30. Collection of shorter treatises (*De labore corporali, De deceptionibus sacerdotum, De impedimentis paenitentiae, De ornamentis mulierum, De duobus gladiis, De bonis et malis sacerdotibus, De osculo pacis*)[231]

Inc.: *Labor corporalis est utilis ad culpe purgacionem …* x *… a populo Dei ablacione etc.*

Prague, National Library, XXIII F 204, fol. 38r–49v

31. Viginti dicta contra fornicarios (Questiones pulchre et utiles)[232]

Inc.: *Fornicacio et omnis inmundicia aut avaricia nec nominetur ...* x *... a qua malediccione liberos et liberatos nos perducat rex pacificus Iesus Cristus in vitam eternam amen.*

MS: 1. Brno, Moravian Library, Mk 108, fol. 63v–67r

2. Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, A 163, fol. 173r

Peter of Dresden

During his stay in Prague, Peter of Dresden allegedly authored several texts. However, the actual authorship of these texts is in many cases disputable.[233] Since there is no list of Peter's treatises, all texts presently ascribed to Peter are listed below, supplied with basic data concerning the surviving manuscripts as well as newly discovered copies, and discussed in detail.

1. De congruitate grammaticali

Inc.: *Congruitas grammaticalis consistit in debita proporcione …* x *… et sic est finis tractatuli grammaticalis Petri de Dresden.*

MS: 1. Prague, National Library, V H 21, fol. 166v–167v

2. Mainz, Stadtbibliothek, HS I 528, fol. 144r–145v

---

[230] Nicholas refers to this work in his *De purgatorio*, see Bartoš, *Husitství a cizina*, 148–149; Tříška, *Literární činnost*, 59.

[231] Bartoš, "Nové spisy," 64–66.

[232] Spunar and Vidmanová, 209.

3. Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, O 43, fol. 19r–21r

Date: ca. 1410

This short tract was found and edited based on the Prague copy by Otto Meltzer,[234] who knew of only this manuscript. This codex presently housed in the Czech National Library in Prague contains a date of 1415 and bears an old shelf-mark of Charles college library (S 13 K). Nevertheless, two more copies of this text survive. The second copy from Mainz is dated to 1410 by scribal colophones on several places in the codex and this dating is accepted also by the modern cataloguer. This manuscript was copied in the Carthusian monastery in Mainz by certain Johannes Lemlein and contains another text ascribed to Peter, the *Parvulus philosophiae naturalis*.[235] The third copy from the Metropolitan Chapter library in Prague contains a scribal explicit of 1415. The manuscript distribution suggests that the text was in all probability composed in the first decades of the fifteenth century in Bohemia. All three codices are also similar in content since they contain texts dealing with grammatical and rhetorical issues.

This text is in all probability the only indisputably authentic work by Peter of Dresden but it has received little scholarly attention so far. It is a very short discussion written in the spirit of speculative, so-called modist grammar. The study of grammar held a privileged position in the curriculum of medieval universitites and was understood as a mixed discipline of study of syntactic structure, philosophical linguistics, philosophy of language as well as history and usage of particular vocabulary items.[236] During the first half of the fourteenth century, several scholars from Erfurt became renowned in a theory of the speculative grammar, known as the second generation of the *modistae*, the modists, who focused specifically on discovering the "universal grammar".[237] Even though fifteenth-century modistic grammar is often criticized as not offering any serious contribution to the doctrinal development of linguistics, this theory dominated the university grammar instruction for some time. Modist grammatical theory is

---

[233] A tentative overview of Peter's works was printed by František Michálek Bartoš, "Nové spisy Petra a Mikuláše z Drážďan (New works of Peter and Nicholas of Dresden)," *Reformační sborník* 8 (1941): 66–67.

[234] Meltzer, "Ein Traktat," 200–202.

[235] For the catalogue record, see http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de/?xdbdtdn!%22obj%2032141114%22&dmode=doc#|4 [accessed January 5, 2018].

[236] Geoffrey L. Bursill-Hall, *A Census of Medieval Latin Grammatical Manuscripts* (Stuttgart – Bad Cannstatt: Fromann – Holzboog, 1981), 11; Mary Sirridge, "Thomas of Erfurt," in *Sourcebook in the History of Philosophy of Language: Primary source texts from the Pre-Socratics to Mill*, ed. Margaret Cameron, Benjamin Hill, and Robert J. Stainton (Cham: Springer, 2017), 295.

exemplified, among others, by Thomas of Erfurt's tract entitled *De modis significandi*, or *Grammatica speculativa*, written around 1310, which was widely circulated also at Prague University.[238] The text gained immediate popularity and as soon as 1324 it was commented upon. Thomas became the basic modist authority of the 14th and 15th centuries and at the same time the last author to develop the modist theory in a significant way.[239] It is worth mentioning that Thomas's *Grammatica speculativa* survives in almost forty medieval manuscripts; in addition, there are twenty six manuscripts that contain commentaries on various parts of the text.[240] What might be interesting is that among these copies that contain commentaries twelve are of Prague origin, three are preserved in Cracow and another three in Wroclaw, while the rest is scattered individually in various other libraries. This confirms lively interest in Thomas's work at Prague University, where – it is worth adding – the grammar was not among the mandatory examinations and thus many students had to undertake private lessons. As a result, Thomas's treatise provides good grounds for comparison with Peter's text.

Peter's text deals with the concept of grammatical construction and lists several of the constructibles (*constructibilia*), which are to him the adequate principles of the subject of syntax.[241] Unlike Thomas of Erfurt, Peter's text focuses only on the second part of the *modus significandi* theory, the so-called *diasynthetica*, which covers the topics of construction, congruity, and perfection. The Middle Ages adopted the concept of construction from Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae*, who did not develop it in a systematic manner; and a fragment of construction theory appears in Alexander of Villa Dei's *Doctrinale*. That is why medieval scholars undertook this task from the early twelfth-century on.[242] Peter claims to deal with grammatical congruity, i.e. the well-formedness of individual constructions, but he discusses in some detail only the constructibles. Thomas of Erfurt defines construction as "a

---

[237] Costantino Marmo, "A Pragmatic Approach to Language in Modism," in *Sprachtheorien in Spätantike und Mittelalter*, ed. Sten Ebbesen (Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1995), 169–183.
[238] Thomas de Erfordia, *Grammatica speculativa*. Ed. and transl. Geoffrey L. Bursill-Hall (London: Longman, 1972). See also František Šmahel, „Fakulta svobodných umění," (Faculty of Arts) in *Dějiny univerzity Karlovy*, vol. 1, 103.
[239] Jack Zupko, "Thomas of Erfurt," in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2015 Edition)*, ed. Edward N. Zalta, available at: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/erfurt/ [accessed January 5, 2018].
[240] *Verfasserlexicon*, vol. 9, col. 855; Bursill-Hall, *A Census*, *passim*; Jan Pinborg, *Die Entwicklung der Sprachtheorie im Mittelalter* (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967), 318–320.
[241] For more details, see Michael A. Covington, *Syntactic Theory in the High Middle Ages. Modistic Models of Sentence Structure* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 61–76 and passim.
[242] Krystyna Krauze-Błachowicz, "Johannes Glogoviensis' Concept of Construction," *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric* 6/19 (2003): 32.

combination of constructibles made up of the modes of signifying, caused by the intellect and devised for the purpose of expressing a compound concept of the mind,"[243] and Peter uses identical words in his definition. In the following, however, there are various discrepancies between Thomas's and Peter's texts. Thomas gives the definition of the construction in the opening paragraphs of the second part of his tract and then divides his explanation into three parts and subdivides the part on the construction into intransitive and transitive construction (*constructio intransitiva*/*transitiva actuum et personarum*). Peter, however, follows a different path. Having handled the many species of the constructibles, he touches upon the division of transitive and intransitive construction in the second half of his tract. He does not discuss either the perfect union of two individual constructibles (*perfectio constructionis*) in any detail, or the case when the subject and predicate are not expressed explicitely in a sentence – a typical case is the omission of a definite pronominal subject. The modists therefore differentiate between *perfectio secundum sensum* and *perfectio secundum intellectum* (completeness according to sense and according to understanding). On the other hand, Peter adds to his deductions various examples (*regule*) that substantiate each of his conclusions. In very general terms, both the structure of the arguments and the examples differ in these two texts; Peter's text representing only a simplified fragment of the modist theory. By the beginning of the 15th century speculative grammar became outdated in Paris – where it once flourished – and as a tool to study Latin syntax it was sidelined by other approaches. However, Thomas's *Grammatica speculativa* remained a popular textbook at Prague University even after the criticism and attack of the representatives of the "new logic."[244] In the second half of the 15th century, speculative grammar notably revives in Cracow, as can be observed in the works of a well-known lecturer at Cracow University Johannes Glogoviensis.[245] An inspection of low-level grammatical texts that were used in the schools shows that speculative grammar played an important role in the university training up to the beginning of the sixteenth century. A survey of such texts – i.e. not only highly theoretical works, but those where modistic theory played varying role – can tell us much more about the intellectual climate of the

[243] Thomas de Erfordia, *Grammatica speculativa*, 279.
[244] Ian P. Wei, *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris. Theologians and the University, c. 1100–1330* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
[245] Krystyna Krauze-Błachowicz, "*Modi significandi* in Johannes Glogoviensis' Grammar," *Mediaevalia. Textos e estudos* 23 (2004): 84.

period.[246] The question therefore arises how Peter's text could have been connected to teaching at Prague University, or, on a more general level, what was the actual purpose of this text?

For the matter at hand, the manuscript context in which Peter's text appears is revealing: The Prague copy V H 21 contains several grammatical treatises, such as John of Vlhlavy's commentary on Donatus;[247] an anonymous *Tractatus de constructione grammaticali* (inc. *Circa materiam construccionis*); the *Flores grammatice* by Ludolphus de Luco from Hildesheim;[248] an anonymous *Thesaurus grammaticalis de structura* (inc. *Emo condigno puerilia dogmata signo*); as well as a closing part of Thomas of Erfurt's *De modis significandi*. This part of Thomas's tract is considered an independent *Tractatus de constructione partium orationis*, with an incipit *Ad cognoscendum naturam constructionis*.[249] Worth noting is the fact that this text alone survives in six copies, all of which are of Bohemian provenance.[250]

This selection of texts is very similar to several other medieval manuscripts preserved in Prague libraries. Namely, manuscript V H 28 (which can be dated to 1433) contains among others a commentary on Thomas's mnemonic verses for teaching grammar to schoolboys, the *Fundamentum puerorum*;[251] a commentary on Donatus; a versified commentary on construction by John of Lauburg *Compendium metricum* (inc. *Tu qui naturas structure queris et optas*);[252] a versified textbook *Precepta scolarium* with a commentary and Czech glosses; an excerpt from Peter of Dresden's *Parvulus logicae*; the *Flores grammatice* by Ludolphus de Luco from Hildesheim and the anonymous *Thesaurus grammaticalis*, both of which were

[246] C. H. Kneepkens, "Some Notes on the Revival of Modistic Linguistics in the Fifteenth Century: Ps.-Johannes Versor and William Zenders of Weert," in *John Buridan and Beyond. Topics in the Language Sciences, 1300–1700*, ed. Russell L. Friedman and Sten Ebbesen (Copenhagen: Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, 2004) 69–71. Kneepkens's analysis and excellent observations are instructive for a proper appreciation of the role of late medieval modism and generally for the need of more research into grammar of this period.
[247] Iohannes de Vlhlavy became a bachelor at Prague University in 1409 (*Liber decanorum* 1/1, 404, 406); nothing more is known about his literary activity. The same commentary survives in a manuscript from the same collection: X E 15, fol. 1r–93r (copied in 1477).
[248] *Verfasserlexicon*, vol. 5, col. 965–967.
[249] *Verfasserlexicon*, vol. 9, col. 852. See also Paul Lehmann, "Mitteilungen aus Handschriften VIII. Zu den sprachlogischen Traktaten des Mittelalters," *Sitzungberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Abteilung* 1944/2 (1944): 7.
[250] The shelf-marks are the following: Prague, National Library, IV E 18, fol. 309r–327r; V H 21, fol. 169r–189r; X F 24, fol. 91r–122r; Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, M 84, fol. 1r–36r; M 199, fol. 16r–57r; M 132, fol. 124r–151r.
[251] *Verfasserlexicon*, vol. 9, col. 855.
[252] *Verfasserlexicon*, vol. 4, col. 668.

copied in the V H 21 as well; and John of Netolice's versified *Compendium de speciebus constructionis* with a commentary.

Similar treatises appear also in a manuscript M 84 from the Metropolitan Chapter Library in Prague: here, an uknown copyist in the early 1450s wrote down several, often versified grammatical texts, including John of Netolice's versified *Compendium* (with a colophon 1452); John of Lauburg's *Compendium metricum*; an anonymous *Thesaurus grammaticalis*; a commentary on Thomas's *Fundamentum puerorum* as well as his rhythmical *Compendiollum de regimine et constructione* (inc. *O pater ob natum*) also with a commentary; and the *Flores grammatice* by Ludolphus de Luco. Most of these texts appear in the two above-mentioned codices as well.

It is evident that these texts were copied, read and commented upon together. At least one of the surviving copies was once in possession of the Charles college library of Prague University and this direct link indicates that they were used as textbooks at the university. The influence of Parisian commentaries and textbooks were by no means pushed aside by the texts from Erfurt. Nevertheless, the link between Erfurt and Prague becomes extremely interesting when we take into consideration Nicholas of Dresden's study at Erfurt University. Is it possible that the circle of the Dresdeners played an active role in the circulation and transmission of some of these texts? Could this be interpreted as a hint of an existence of the Dresden School? A detailed textual comparison of relevant material is, therefore, essential for taking this issue any further. The fact that these texts are presently accessible only in medieval manuscripts hinders this task for the time being. Nevertheless, based on the intricate transmission of Thomas of Erfurt's texts in the Prague milieu, it might not be wrong to presume that the connection between Erfurt and Prague was even stronger than previously thought. The link between still popular modistic grammar and Peter's treatises can be understood, after all, as evidence for his innovative teaching activities in Prague. Peter's short and clear and extraordinarily well-organized text shows no signs of doctrine and it was these qualities that in all probability rendered its popularity as a textbook possible.

2. Parvulus logicae

Inc.: *Propositio est oratio vere vel false significans indicando, ut homo currit* … x … *et multae aliae regulae consequentiales patent ubi supra.*

MS: 1. Erfurt, Universitäts- und Forschungsbibliothek, CA 4º 245, fol. 1r–32r

2. Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 2084, fol. 104r–217r

3. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 14880, fol. 2r–37r

4. Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 10044, fol. 13–26

5. Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3065, fol. 94r–95v (Inc. *Proposicio est oracio indicativa congrua*)

6. Prague, National Museum, XII F 4, fol. 337v–341r (Inc. *Proposicio est oracio indicativa*)

7. Prague, National Library, XIV F 20, fol. 1r–16v, incomplete (Inc. *Proposicio est oracio* x expl. *octava regula est a particulari ad suam indefinitam*)

8. Prague, National Library, V H 28, fol. 81r–85v, incomplete (Inc. *Proposicio est oracio indicativa* x expl. *tercia maiorem variat servatque minorem*)

9. Erfurt, Carthusian monastery Salvatorberg, now lost (*Autor istius tractatuli mag. Petrus Gerit, mag. schole in Dresssen, scil. in Missna. Et sicut dicitur, tunc in ultimis suis diebus pervenit ad Boemicam pravitatem et Constancie incineratus*)

Date: N/A

Another tract attributed to Peter is a short commentary on logic that can be found in several manuscripts and old prints and that is usually entitled as *Parvulus logicae*.[253] Logic was the core of what we would now call the undergraduate curriculum. The need to instruct teenage boys in logic (that always existed) was substantially accentuated at the beginning of the 13th century. The *Summaries of logic* (c. 1230) by Peter of Spain aptly responded to this need.[254] The situation at Prague University was no exception: the study of logic also had a special place in the trivium as more than half of the obligatory lectures in the bachelor curriculum were on the subject of logic. František Šmahel showed, for instance, that students

[253] Lohr, "Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries," 353, no. 1, registered five manuscripts; the Vatican copy Vat. lat. 3065 and the three Prague additions were put in by Bartoš, "Nové spisy," 66.

[254] Peter of Spain's text survives in about three hundred manuscripts and two more hundred printed editions; it is critically edited: *Tractatus Called Afterwards Summulae Logicales. First Critical Edition from the Manuscripts with an Introduction.* Ed. L. M. De Rijk (Assen, Vam Govrum, 1972); see also Brian P. Copenhaver, *Peter of Spain: Summaries of Logic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

at Prague University had to prove their knowledge of Peter of Spain's *Summulae logicales* in order to acquire the bachelor's degree; while in Paris two other grammar handbooks were assigned. Moreover, Aristotle's *Topica* was among the obligatory texts for the bachelor examination and the *Physics* for the master of arts's examination in Paris, while in Prague the order was transposed. It might be worth mentioning that this reverse order of reading the *Topica* and the *Physica* was accepted also in Vienna and Erfurt.[255] This tallies with the previously suggested strong connection between Prague and Erfurt universities.

Speaking of Peter of Dresden's text, Lohr listed five manuscripts preserved outside Bohemia and a dozen of prints, which were allegedly printed by Bartholomew Arnoldi of Usingen.[256] More manuscripts of Bohemian origin can be added to Lohr's list: A copy from the collection of the National Museum in Prague (XII F 4), entitled *Draznensis minor* (fol. 337v), has an only slightly different incipit.[257] Incompletely, the text survives in a manuscript in the Czech National Library in Prague (XIV F 20) where Peter's philosophical manual, which will be discussed below, is preserved as well.[258] The very same collection contains another, unfinished copy of this text (V H 28).[259] An interesting piece of information comes from a mid-15th-century catalogue which records a lost manuscript from a Carthusian cloister in Erfurt. The manuscript supposedly contained a text entitled *Parva logicalia* with the following note: *Autor istius tractatuli mag. Petrus Gerit, mag. schole in Dresssen, scil. in Missna. Et sicut dicitur, tunc in ultimis suis diebus pervenit ad Boemicam pravitatem et Constancie incineratus*, which is, in all probability, identical with the text preserved in the above-mentioned manuscripts.[260]

[255] Šmahel, „Fakulta svobodných umění," 111.
[256] Lohr, "Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries," 353, no. 1.
[257] František Michálek Bartoš, *Soupis rukopisů Národního musea v Praze* (Catalogue of manuscripts of the National Museum in Prague), vol. 2 (Prague: Melantrich, 1927), 237.
[258] Truhlář, *Catalogus*, vol. 2, 327–328, with an attribution *Petri Hispani Tractatus de syllogismis*.
[259] Truhlář, *Catalogus*, vol. 1, 418–419.
[260] Paul Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, vol. 2, *Bistum Mainz und Erfurt* (Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928), 485. The catalogue mentions Peter's name in connection with two treatises: the first treatise is the present *Parva logicalia* while the other is the *Circa parvulum philosophie glosa magistri Petri de Dressen* (p. 489), that is, a text described in the following entry. The opinion that Peter was burnt in Constance could possibly be explained by the confusion concerning his death in Regensburg, as was shown above. Certainly, the mention of Constance must be a mistake of some sort, perhaps in connection with Hus as the main representative of the *Boemica pravitas* and his martyrdom in this city. Nevertheless, Constance as the place of Peter's death does appear in the sholarly literature, for instance in Lohr, "Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries," 352.

Nevertheless, the attribution of this text to Peter of Dresden remains problematic and the manuscript material must be assessed critically in order to resolve this issue. There are various and mostly anonymous late medieval *compendia* that treat certain points of logic and comment for that matter on Peter of Spain's *Summulae*. The titles *Parva logicalia* and *Parvulus logicae* were profusely confused.[261] For example, a commentary of the famous French Dominican John Versor from the roughly same period is very likely to be hidden behind some of the copies identified by Lohr as Peter's *Parvulus logicae*. Ivan Boh, who analyzed the content of the *Parvulus logicae* based on two old prints, considered this an anonymous piece and the possible link with Peter of Dresden apparently escaped him.[262] Interestingly, he observes that the *Parvulus* defines the proposition (*De propositione*) differently from Peter of Spain and ascribes this shift in meaning to a possible influence of the theory of the modes of signifying,[263] which is – regarding Peter of Dresden's undeniable authorship of the modist grammatical treatise – a remarkable information. As Boh noted, even though these *compendia* do not document significant progress in logic (and cannot be, for that matter, compared with the innovations of logicians of previous centuries), their value lies elsewhere: "We might learn from these summaries what the masters who have written them considered to be the minimal but most important topics in logic curriculum."[264] This is a valuable hint concerning Peter of Dresden's involvement in teaching, if he really can be identified as the author of this text.

3. Parvulus philosophiae naturalis (PPN)

Inc.: *Natura est principium et causa movendi et quiescendi eius, in quo est principium per se et non secundum accidens* … x … *sed Deum non cognoscit per abstractionem, quia similitudo abstracta simplicior est illo, a quo fit abstractio, Deo autem nihil est simplicius.*

Ed.: Andrzej I. Dumała, "*Parvulus philosophiae naturalis* Piotra z Drezna," *Studia Antyczne i Mediewistyczne* 4/39 (2006): 281–294.[265]

---

[261] Carl von Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande*, vol. 4 (Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel, 1870), 219–221.
[262] Ivan Boh, "A Late-Mediaeval Assessment of the Scope of Logic: An Analysis of Parvulus logice," *Studia mediewistyczne* 22/1 (1983): 3–36.
[263] Boh, "A Late-Mediaeval Assessment," 6, note 14.
[264] Boh, "A Late-Mediaeval Assessment," 6–7.
[265] Dumala knew of fifty-five manuscripts and twelve old prints, but he has not published his findings yet (p. 278); his edition is based on five fifteenth-century copies of Cracow provenance, one late medieval manuscript from Leipzig and one early-sixteenth-century print.

MS: Additions to Lohr's list of 60 manuscripts:[266]

1. Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, M 56, fol. 1r–88v (1485; with comm.)

2. Prague, National Museum, Kruliš-Randa 8 G 16 (= XII F 30), fol. 1r–13v (XV^1; with comm.)

3. Eichstätt, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. st. 685, fol. 311r–315r (1456–1458; with comm.)[267]

4.* Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M. ch. f. 118, fol. 2r–10v (1493; with glosses)[268]

5.* Erfurt, Universitätsbibliothek, CA Quart 240, fol. 1r–14r (1404)

6. Naumburg, Domstiftsbibliothek, Nr. 14, fol. 71r–82r (1485–1492; with comm.)

7.* Tübingen, Universitätsbibliothek, Mc 335, fol. 168r–188v (1487–1492; with comm.)

8. Tübingen, Universitätsbibliothek, Mc 23, fol. 167r–260v (1430–1444; with comm.)

9. Erfurt, Carthusian monastery Salvatorberg, now lost

Date: ca. 1404(?)

The most disputable piece among Peter's texts is *Parvulus philosophiae naturalis (PPN)*, a very popular concise manual of natural philosophy. Since this text was presented and discussed by Martin Grabmann, various "discoveries" were made of individual manuscripts of the *Parvulus*.[269] It is an extract from the well-known treatise *Philosophia pauperum* (or

[266] Lohr, "Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries," 353–354, no. 2. Some additions to Lohr's list were presented by Josef Tříška, "Příspěvky k středověké literární universitě" (Contributions to the medieval literary university), *AUC–HUCP* 9/2 (1968): 20, out of which the following references are incorrect: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, lat. qu. 826, nr. 7; Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 1069, fol. 143r; Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 4937, fol. 5r–46v. I could not verify Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 2117, fol. 2v; Vatican Library, Pal. lat. 1050, fol. 168v. Further additions were registered in the *Repertorium Initiorum Manuscriptorum Latinorum Medii Aevi*, ed. Jacqueline Hamesse and Sławomir Szyller, vol. 2 (Leuven: Brepols, 2008), 696–697. Currently, Annemieke Verboon is investigating the transmission of the *PPN* manuscripts and has collected ca. 80 copies. Her list has not been published yet, for more, see "Brain Ventricle Diagrams: A Century After Walther Sudhoff. New Manuscript Sources from the XVth century," *Sudhoffs Archiv. Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 98/2 (2014): 218, 231. Verboon's main focus are copies that contain ventricle brain diagrams and for this reason her article brings a list of twenty copies with these diagrams – these are in the above list marked by *.

[267] The manuscript comes from a Dominican monastery in Eichstätt, see Karl Heinz Keller, *Die mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Eichstätt*, vol. 3, *Aus Cod. st 471 – Cod. st 699* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2004), 397–403. See also A. L. Gabriel, review of *Speculum philosophiae medii aevi: Die Handschriftensammlung des Dominikaners Georg Schwartz († nach 1484)*, by Maarten J. F. M. Hoenen, *Speculum* 71/1 (1996): 159.

[268] Hans Thurn, *Die Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Würzburg*, vol. 2/1, *Handschriften aus benediktischen Provenienzen*. (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1973), 102–105. See also Annemieke R. Verboon, "La perception sensorielle et la physiologie du savoir. Manuel du fin XVe siècle – MS Würzburg, UB, M. Ch. F. 118," *Archives des Sciences Sociales des Religions* 182 (2018): 1–28 (accepted/in press).

[269] Martin Grabmann, *Die Philosophia pauperum und ihr Verfasser Albert von Orlamünde*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters 20/2 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1918), 29–33. See also Grabmann,

Summa naturalium) by Albert of Orlamunde (frequently attributed to Albert the Great), a 13th century compendium which circulated in Central and Eastern Europe well into the 16th century and which was often preserved in manuscripts and also printed together with Peter's treatise.[270] Peter's *Parvulus* was also very popular and has survived in about eighty manuscripts from the fifteenth century and more than twenty old prints from 1495–1521.[271] In 1499, Bartholomew Arnoldi of Usingen published his own commentary on *Parvulus philosophie naturalis* in Leipzig, which was to a certain extent different from Peter's *Parvulus philosophie naturalis* and which added further confusion to the attribution of the *Parvulus*.[272]

The *Parvulus philosophiae naturalis* became a highly popular textbook in the fifteenth-century and kept this position until the sixteenth century, most probably due to its conveniently concise exposition of the main points of Aristotelian natural philosophy. Its threefold structure follows the content of three of Aristotle's works, namely the *Physica*, *De generatione et corruptione* and *De anima* – and that is why the *PPN* is in numerous manuscripts divided into three shorter parts (*tractatus*). The first part discusses several notions (*natura*, *materia*, *forma*), the problem of four kinds of causes, and special attention is paid to *motus* as a central notion of natural philosophy, which is dealt with in detail and supplied with definitions of *quies*, *infinitum*, and the preconditions of motion, i.e. *vacuum*, and *tempus*. In the second part, the four elements (*elementa*) and their qualities are addressed, together with an explanation of how things come into being and pass away (*generatio et corruptio*), including the question of alteration. The final part discusses the definition and division of soul faculties.

Martin, "Handschriftliche Forschungen und Funde zu den philosophischen Schriften des Petrus Hispanus, des späteren Papstes Johannes XXI," *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Abteilung* 9 (1936): 80.

[270] Scholars still question the authorship of the *Philosophia pauperum*. For more, see *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles B. Schmitt, Quentin Skinner, and Eckhard Kessler (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 793–794.

[271] Lohr, "Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries," 353–354. The number was increased by Verboon, "Brain Ventricle Diagrams," 218, 231.

[272] Sebastian Lalla, *Secundum viam modernam. Ontologischer Nominalismus bei Bartholomäus Arnoldi von Usingen*. (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2003), 77–86, discusses the relationship of Peter's *Parvulus* to the numerous prints of Bartholomew of Usingen and shows that Bartholomew had no idea whose text he himself was commenting on. Furthermore, Bartholomew seems to have been unaware of Peter's connection with the Hussite movement. Lalla identifies Peter with Petrus Gerticz of Dresden (without questioning Peter's authorship of the *Parvulus*); his summary of Peter's biography rests mainly on older German sources and is thus not reliable.

The long list of manuscripts which supposedly contain this richly preserved tract still awaits due appraisal.[273] The same applies to its authorship. It is very likely that some of the manuscripts will have to be excluded from the list while others will be added – the many inaccuracies and confusions were, among other reasons, caused by the fact that the incipit of the *PPN* is identical with Aristotle's *Physica*. The other reason, perhaps even more important, is the fact that the manuscript catalogues and repertories do not differentiate between the text of the *PPN* and its commentaries. Moreover, it can be expected that progress in cataloguing of minor collections will yield further results.

The circulation of the *PPN* in medieval Bohemia might be of importance for the question of Peter's possible authorship of the text. Lohr listed five manuscripts presently housed in Bohemian archives and libraries. In addition, there are two more manuscripts of Bohemian origin that were not registered by Lohr and that contain commentaries: namely a manuscript presently in the Prague Metropolitan Chapter Library (M 56 with a scribal date 1485)[274] and an incomplete copy in the collection of the National Museum in Prague (8 G 16; presently XII F 30).[275] These are not very high numbers. Therefore, the seemingly high popularity of the *PPN* in the German milieu might suggest that the text originated during Peter's stay in Germany – i.e. most probably between 1405 and 1411. However, this does not exclude the possibility that Peter authored the text in Prague but it enjoyed wider circulation only subsequently in this environment. The earliest dated copies of the text strengthen the connection of Peter or his supporters with Erfurt university.

Another crucial question for establishing the authorship of the *PPN* is the date of its origin. The oldest among the known surviving copies is probably a manuscript from Erfurt (CA Quart 240), dated to 1404–1405.[276] A copy presently housed in Munich (BSB, Clm 18917) was

[273] Andrzej Dumala (as above, note 265) did not print his list of manuscripts; the issue is currently being investigated by Annemieke R. Verboon (see above, note 266).

[274] Antonín Podlaha, ed., *Doplňky a opravy k soupisu rukopisů knihovny metropolitní kapitoly pražské* (Supplements and corrections to the catalogue of manuscripts of the Metropolitan Chapter in Prague) (Prague: Sumptibus S. F. Metropolitani capituli Pragensis, 1928), 39.

[275] Registered by Bartoš, "Nové spisy," 66; not registered in Pavel Brodský, "Rukopisy Otakara Kruliše-Randy v knihovně Národního muzea (Manuscripts of Otakar Kruliš-Randa in the library of the National Museum)," *Miscellanea oddělení rukopisů a vzácných tisků* 7/2 (1990): 19–30; new catalogue: Michal Dragoun, *Soupis středověkých rukopisů knihovny Národního muzea. Doplňky ke katalogům F. M. Bartoše, J. Vašici a J. Vajse* (Prague: Národní muzeum – Scriptorium, 2011), 150–152.

[276] According to Dumala, "*Parvulus philosophiae naturalis* Piotra z Drezna," 276; see Wilhelm Schum, *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der Amplonianischen Handschriften-Sammlung zu Erfurt* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1887), 496. Verboon, "Brain Ventricle Diagrams," 218, 222–223, rejects this dating because the colophones in the manuscript in question are not directly connected with the text of the *PPN*, and therefore

written in Erfurt before 1408.[277] In Poland, two copies survive that can be dated to 1414 or 1416 and that already contain a commentary or glosses (Wroclaw, IV Q 24; Cracow, BJ 2179). Nevertheless, the dating of individual copies is complicated by the above-mentioned fact that some of the copies in Lohr's list contain a commentary, while others contain only the *PPN* (unfortunately Lohr did not pay due attention to this issue). We can assume that the practice of copying and commenting on the *PPN* was diverse. In Berlin, SB lat. qu. 17, for instance, both the text and the commentary were written down together in 1433, according to a colophon. A quick look at the colophones shows that this was the case for majority of the late fifteenth-century copies. But there are surely codices where the act of copying the text of the *PPN* and the subsequent commentary took place individually. Generally, it is not clear how the text of the *PPN* relates to the commentaries. Bartholomew Usingen, for example, added his own commentary in the middle of the text of the *PPN* printed in boldface type. In some manucripts, there are interlinear or marginal glosses, while in others the complete text is interpreted, or space for future comments is left. This takes us back to the question of the function of the text.

It seems clear that the text was written for educational purposes. Erich Kleineidam maintained that the *PPN* was in circulation at city schools so that students had become acquainted with the material already before they started their academic studies.[278] This tallies with the testimony of the following *PPN* copy: a manuscript presently housed in Wolfenbüttel, Cod. Guelf. 906 Helmst., was copied in 1457 by Vinzenz Varnholte of Spandau, a then rector of a city school in Tangermünde. Andrzej Dumala registered further evidence on the circulation of the *PPN* at lower-education levels: a certain Iohannes Nicolai of Gnezno, before enrolling at Cracow in 1420, had copied a commentary on the *PPN* already in 1416.[279] Nevertheless, Dumala also recorded another example pointing to a different direction: Iohannes of Ludziczsko, a student at Cracow University, copied the *PPN* on 21 April 1421,

---

considers the oldest dated copy of the *PPN* to be from 1413 (namely Prague, National Library, XIV F 20). On codicological grounds, there is no reason for rejecting the dating of the Erfurt copy.

[277] Annemieke R. Verboon, "Transmitting school-philosophy. Thomistic commitments regarding sense perception in a 15th-century Cologne student manuscript," in *Bücher und Identitäten. Literarische Reproduktionskulturen der Vormoderne*, ed. Eckhart Lutz, Nicole Eichenberger, and Crisitne Putzo (Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2017), 10.

[278] Kleineidam, *Universitas studii Erffordensis*, vol. 2, 156.

[279] Dumala, "*Parvulus philosophiae naturalis* Piotra z Drezna," 277, 280 – the manuscript in question is Cracow, BJ 2179.

i.e. one year before obtaining his MA degree.[280] It was mentioned above that the order of prescribed books, as stated in the Parisian statutes, was reversed at the universities in Prague, Erfurt, or Vienna.[281] That is why the *PPN* was probably intended for the bachelor programme since it covered areas required for the bachelor examination at these universities (i.e. the *Physica*), and not for the MA level.[282]

In more detail, the connection of the *PPN* to university instruction was examined by Annemieke Verboon.[283] Several statutes give evidence that the *PPN* was in use at many Central and Eastern European universities, such as Leipzig, Cracow, Erfurt, Vienna, Basel and elsewhere.[284] Based on a copy from Würzburg, which contains several texts interpreting Aristotle's *De anima* (the *PPN* being one of them), Verboon then provides an actual insight into the medieval classroom in late-medieval Cologne. She showed various textual and visual tools that helped young bachelor students navigate through the curriculum and grasp the basics of philosophical notions that they had to memorise without truly understanding them. It is noteworthy that every fourth extant copy of the *PPN* is accompanied by a drawing of a brain ventricle diagram. According to Verboon, the *PPN* represents the by far most often illustrated text with visual representation of the brain and its information processes, i.e. in the iconographical tradition of the so-called brain ventricle diagrams. The *PPN* therefore played an important role in the diffusion of this iconographical type.[285] Moreover, Verboon argued that the diagrams in the *PPN* contributed to a shift in discussing cognition from a metaphysical and philosophical points of view to a discussion of the brain issues in a medical framework.[286] The full-page drawings appear in individual copies either within the text, but also separately –

[280] *Ibid.*, 276–277: Iohannes of Ludziczsko was awarded the MA degree in 1422. The manuscript is in Warsaw, National Library, II 8072 akc. 7183.
[281] See above, 83–84.
[282] This was suggested by Pekka Kärkkäinen, "Psychology and the Soul in Late Medieval Erfurt," *Vivarium* 47/4 (2009): 427. Kärkkäinen compared two contemporaneous commentaries on Peter's *Parvulus*, both printed in Leipzig in 1499: Usingen's commentary, written in the spirit of the Erfurtian *via moderna*, and Johannes Peyligk's *Philosophiae naturalis compendium*, which followed *via antiqua*. In order to differentiate the positions of the main philosophical schools of the time, Kärkkäinen used a third commentary offering the Scotist perspective, namely one written by a Cracow Scotist John of Stobnica. His analysis shows that the Erfurtian philosophers often substantiated their positions against their opponents from the authorities of their own school.
[283] Verboon, "Transmitting school-philosophy," 1–43.
[284] *Ibid.*, 12, assuming the same situation in Cologne, even though the *PPN* is not mentioned in any of the Cologne statutes.
[285] Verboon, "Brain Ventricle Diagrams," 216, 219.
[286] *Ibid.*, 219–221.

apparently they illustrate the explanations on the *PPN* rather than the *PPN* itself.[287] Generally, they belong to the fourth part of the *PPN* about *De anima*, which discusses the faculties of the soul.

The above-described interesting details about the rich circulation of the *PPN* copies and the subsequent commentaries on it, however, did not yield much evidence about the authorship of the original text or its precise dating. There are only a few exceptions. In this respect it is important that these manuscripts (i.e. containing evidence about their authorship) expressly name either Peter of Dresden or Petrus Gerticz, i.e. one of the possible identifications of Peter of Dresden: A manuscript presently housed in Vienna claims that the author of the *Parvulus* was *Magister Petrus Gerticz, quondam rector scolarum in Dresden*;[288] a codex from Munich has a heading of *Tractatulus parvus et utilis translatus per magistrum Petrum in Dresden ex summulis Alberti*;[289] a colophon in the copy in the National Library in Warsaw reads: *Explicit tractatulus philosophiae naturalis brevis, bonus et utilis collectus per magistrum Petrum, fidelem lectorem scholarium Drezdensem, finitus per Johannem de Lludziczsko in crastino sancti Adalberti sub anno Domini M^{o}CCCC^{o}XXI^{o}*.[290]

By and large, the surviving medieval manuscripts contain some grounds for Peter of Dresden's authorship of the *PPN*. This is furthermore supported by the contemporary hints emphasizing Peter's authority as a teacher. On the other hand, it is difficult to imagine that the author of such a medieval bestseller could have been linked in any way to Hussite heresy, or any kind of unortodoxy (such as Waldensianism, as was suggested for Peter in Nuremberg in 1405). There are almost no traces of such a connection in the manuscript copies of the *PPN* or its subsequent commentaries. The only apparent exception is the fifteenth-century library catalogue where an allusion to a lost Erfurt copy is recorded and which speaks of Peter having joined the Hussites at the end of his life. Nevertheless, the confused reference to Peter's death in Constance in this catalogue makes the reliability of this report less trustworthy.

If we link the history of the text to Peter's biography, the *PPN* would have to be written in Prague before Peter's departure to Germany around 1405, or shortly afterwards. This means

[287] Verboon, "Transmitting school-philosophy," 13–14.
[288] Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 5242, fol. 5v; for a basic description of the contents of the manuscript, see *Tabulae codicum manu scriptorum praeter graecos et orientales in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asservatorum*, vol. 4, *Cod. 5001–6500*. Ed. Academia Caesarea Vindobonensis (Vienna: Gerold, 1870), 72. This manuscript is listed by Lohr under shelf-mark 5243.
[289] Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 18917, fol. 73; pointed out by Bartoš, *Husitství a cizina*, 75, n. 2.

that Peter wrote this text during his studies in Prague or in his very early years as a lecturer. Alternatively, the links to Erfurt milieu that emerged in the course of the manuscript survey might indicate that during his travels between Nuremberg and Dresden (ca. 1405–1406) Peter spent some time in Erfurt. This might also explain the fact that there are very few medieval copies of Bohemian provenance and many more from Germany.

For the present purpose, the connection between Peter Gerit (as a variant of Gerticz) and Peter of Dresden attested to in several manuscripts (among them the testimony of the Erfurt manuscript, contemporary with Peter's life, is especially conclusive) adds weight to the suggestion that the Peter who was rector in Dresden was the same man who was a teacher in Prague and the author of this popular treatise.

DUBIA

4. Parvulus philosophiae moralis

Inc.: *Licet homo inter alia animalia magis sit corpore erectus donisque naturalibus et viribus ac potenciis corporis …* x *… cognoscimus quod nobis concedat qui sine fine vivit et regnat in saecula saeculorum. Amen.*

MS: 1. Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, lat. fol. 40 (Rose No. 984), fol. 61–82r
2. Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, lat. qu. 97 (Rose No. 982), fol. 146r–168r (Leipzig?)
3. Göttingen, Universitätsbibliothek, Philol. 41C, fol. 31–49, 63–74
4. Luxembourg, Bibliothèque nationale, N^{o} 53, fol. 318–343 (1467)
5. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 8401, fol. 405r–424v

Date: N/A

Lohr suggested that a text entitled *Parvulus philosophiae moralis*, so far identified in five manuscripts, also bears the imprint of Peter's authorship.[291] The text contains glosses and in some cases also a commentary. In one of the Berlin manuscripts (lat. fol. 40), the above-mentioned *Parvulus philosophiae naturalis* ascribed to Peter is copied as well.

5. Conspectus divisionis universalium

Inc.: *Universale est duplex: reale / loycale ...*

MS: Erfurt, Universitäts- und Forschungsbibliothek, CA 4^{o} 271, fol. 14v

[290] Recorded by Dumala, "*Parvulus philosophiae naturalis* Piotra z Drezna," 276, 279.

Date: ca. 1404

František Šmahel provisionally attributed a short commentary on Aristotle's logic, *Conspectus divisionis universalium*, preserved in a single manuscript in Erfurt dated to 1404, to Peter of Dresden.[292] A collection of philosophical treatises in this manuscript contains various pieces, among which the name of Peter of Dresden and a note on place and date of origin are mentioned (Dresden 1405). It is yet to be decided whether this short graphical representation of the above-mentioned question on the universals can be considered a separate piece or only an extract from some other treatise.

6. Abbreviata Posteriorum

Inc.: *Omnis doctrina et omnis disciplina intellectiva ...* x *... ergo omnis homo est realis propter realitatem et sic est finis huius. Expliciunt abbreviata posteriorum magistri Petri Dresden reportata.*

MS: Erfurt, Universitäts- und Forschungsbibliothek, CA 4º 271, fol. 124r–126r

Date: ca. 1404

The very same manuscript as the above *Conspectus divisionis universalium* contains another short text with the rubric *Expl. abbreviata posteriorum magistri Petri Dresden reportata* and for this reason has been ascribed to Peter of Dresden.[293] The short text reveals a textbook character since it is written in one column, leaving space for notes on the other half of the pages. Only the first two pages contain a commentary, the rest is empty. Nevertheless, the question of Peter's authorship needs to be analyzed in detail – but to resolve this matter, further investigation into the relevant manuscript material is required.[294]

---

[291] Lohr, "Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries," 354, no. 3.

[292] František Šmahel, *Verzeichnis der Quellen zum Prager Universalienstreit 1348–1500* (Warsaw, Wrocław, Cracow, and Gdańsk: Ossolineum, 1980), 53. Šmahel records that the tract is copied from fol. 14v on and contains a date of 1404 in it; nevertheless, according to the catalogue, this date with Dresden as a place of origin appears on fol. 25v, while on fol. 7v there is another explicit: *Expl. dicta edita a magistro Petro* – see Wilhelm Schum, *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis*, 514–515.

[293] Lohr, "Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries," 354, no. 4; in the catalogue it is entitled *Magistri Petri (Hispani?) excerpta ex libris posteriorum analyticorum Aristotelis deprompta* – Schum, *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis*, 515.

[294] Similar piece with the same incipit appears in the same collection – CA 4º 20, fol. 137r–158r.

Friedrich Eppinge and his *Posicio*

In all probability, Friedrich Eppinge composed a single treatise entitled *Posicio de excommunicacione*. The topic covers systematically all aspects of unjust excommunication, an issue soon to become pressing in pre-Hussite Prague. Eppinge wrote it in August 1412 and the text survives in 10 copies.[295]

In a broader sense, the problem of excommunication is connected to a general interest in Wyclif's teachings that rose in Prague in the last decades of the fourteenth century and conflicts over Wyclif culminated in the first decade of the fifteenth century. An early piece of evidence of the acquaintance with Wyclif's teachings in Prague is presented by the work of Nicholas Biceps, one of the lecturers of the Dominican order at Prague University.[296] The turn of the fourteenth century was marked by diligent copying of Wyclif's texts by Czech students, including Jan Hus, who himself copied Wyclif's philosophical tracts in 1398 – an extant holograph by Hus contains Wyclif's tracts *De materia et forma*, *De tempore*, *De ideis*, and *De universalibus*. The first open clash over Wyclif's teachings took place in Prague in 1403 and the dispute flared up again in 1412 in connection with the announcement of indulgences. As mentioned above, Jan Hus sharply criticized this and the debate soon took on much more important aspect – that of general matters of papal authority and the definition of the Church. In consequence of the anti-indulgences riots, the professors at the theology faculty at Prague University condemned again notorious forty-five articles of Wyclif that were originally compiled in 1403 by the Dominican John Hübner.[297] As a reaction, a new defence of Wyclif took place at the university in August 1412.[298]

During this "Wyclif's second tournament" Hus defended six of Wyclif's articles, Jacobellus article number thirty-two and Eppinge defended Wyclif's article number eleven on

[295] The content of the treatise was analyzed by Kejř, *Z počátků*, 172–176, supplemented by a list of extant manuscripts with one exception of a copy presently housed in Leizig – see below.

[296] Biceps argued against Wyclif's opinions on the Eucharist before 1380. Šmahel, "Wyclif's Fortune," 469–470 showed that Wyclif's philosophical works were known in Prague already in the 1360s.

[297] Hübner compiled twenty-four articles extracted from Wyclif's writings that were condemned as heretical at a London Synod in 1382, to which he added another twenty-one. These forty-five articles were subsequently condemned by Prague University. See František Palacký, ed., *Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus vitam, doctrinam, causam in Constantiensi concilio actam ... illustrantia* (Prague: F. Tempsky, 1869), 327–331.

[298] For more, see Vilém Herold, *Pražská univerzita a Wyclif. Wyclifovo učení o ideách a geneze husitského revolučního myšlení* (Prague University and Wyclif. Wyclif's doctrines about the Ideas and the genesis of the Hussite revolutionary thought) (Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1985); idem, "Zum Prager philosophischen Wyclifismus," in *Häresie und vorzeitige Reformation im Spätmittelalter*, ed. František Šmahel (Munich: 1998), 133–146; idem, "The Spiritual Background of the Czech Reformation: Precursors of Jan Hus," in *A Companion to Jan Hus*, ed. František Šmahel and Ota Pavlíček (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2015), 89–95.

unjust excommunication.[299] This *Posicio de excommunicacione* is sometimes known also by its incipit *Credo communionem sanctorum*, and some medieval manuscripts designate it as *Collacio de excommunicacione*. The authorship is indisputable as it is registered in several of its medieval copies. Moreover, the text was acknowledged by Eppinge's colleagues in Prague: Hus praised it in his *De ecclesia*,[300] and Jacobellus of Misa incorporated the text *in extenso* into his own *Tractatus responsivus*, as noted above.[301] The time of its origin is also quite unquestionable – the text was written in connection with the above described events of August 1412. At present ten surviving medieval copies of this text were identified:[302]

1. Prague, National Library, XIII F 21, fol. 118v–128v
2. Prague, National Library, X F 8, fol. 99v–104v
3. Prague, National Library, V E 28, fol. 77r–79v, 102r–103v
4. Prague, National Museum, XIV E 2, fol. 295r–308v
5. Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, C 116, 279r–291v[303]
6. Bautzen, Stadtbibliothek, 8º 7, fol. 54r–68r
7. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 4512, fol. 243r–257r
8. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 4519, fol. 119v–133v
9. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 4521, fol. 149r–155v
10. Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, MS 594, fol. 322ra–330ra

Even though the subject of Eppinge's defence was to prove the accuracy of Wyclif's article, he does not explicitly refer to it. Moreover, Eppinge's approach was distinctly independent from that of Wyclif's. Most importantly, Eppinge did not accept one thesis characteristic of Wyclif, namely the definition of the community of the saints as a corpus predestined to salvation; like many other Hussite reformers, Eppinge differentiated between

[299] Eppinge mentions forty-five articles and proceeds to defend two that are pertinent to the topic of unjust excommunication – nevertheless their wording is identical to the wording in the original article. The article in question contains the argument that "No prelate should excommunicate anyone unless he know that man first to have been excommunicated by God. Otherwise, in excommunicating him, the prelate becomes a heretic or excommunicate himself." – English translation by Kaminsky, *A History*, 83–84.

[300] *Magistri Iohannis Hus Tractatus De ecclesia*. Ed. S. H. Thomson (Prague: Komenského evangelická fakulta bohoslovecká, 1958), 216: "Hec breviter de excomunicacione, de qua fecit posicionem solempnem sancte memorie pius christianus et magnus zelator et scrutator legis Christi magister Fridricus Epinge, baccalaureus iuris canonici, tractans illum articulum…".

[301] *Mistra Jana Husi Tractatus responsivus*. Ed. S. H. Thomson (Prague: s.n., 1927), 103–133.

[302] Kejř, *Z počátků*, 172–173 lists all of the mentioned manuscripts except for Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, MS 594, fol. 322ra–330ra. Kejř showed that a copy from Prague, National Library, VIII G 34, ascribed to Eppinge by a modern catalogue, does not contain Eppinge's *Posicio*.

[303] This is a copy of Jacobellus's *Tractatus responsivus* that incorporates Eppinge's *Posicio*.

the Church as an institution and the invisible community of the saints. The conclusion drawn in his *Posicio* was that the excommunication from the actual Church was only declaratory while exclusion from the communion of the saints was mortal for the sinner on whom it was imposed. Therefore, unjust excommunication from the Church was not primarily harmful and was to be feared only in its secondary effects. This position was accepted by other Hussites, too, especially by Jan Hus in his treatises *De sex erroribus* and *De ecclesia*. Hus already touched upon this topic in his commentaries on Lombard's *Sentences* which he delivered as a lecturer at Prague University between 1407 and 1409.[304] This led scholars to believe that it was Hus who originally developed the argument into its present form. Nevertheless, contrary to earlier opinions that Eppinge drew on Hus, his *Posicio* is distinctly independent from it and from the legal point of view better argued.[305] Unlike Hus and his colleagues who emphasized the moral aspect of guilt and its ethical rightfulness, Eppinge strove to analyze the purely legal aspects of unjust excommunication and proved the impeccability of Wyclif's article based on the legal principles. His *Posicio* can therefore be appreciated as an extremely complex legal treatment of a highly debated issue which Eppinge supported with valuable canonistic material.[306]

The fact that Eppinge also showed profound knowledge of Matthias of Janov in this treatise is a significant point and has been noted above.[307] It should be stressed that Janov's central treatise *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti* circulated mostly in Bohemia and therefore it seems very probable that both Eppinge and Nicholas encountered it in Prague.[308] Whether Eppinge could have become acquainted with Matthias's *Regulae* in 1409 (if we accept that he had already spent some time in Prague back then) or only in 1412, is impossible to decide.

---

[304] An uncritical edition is *Mag. Joannis Hus Super IV. Sententiarum*, 2 vols., ed. Wenzel Flajšhans and Marie Komínková (Prague: J. R. Vilímek, 1905); see also Stephen E. Lahey, "The Sentences Commentary of Jan Hus," in *A Companion to Jan Hus*, ed. František Šmahel and Ota Pavlíček (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2015), 130–169.
[305] Kejř, *Z počátků*, 172–176.
[306] Cegna in *Nicolai Dresdensis Expositio super Pater noster*, 66 argued that Eppinge influenced Jacobellus of Misa's ecclesiology, mostly concerning the question of lay communion under both species. Detailed comparison of their treatises showed that both works drew on the writings of Matthias of Janov, an influential source for many Hussite reformers, see Krmíčková, *Studie a texty*, 77–85.
[307] See above, 52. Spiritual background of the Czech Reformation has been recently analyzed by Marin, *L'archevêque, le maître et le dévot*; Vilém Herold, "Ideové kořeny reformace v českých zemích," in *Dějiny politického myšlení*, vol. 2/2, *Politické myšlení pozdního středověku a reformace*, ed. Vilém Herold, Ivan Müller, and Aleš Havlíček (Prague: Oikoymenh, 2011), 173–181; idem, "The Spiritual Background of the Czech Reformation," 69–95.
[308] Only parts of the *Regulae* dealing with the problem of the Eucharist enjoyed wider circulation, for details see Spunar, *Repertorium*, vol. 1, 163–169.

Combined with the fact that Nicholas of Dresden was also influenced by Matthias's opinions, this adds weight to the hypothetical existence of the circle of the Germans in Prague.

It has been suggested that Eppinge composed another treatise, a commentary on the third book of Henry Bohic's *Distinciones Decretalium*,[309] because a fragment of Bohic's *Quaestiones super tercium librum Decretalium* is preserved in a manuscript in the National Library in Prague, sign. IV C 27, fol. 1r–12v with an inscription "M. Friedrici Eppinge".[310] Nevertheless, Bohic's commentary on the first book of the Decretals is preserved in another Prague codex, namely National Library, sign. V B 17, fol. 1r–210v. In this codex, Eppinge's name appears in the form of an owner's mark. A comparison of these codices revealed that in both cases the notes about the ownership were written by the same hand and that originally the two codices were bound together.[311] Eppinge used Bohic's treatise extensively in his own *Posicio* and it is therefore very likely that he possessed all five books of this widespread commentary. Unfortunately, the two Prague codices do not reveal any details about their place of origin that could subsequently be of help concerning Eppinge's biography and oeuvre.

Peter Turnau

At the beginning of 1422 Turnau travelled to the East "to see the miracles of the world" (*ad videndum mirabilia mundi*).[312] He journeyed through Greece to Crete where he spent about four months (April – July 1422). His plan to continue to Jerusalem was abandoned and Turnau returned to Prague through Venice. The literary product of this enterprise is a short Latin tract describing the rites of the Eastern Church and comparing the most interesting of them with the Western tradition.[313] The text survives in four medieval manuscripts in Prague. Peter's authorship is acknowledged in one of them, where the copyist superscribed the text as *Ritus Grecorum … Petri Pruteni*, referring to his Prussian origin.[314]

[309] Kejř, *Z počátků*, 176–178 summarizes these suggestions and disproves them.
[310] For more on the authorship, see František Michálek Bartoš, "Do čtyř pražských artikulů" (To the four Prague articles), *Sborník příspěvků k dějinám hlavního města Prahy* 5/2 (1925): 56.
[311] Kejř, *Z počátků*, 176–178.
[312] Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 109.
[313] Edited by Bartoš, "Německého husity Petra Turnova spis," 13–25; discussed by Selge, "Heidelberger Ketzerprozesse," 189–190. Czech translation by Jakub Jiří Jukl, "Německého husity Petra Turnova spis po řádech a zvycích církve východní" (A treatise on the cusstoms and rites of the Eastern Church by the German Hussite Peter Turnov), *Theologická revue* 75/3–4 (2004): 437–450.
[314] Prague, National Library, V F 1, fol. 125r; recorded by Bartoš, "Německého husity Petra Turnova spis," 4.

Concerning its content, the treatise does not bring anything new or striking for the Hussite reformers. It reflects and describes in detail the Greek tradition related to baptism, confession, matrimony, extreme unction, priesthood, or the Eucharist. The fact that Turnau does not dwell on this topic provided grounds for dating this treatise to a period when the Utraquism was a *fait accompli* in Hussite Bohemia.[315] Turnau offers a full description of the liturgical vestments and the ceremony, but does not comment on the legitimacy of administering the communion under both species at all. Turnau also stresses that the Greeks are against all killing or wars, taking oaths, idolatry, church music and other practical issues. Last but not least, it has been suggested that the Orthodox doctrine concerning the purgatory was taken over from this source by the Taborites in 1431.[316]

Peter Payne

Payne's opinions can be reconstructed based on a number of treatises that he wrote during his Prague period and in which he commented on the most topical issues.[317] By way of introducing himself in Prague, Payne participated in the discussion about the necessity of the lay chalice. The first surviving tract in his literary production, the *Quia nostri temporis homines*, was written at the beginning of February 1415.[318] Payne defended here the necessity of the administration of the Eucharist to the laity under both species, by which he supported his colleague Jacobellus of Misa, one of the leading representatives of the reformist party in Prague. Among other issues, in which Payne subsequently participated, was the problem of taking oaths, the theory of predestination and free will,[319] or the worship of images.

During his early days in Prague, Payne is believed to have composed a mnemotechnical device for students – which has subsequently been considered an evidence of his teaching activities and an outcome of his connection with the school of the German masters. The text,

[315] Bartoš, "Německého husity Petra Turnova spis," 4–5.
[316] *Ibid*., 5.
[317] About two dozen of his texts were listed by František Michálek Bartoš, *Literární činnost M. Jana Rokycany, M. Jana Příbrama, M. Petra Payna* (The literary work of M. Jan Rokycana, M. Jan Příbram, M. Petr Payne). Sbírka pramenů k poznání literárního života československého, vol. 3, no. 9 (Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1928), 93–111.
[318] Edited by Krmíčková, *Studie a texty*, 148–164, where she also summarizes older opinions concerning Peter's authorship of this tract (35–38).
[319] Luigi Campi, "Una difesa del determinismo dell'ultimo Wyclif attributa a Peter Payne," *Rivista di storia della filosofia* 4 (2015): 829–871, in his edition of a defence of Wyclif's determinism doubts Payne's supposed authorship. However, Stephen E. Lahey, "Peter Payne Explains Everything that Happens," in *Jan Hus 1415 a*

preserved in a single manuscript, is referred to as *Dicta magistri Petri Henkliss* and can therefore be positively attributed to Payne, who was very often referred to as Peter "English" in Bohemia.[320] The manuscript, now held in Vienna, contains numerous texts written by the Czech reformers and most probably originated between 1420 and 1421.[321] Payne's text is as yet unedited and even a perfunctory examination indicates a need to appraise the text critically. It is not a homogenous piece as there seem to be two independent parts. The first one (fol. 278r–279r) touches upon the problem of confession and penitence and in all likelihood is a follow-up to a previous anonymous section listed in the catalogue under the title *Miscellanea de praedicatione, de oratione Dominica, de decem praeceptis etc*.[322] The text starting on fol. 267r deals with seven mortal sins, continues with *peccata clamantia coram Deo* (fol. 271v), the solutions of God's commands and their observance, and concludes with a graphical representations of the obstacles related to penitence (fol. 277v). These excerpts from relevant authorities do not seem to have any connection with teaching. A change of scribal hand appears on fol. 278r where the above-mentioned superscription *Dicta magistri Petri Henkliss* can be read. This hand copied the text up to fol. 285v where Payne's text finishes – this fact makes it probable that the superscribed name of Peter Payne on fol. 278r is only an inadvertence. This first part is followed on fol. 279r–285v by a text entitled *De novem alienis peccatis* (with a superscribed *Henkliss* again) and the explicit on fol. 285v determines the authorship clearly (*Expliciunt dicta magistri Petri dicti Henkliss*). Nevertheless, this text does not seem to be a device for students either, but rather a shorter treatment of the same topic as the previously described parts, i.e. confession. In sum, this text does not supply evidence for Payne's teaching activities either.

What deserves special attention, however, is Payne's role in the indexing of Wyclif's works in Bohemia. In connection with the polemics over Wyclif's teachings Payne initiated a project of cataloguing and indexing Wyclif's texts. This highly sophisticated and unique research tool[323] was in England primarily aimed at preaching. Due to Payne's initiative in

---

600 let poté, ed. Jakub Smrčka and Zdeněk Vybíral (Tábor: Husitské museum, 2015), 129–143, accepts Payne's authorship of this text without doubts.

[320] Bartoš, *Literární činnost M. Jana Rokycany, M. Jana Příbrama, M. Petra Payna*, 98, no. 6.

[321] MS 4550, see *Tabulae codicum*, vol. 3, 308–309; Peter's text is supposedly on fol. 278r–285v.

[322] *Tabulae codicum*, vol. 3, 309.

[323] Analyzed by Anne Hudson who has carried out research on it on several occasions: Anne Hudson, "The Hussite catalogues of Wyclif's works," in *Husitství – reformace – renesance. Sborník k 60. narozeninám Františka Šmahela*, vol. 1, ed. Jaroslav Pánek, Jaroslav Boubín, Miloslav Polívka and Noemi Rejchrtová (Prague:

Bohemia, however, it was adjusted to serve a new purpose, namely as a quick reference-finder during live theological discussion. Payne was able to exploit this tool at the Council of Basel. Undoubtedly, such an enterprise must have involved more people with a university background and can thus be indicative of Payne's connection with the university – even if only circumstantially. The ramifications of Payne's indexing enterprise in connection with Nicholas of Dresden's *Apologia* will be mentioned in more detail below.

Payne authored a number of other texts, as Bartoš's list shows, and his attention to bibliographical issues is reflected in many of them. To give just one example: in one of the surviving copies of Payne's *Posicio contra Pribram* written in 1429 (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3935), where he defended Wyclif against John of Příbram's charges of Eucharistic unorthodoxy, the text is very neatly subdivided into chapters. This, in consequence, renders very quick orientation. Even though useful for analysing Payne's strategies of spreading Wyclif's tenets, these text, however, are not instrumental for the present question, i.e. the existence of the Dresden School.

Common enterprises: John Drändorf, Peter Turnau, and Conradus Stoecklin

The source material revealed two occasions when the members of the Dresden School cooperated in publicizing or writing common texts. John Drändorf worked together with Peter Turnau on a manifesto *Misericors deus* that criticized the contemporary decline of the clergy's morals. The role of this text within the general framework of the propaganda of the Dresdeners towards the German lands will be discussed later.

A common literary enterprise of John Drändorf and Conradus Stoecklin is documented by singular evidence of a manuscript of Prague origin. According to this testimony, John Drändorf copied Lira's *Postil* on the gospels and on St. Paul's letters in Prague in 1412, as it reads "Prage reportata per Johannem Draendorf a. D. 1412".[324] Conradus Stoecklin subsequently commented upon the text and his marginal glosses show the influence of Nicholas of Dresden's teachings.[325] These glosses contain a sharp rejection of oath-taking, all killings, public confessions and critiques of other Catholic positions concerning the

Historický ústav, 1994), 401–417; eadem, "The Hussite Catalogue of Wyclif's Works," in *Studies in the Transmission*, no. III, 1–35.

[324] Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, shelf-mark A 40/1, fol. 55v – Patera and Podlaha, *Soupis rukopisů knihovny metropolitní kapitoly pražské*, vol. 1, 37.

sacraments or penitence. Some of the authorities used by Conradus to support his arguments are expressed in a fashion similar to arguments in Nicholas's treatises (adjustment of longer quotations, referring to Pseudo-Chrysostomus's treatise as *De opere imperfecto* etc.). The glossator also reflects on the actual beginnings of Utraquism in Prague and thus the origin of the glosses can be dated to a period after 1414 when this practice commenced there.

[325] Explicit on fol. 175r records Conradus's name. The glosses were printed and analyzed by Neumann, "Glossy v Drändorfově postile, 457–465.

Teaching as Indirect Evidence

As was shown above, the scholarly literature often mentions the teaching activity of the Dresden School as one of the possible bonds between the people involved in it.[326] Nevertheless, the analysis of the primary sources in the previous chapters revealed that the activity of the group as an institutional body lacks a firm background. This was furthermore substantiated by the biographical data of the School's members. The biographical data also revealed that until the period spent in Dresden the people in question had relatively little in common. To be precise, the only possible bond was that some of them may have studied at the university in Prague, but their subsequent destinies varied greatly. Therefore, the following question needs to be asked: Can the so-called Dresden School be perceived as a schooling institution whose origins can be traced to Dresden; and if this is the case, what kind of an institution was it? The main focus of the following analysis will be placed on the story of the School, rather than on the people it comprised. It is necessary to divide this examination into two parts, one involving an analysis of the activities of the relevant people at the *Kreuzschule* in Dresden, while the other one will focus on the period the group spent in Prague at the Black Rose House. In another words, the main purpose of the subsequent analysis is to find out whether the people in question show an affiliation with the Dresden School as a distinct schooling institution.

Kreuzschule in Dresden

Firstly, the activity of the Dresdeners at the *Kreuzschule* in Dresden must be examined in order to clarify whether it was only Peter of Dresden who worked there, or whether a distinct group of people formed around Peter already at the *Kreuzschule* in Dresden and consequently moved to Prague together. Let me repeat that the primary narrative sources expressly mention only the name of Peter of Dresden in connection with Dresden. As Peter's colleague in Dresden, a certain Nicholas is mentioned in the anonymous account, which is, nevertheless, later in origin and of doubtful value. It was argued above that its author was not very well

informed about the situation outside Bohemia and that he included the story of Peter and Nicholas's expulsion from Dresden in order to substantiate Peter's role in the introduction of Utraquism in Prague – i.e. this connection does not rest on reliable grounds. Combined with the biographical analysis, it is still impossible to know whether Nicholas was ever in Dresden or not. A further outcome of the biographical examination arose from the inquisitional protocol of John Drändorf, who claimed to have studied in Dresden under Peter of Dresden and Friedrich Eppinge. This, in consequence, contradicts acceptance of Nicholas's activity in Dresden. The implication of the two pieces of evidence is that we can acknowledge that Peter of Dresden and Friedrich Eppinge on the side of the teachers and John Drändorf on the side of the students were active in Dresden, while Nicholas of Dresden's role remains uncertain.

The existence of three names cannot in itself attest to the existence of a schooling institution. I will therefore take a closer look at what is known about the *Kreuzschule* in Dresden in this period and see what kind of connection between the *Kreuzschule* and the above names can be gleaned from the available sources.

The *Kreuzschule* in Dresden was the oldest school in Dresden, a grammar school connected to the local church of St. Cross (*Kreuzkirche*) and its choir.[327] The first mention pertaining to its existence can be found in a charter from April 6, 1300 that was witnessed by the rector of the school (*Cunradus rector puerorum in Dresden*). Official spending on the school is documented by the sources in 1370, while a school-house built in 1480/1481 burnt down and a new building on the south side of the church was in existence by 1493. The choir played an important role in the school and in the life of the church from its very beginning. The choir participated on various occasions connected to masses, psalmody and similar activities. From 1408 on, the school rector was to provide six pupils who could accompany by singing from sunset till midnight the priests going to administer the Eucharist to the sick and the dying. The evidence on how much money the school rector received for this obligation in 1405, 1411 and later indicates that it was a demanding task.[328] Yet no concrete information about the scale of human resources required for the task is known. In connection with the

[326] See above, *Introduction*, 4.

[327] The history of the *Kreuzschule* is discussed widely in older German literature, the best older synopsis is Meltzer, "Die Kreuzschule zu Dresden" 1–62; for more recent contribution, see Butte, *Geschichte Dresdens*, 100–120.

[328] The sums and references to relevant entries in the *Stadtbuch* are given by Meltzer, "Die Kreuzschule zu Dresden", 26–27.

Midsummer Eve of 1370, the rector and eighteen members (*Schulgesellen*, *socii*) of the school are mentioned as being invited for a festive banquet, but these must have comprised not only the teaching staff but also more advanced students of the school. However, the heavy duties of the choir might have allowed for perhaps larger numbers than the below-mentioned four members of teaching staff.[329] Another glimpse into the matter is recorded by the first school-order issued by rector Nicholas Thirmann in 1413, which is a unique source of information for the studied period.[330] It mostly records the various incomes of the school, yet in passing it also mentions the division of pupils into three classes and touches upon the course of the school-year. The curriculum comprised the seven liberal arts and prepared students for higher university education. The teaching staff comprised a rector, two teachers (*locati*) and one teaching assistant (*signator* or *calefactor*) as well as one advanced student. The students were divided into three groups – those who read the *Doctrinale* by Alexander of Villa Dei and were active in the choir; those who dealt with logic; and finally those who dealt with philosophy. Further data concerning the students could be deduced from the numbers of students from Dresden who studied at neighbouring universities.[331] Between 1373 and 1409 (when the university in Leipzig was founded), Viktor Hantzsch counted altogether twenty students from Dresden at various universities. Most of these students frequented the university in Prague (fourteen out of twenty; four studied in Erfurt, one in Cologne and one in Cracow); after 1409 almost without exception students preferred the university in Leipzig (until the mid-15 century, out of the 55 students only three studied elsewhere). The possible connection of the members of the Dresden School and Prague University was discussed above: Peter of Dresden most probably studied in Prague before his rectorship at the *Kreuzschule*; so did Nicholas of Dresden and Peter Turnau, and most likely also John Drändorf. Sadly, none of the names recorded in the university registers can be firmly connected with the group around Peter of Dresden – that is, other than previously known names. Apart from the above mentioned, there is no further information about actual instruction at the school, about the detailed structure and size of the student body or the staff at the *Kreuzschule* from this period. Subsequently, it is

[329] See Butte, *Geschichte Dresdens*, 102.
[330] Otto Meltzer, "Über die älteste Schulordnung der Kreuzschule zu Dresden," *Neues Archiv für sächsische Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 14 (1893): 291–311; Hubert Ermisch, "Die älteste Schulordnung der Kreuzschule zu Dresden," *Neues Archiv für sächsische Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 13 (1892): 346–347. The school-order was last printed in *Das Älteste Stadtbuch von Dresden*, 186–188.
[331] Hantzsch, *Dresdner auf Universitäten*, 10–13.

known that substantial changes took place in the school in 1539, brought on by the onset of the Reformation. These are, however, of no interest for the studied period.

As mentioned, the oldest school-order represents a source of primary value, mostly because it contains a piece of valuable information about Peter of Dresden. It was formulated by Nicholas Thirmann, Peter's successor, who held the office between 1412/1413 and 1418. The period when Peter held the office is vaguely delimited by the year 1407, when his predecessor Andreas was still in this function, and the accession of Thirmann in 1412 at the latest. Even though Thirmann carried out many changes after Peter's departure from Dresden, he describes Peter's rectorship in a collegial tone – in two places he justifies his orders by referring to their previous existence under Master Peter's rectorship. What follows from this is that Peter must have left Dresden under normal circumstances, even if there was pressure on him and his colleagues to leave.

Peter's role as a schoolmaster of the *Kreuzschule* (ca. after 1407–1411) marked a unique period in its history. The inquisitional protocol of John Drändorf claims that Friedrich Eppinge was a co-teacher to Peter in Dresden.[332] Another member of the staff at the *Kreuzschule* in Peters' time was one "Nicolaus", as recorded in the anonymous account.[333] It was discussed above that this person cannot be positively identified with Nicholas of Dresden. Many of the students in the time of Peter's rectorship are believed to have been itinerant students with nonconformist ideas, but the only student known by his given name is John Drändorf. However, there were probably more people attracted by the subjects taught and discussed openly as well as privately in the circles around the *Kreuzschule*. The ideas that circulated here in this period are hinted at by the decree of the Meissen bishop Rudolph, which seems to be aimed at Peter of Dresden.[334] On 18 October 1411, Rudolph issued a decree that banned the teaching of the Bible and the Canon Law at particular schools, admonishing the rectors of these schools to be content with instruction solely in the liberal arts. In addition, it says that the gospels, hymns and the sequences can be exposed in the vernacular. The bishop stressed that the prescribed instruction had been especially transgressed in Dresden and warned against the dangerous heresy that could spread from there, clearly pointing to the activity of Peter of

[332] Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 69.
[333] See above, 18–21.
[334] *Urkunden der Markgrafen von Meissen und Landgrafen von Thüringen 1407–1418*, 203–204. For more on the decree, see above, 19.

Dresden at the *Kreuzschule*. This fact is supported by evidence from the anonymous tract, which gives concrete examples of the heresies the bishop must have feared. Its main point was to accuse Peter of Dresden and his fellow, Nicholas, of spreading the necessity of the lay chalice and of having convinced large numbers of their students of it (*scholarium multitudinem suorum multipliciter infecerunt*). Apart from this, the report states that Peter and Nicholas discussed other interesting questions, though without further specification. It was because of these issues that they were expelled from Dresden.

The situation at the *Kreuzschule* changed significantly under the new rector. For Nicholas Thirmann, a fiery and ambitious man interested in the Church and politics, the office of the rector was above all a means to fight the heretics. He fought against itinerant students who might contaminate the school with dangerous Hussite ideas through enforcing an entrance examination and an enrolment fee. In all probability, this was also the driving force behind his new school-order. Therefore, his reaction must be understood in the given context as a counter-reaction to the situation at the *Kreuzchule* under Peter's rectorship. Let me underline again that Peter's rectorship marked an exceptional and very likely attractive period of the history of the *Kreuzschule* that came to a rather rapid end. Still, the absence of further information does not allow us to accept the existence of an institutionalized enterprise. It seems more probable that it was the single-handed activity of Peter of Dresden which proved to be successful and was continued elsewhere.

The fact that two of his colleagues moved with Peter to Prague does not change this picture. Peter of Dresden and Friedrich Eppinge were in Prague by the summer of 1412, though there are no details as to how they got there from Dresden. Nevertheless, it is not likely that the group travelled from Dresden to Prague together. John Drändorf travelled to Prague through Zittau, where he spent some time together with his future colleague Peter Turnau. They studied logic at a particular school under a certain Master Albertus, and subsequently moved to Prague together.[335] Turnau had other contacts in Zittau, for example with a certain Johannes Lubras, a Bachelor of Arts from Prague University from 1399.[336] But Lubras stayed in Zittau and became a teacher and chaplain there. He did not join his friend on his move to Prague, so the tempting idea of extending the network of the Dresdeners must be dismissed.

[335] On the school in Zittau, founded in May 1310, see Johannes Müller, "Die Anfänge des sächsischen Schulwesens," *Neues Archiv für sächsische Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 8 (1887): 251–252.
[336] Heimpel, *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren*, 206.

All in all, the scarcity of names outlined above together with the lack of other information disprove the hypothesis that the teaching enterprise at the *Kreuzschule* in Dresden was transferred to Prague on institutional grounds. Peter of Dresden in all likelihood influenced and inspired two members of the *Kreuzschule* to follow him to Prague, but that is all there is to it. Let us now take a closer look at the situation in Prague, which might still modify the perspective on the people previously active in Dresden.

At the Black Rose in Prague

A number of sources indicate the presence of the above-mentioned names in Prague by 1412 at the latest. As far as the narrative sources are concerned, the chronicle *Beginnings of Hussitism* records that Peter and Nicholas ran a *bursa* at the Black Rose House in Prague and the teaching activity of the Dresdeners in Prague is confirmed by manuscript material, too. The *Chronicon Procopii* also reveals that the Germans had a school in the New Town of Prague. Enea Silvio Piccolomini claims that Peter of Dresden undertook the teaching of boys in Prague (*puerorum docendorum curam accepit*). The above-mentioned anonymous tract tells us that Peter and Nicholas attracted a multitude of scholars (*pluralitatem scholarium collegerunt*). Yet the evidence for the existence of a "School" in Prague is not at all conclusive.

What is certain is the place where the Dresdeners found their refuge. The house called "At the Black Rose" in the New Town of Prague was bought by the *nacio Bohemorum* of Prague University and served as one of its main centres.[337] Previously it belonged to the wealthy family of the Rotlev, who sold it to the University in 1402 and its masters kept it until 1430. This large house, one of the most important university properties in the neighbourhood and one of the three houses belonging to the *nacio Bohemorum*, was witness to many important events of the time. For instance, during the struggle over Wyclif's ideas, which was under way in Prague from 1403 and in which the Dresdeners also played a role, the Black Rose House hosted a general meeting of the Bohemian nation of Prague University. During the assembly

[337] Wácslav Wladivoj Tomek, *Základy starého místopisu Pražského* (Fundamentals of the old topography of Prague), vol. 2, *Nové Město Pražské* (New Town of Prague) (Prague: Královská česká společnost nauk, 1866), 188. See also Karel Chytil, *Antikrist v naukách a umění středověku a husitské obrazové antithese* (Antichrist in the teachings and art of the Middle Ages and Hussite pictorial antitheses) (Prague: Česká akademie, 1918), 145–146; for more on the topography see Jan Vlk, ed., *Dějiny Prahy* (History of Prague), vol. 1, *Od nejstarších dob do sloučení měst pražských [1784]* (From the oldest times to the union of the towns of Prague [1784]) (Prague and Litomyšl: Paseka, 1997), 208–209.

on May 24, 1408, the reformist party around Jan Hus yielded to the pressure from the Prague archbishop and agreed not to interpret any of Wyclif's articles in a heretical sense, which was an important turning point in the struggle. The house "At the Black Rose" is where the group of the German masters found shelter and because of this, the group is sometimes referred to as the "Black Rose School".[338]

The sources suggest that the German masters ran a bursa in this house.[339] According to the students' testimony, among the teachers at the Black Rose House were Peter and Nicholas of Dresden. Peter Turnau did not even board at the Black Rose House and denied ever having heard a lecture by Peter of Dresden – which, as a matter of fact, also attests to Peter's teaching activity. The interesting thing is that, as in Dresden, the German masters also attracted a number of scholars and students in Prague.

Apart from these direct references, the treatises of the members of the School represent another indicator of their teaching activities. Hence Peter's role as a teacher in Prague is substantiated by the evidence of his treatises, since most of these were composed in Prague and became popular manuals among the students. Nicholas of Dresden allegedly composed a short catechetic tract that survived in a single manuscript in Cracow.[340] The copy contains an explicit *Explicit decalogus utilis pro informacione puerorum*, yet it is certainly not written for young boys. As an exposition of the Decalogue and the sacraments, the text rather seems to be targeted at their teachers and priests. Being composed around 1412, it belongs to one of the oldest works of Nicholas of Dresden[341] and it can be understood as another testimony of his teaching activity. Another catechism ascribed to Nicholas, the *Tractatus de fide catholica*, was also composed for students and not for uneducated laity, as its length, structure and content clearly show.[342] Supposing that the text was written between 1415 and 1417, as the editor of the text suggested, it would be another piece of evidence that Nicholas worked as a teacher in Prague. Another member of the School, Peter Payne, composed a treatise that has been

[338] This name *Rosa Nera* or *Rosa Nigra* is often used by Romolo Cegna, who focused his extensive research mainly on the fate of Nicholas of Dresden, see *Nicolai Dresdensis Expositio super Pater noster*, 5–67.
[339] On the development of meaning of the word *bursa* in connection with the university life, see František Šmahel, "Scholae, collegia et bursae universitatis Pragensis. Ein Beitrag zum Wortschatz der mittelalterlichen Universitäten," in *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter*, 85–102.
[340] MS 2148, Biblioteka Jagiellońska Krakow, fol. 2r–21r. See also Emil Havelka, *Husitské katechismy* (Hussite catechisms) (Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1938), 100–110.
[341] Havelka, *Husitské katechismy*, 108–109 dates it to the period before 1412, possibly even to 1410.
[342] Havelka, *Husitské katechismy*, 81–91, edition on p. 192–205; the text was edited anew by Jiří Daňhelka, ed., *Drobné spisy české* (Shorter Czech writings), Opera omnia Iohannis Hus IV (Prague: Academia, 1985), 532–542.

classified as a device for students, namely mnemonic verses for students entitled the *Dicta*.[343] I have argued above that the single copy of this text preserved in Vienna needs a thorough critical appraisal because it does not seem to be a homogenous piece. It has to be said however that the content of one of its parts deals with a topic similar to the "catechetic" tracts by Nicholas because it also interprets the Decalogue and touches upon the problem of penitence, among other things. Nevertheless, because Payne's teaching activities are not, unlike Nicholas's, endorsed by the testimonies of his possible students, the evidence of this short treatise cannot support the supposition that Payne ever worked as a teacher in Prague.

It would be very interesting to know how the members of the School attracted 'the flocks' (*pluralitatem scholarium*) in Prague, as the narrative sources suggest. The anonymous tract calls the Dresdeners' supporters *novitatum amatores*, i.e. the lovers of novelties. Unfortunately, there is no direct evidence about the actual ideas that the Dresdeners supposedly promoted in Prague through their teaching activities. The prime theme for most of the relevant reports is the role of the Dresdeners in the introduction of the lay chalice. The dissemination of Utraquism in Prague only started around 1414 under the leadership of Jacobellus of Misa. Jacobellus received support for the matter in writings from Nicholas of Dresden as well as from Peter Payne. As far as their extant treatises are concerned, other members of the School did not address the question of the lay chalice at all. On the other hand, Peter of Dresden wrote popular treatises for students on grammar, logic and philosophy, which can be considered as innovative. However, the circulation of relevant manuscripts in Bohemian milieu does not show how topical they might have been in Prague at the time – contrary to the success they had at German universities in a later period. Friedrich Eppinge addressed the highly appealing topic of unjust excommunication. In his *Posicio de excommunicacione* from 1412, he argued the case of unjust excommunication from a refined legal point of view and presented the impeccable conclusion that excommunication from the institutional Church does not cause harm, a point soon to be readily accepted by his reformist colleagues. The set of glosses composed by Conradus Stoecklin in Prague reflects on oath-taking, killing, or public confessions, and criticizes Catholic positions on sacraments or penitence; generally the glosses are very much in the spirit of Nicholas of Dresden's teaching.

[343] Bartoš, *Literární činnost*, 98, no. 6. See above, 98–99.

The date of their origin cannot be settled with precision but they seem to be of later origin and their connection to the teaching of the Dresdeners remains vague.

The wide scope of issues covered by the Dresdeners, as presented above, justifies on the one hand the assumption that the group disseminated an attractive flow of ideas. On the other hand, the very diversity of issues hinders the acceptance of the original assumption, i.e. that the Dresden School represented an ideologically compact group. Unfortunately, the lack of comparative material hampers insight into the opinions of the individual members on similar issues. But above all, there is no apparent link between the evidence on teaching activities of the individuals and their involvement in the topical issues of the time. In another words, the treatises which point to the teaching of Peter of Dresden, Nicholas or Peter Payne are entirely different from those that found a lively echo in the life of pre-Hussite Prague, covering topics such as the lay chalice, rejection of killing or oath-taking. At any rate, the reason for the present survey was to connect the two phases in the existence of the School in Dresden and in Prague. This, however, turned out to be impossible. Undeniably, there was a number of people interested in the ideas of Peter of Dresden and Friedrich Eppinge at the *Kreuzschule*. The bursa in Prague also attracted many students, but here the major role was played by Nicholas of Dresden, while Peter and Friedrich gradually withdrew. Therefore, the institutional character of the Dresden school – as far as its staff, their biographical data and ideas that were promoted by its alleged members are concerned – is not substantiated by the sources. The *Kreuzschule* in Dresden and the bursa at the Black Rose in Prague were two different things in terms of teaching institutions.

Shared Doctrine

Since the teaching activities of the group described above failed to support the alleged existence of the Dresden School, scrutiny of the doctrines to which the members of the group professed might yet alter the perspective. Here, one repeatedly encounters an issue that was constructed in connection with the Dresdeners a long time ago and which frequently appears in the scholarly literature until modern times: namely, the question whether the Germans around Peter and Nicholas of Dresden could be labelled as Waldensians. Are the ideas they held specifically Waldensian?[344] Following the contributions on the Dresden School by Howard Kaminsky and Romolo Cegna,[345] this problem preoccupies many authors who are interested in doctrinal matters connected to the Dresdeners.

The question is a difficult one. For such a purpose, all opinions that can be abstracted either from the narrative sources or from the treatises of the members should be examined. As it emerged from the previously described data, the lack of comparative material makes this a fruitless enterprise. On the one hand, the narrative sources do not contain enough data on the members' Waldensianism; on the other hand, it is basically only the treatises of Nicholas of Dresden which are available for analysis of their doctrinal background. This is the reason why the analyses of doctrinal matters related to the Dresden School have yielded conflicting and at the same time limited results. I intend to approach the history of the Dresden School from a different standpoint.[346] In my opinion, the problem with the Dresden School and its "doctrine" is quite different. First of all, it must be determined whether the Dresden School represented a

[344] Rudolf Holinka wrote a pioneering study on the problem of heresies in Bohemia entitled *Sektářství v Čechách před revolucí husitskou* (Heresies in Bohemia before the Hussite revolution) (Bratislava: Filosofická fakulta university Komenského, 1929). The Waldensian orientation of the Dresden School was discussed at length by F. M. Bartoš and J. Sedlák in their previously mentioned studies. Apart from Kaminsky's and Cegna's contributions, the Waldensianism of the Dresdeners was discussed more recently by František Šmahel, "Crypto-et semi-vaudois dans la Bôheme hussite," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 217/1 (2000): 101–120.

[345] Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 5–28; Cegna, "Appunti su Valdismo e Ussitismo," 3–34, 3–42. One of Cegna's latest contributions is "Il *Tractatus de iuramento* di Nicola della Rosa Nera," *Aevum* 82/2 (2008): 429–489.

[346] I am not avoiding this issue on theoretical grounds, because of, for example, the present discussion on the semantic meaning of 'Waldensianism' or 'Waldensianisms' – see Peter Biller, "Goodbye to Waldensianism?", *Past and Present* 192 (2006): 3–33; Grado Giovanni Merlo, "Itinerari storiografici dell'ultimo decennio", in *Valdesi medievali. Bilanci e prospettive di ricerca*, ed. Marina Benedetti (Torino: Claudiana, 2009), 11–21.

distinct group. Only if this is the case, then the doctrinal impact of the Dresden School can be analyzed. For the present survey, however, it is useful to summarise – even if only in passing – the past polemics and the main points contained therein. Contemporary evidence from the primary sources will serve as a point of departure.

The doctrines allegedly held by the members of the Dresden School, as revealed in the primary narrative sources, comprised the following: The majority of the extant sources from this period accused the Germans, most often Peter or Nicholas, of introducing the idea of the necessity of the lay chalice in Prague, or already even in Dresden. The contemporary compilation *Chronicon breve* maintained that the Germans administered the communion also to children. Enea Silvio Piccolomini accused Peter of being infected by Waldensianism. The anonymous tract is the only source to give a fuller account of the doctrines that the Germans held. According to its author, the Germans did not believe in purgatory, and for that matter in the redemptive function of the saints' intercessions (this is endorsed by further manuscript notes). Among other "fantasies" that the Germans allegedly taught was also the opinion that the Pope was the Antichrist.

The focus on the matter of the lay chalice predominates the discourse. The question of the introduction of the lay chalice has been settled previously in favour of Jacobellus of Misa as the chief agent in the matter, invaluably assisted by Nicholas of Dresden. As concerns the communion of children, Nicholas probably played a more important role because it was him who for the first time collected relevant theological authorities in favour of this requirement in 1415.[347] The justification of the necessity of the lay chalice in Prague was the common enterprise not only of Jacobellus and Nicholas, but it built on other resources: the local tradition played a role here, too, represented primarily by Matthias of Janov's requirement of frequent communion.[348] Bearing this in mind and considering that other Dresdeners did not participate in this heated discussion (with the exception of Peter Payne on one occasion), the spread of Utraquism cannot be considered a distinct trait of the Dresdeners' doctrine.

[347] Namely in his treatise *Contra Gallum* – for more details and the background of this problem, see Helena Krmíčková, "Několik poznámek k přijímání maličkých 1414–1416" (A couple of notes on the communion of children 1414–1416), *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity* C 44 (1997): 59–69.

[348] Helena Krmíčková, "The Janovite Theory and the Renewal of the Lay Chalice," in *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*, vol. 3, ed. Zdeněk V. David and David R. Holeton (Prague: Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, 2000), 63–68.

Enea Silvio Piccolomini gave the attack a more general framework by accusing the group of supporting Waldensian heresies. The accusation rested on the same grounds as the above anonymous tract or the manuscript notes. The ostensible Waldensianism resided in the denial of oath-taking and the existence of purgatory as well as in the sharp criticism of the Pope, which resulted in his identification with the Antichrist. On the whole, if the contemporary sources are considered, only Nicholas of Dresden, John Drändorf, Bartholomew Rautenstock and Peter Payne can be connected to Waldensianism.

In the case of John Drändorf and Bartholomew of Rautenstock, the accusation of their Waldensianism rested on their refusal to swear an oath. The occasion when this came to the fore was the Lipnice ordinations in 1417, an important event in the establishment of Hussite Utraquism in Bohemia that has been described previously.[349] While Rautenstock simply refused to swear an oath, Drändorf claimed to have made a vow of chastity and poverty. From the inquisitional protocol it seems that Rautenstock held ideas similarly radical to those of Nicholas of Dresden.[350] He did not believe in the intercessions of saints or the Virgin Mary, denied the existence of the purgatory, criticised the use of holy images as well as indulgences and public confessions. On the other hand, John Drändorf's opinions were somewhat milder. Kaminsky classified them as a protest "against the jurisdictional aspects of the Church – its property, dominion, excommunications, hierarchical authority etc."[351]

Peter Payne had undeniable contacts with the Waldensian community in Germany, where he met the prominent Waldensian emissary Friedrich Reiser. However, his connection with or his influence over the Dresden masters in Prague was rejected based on this very late date of arrival in Prague.[352] For this reason, his case is not relevant for the allegedly shared ideology of the group. At any rate, Payne's treatises show that he held moderately reformist ideas, among which his denial of oaths was the most radical.[353] Anne Hudson showed that Payne's opposition to oaths was influenced both by Waldensians and Lollards and that Payne may have already formed his opinions in England.[354]

---

[349] See the pertinent passages in the biographical descriptions of Drändorf and Rautenstock. The background of this event is described by Kaminsky, "Hussite Radicalism," 121–125.
[350] The protocol was printed by Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte* 2, 626–629.
[351] Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 25.
[352] On Payne's travels and his arrival in Prague, see Šmahel, "Curriculum vitae Magistri Petri Payne," 144–147.
[353] A list of Payne's treatises was collected by Bartoš, *Literární činnost M. Jana Rokycany, M. Jana Příbrama, M. Petra Payna*, 93–111.
[354] Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, 371–372.

Much more peculiar is the question of Nicholas of Dresden's Waldensianism. For one thing, Nicholas left behind about two dozen of treatises in which he expressed his sharp criticism of the contemporary Church and called for a change of the existing social order.[355] Most popular among them was an antithetic treatise comparing the life of Christ with that of the Roman Pope (*Tabule veteris et novi coloris* or *Cortina de Anticristo*), his contribution to the debate on the necessity of the lay chalice (*Nisi manducaveritis*, *Apologia*, *Contra Gallum* and others), his defence of the freedom of preaching (*De quadruplici missione*) or the *Dialogus de purgatorio*, all of which are preserved in numerous copies. In Czech scholarship, a debate whether Nicholas was a Waldensian heretic or not was opened by Jan Sedlák who detected several Waldensian elements in Nicholas's writings.[356] According to him, Nicholas's efforts towards the introduction of the lay chalice, his denial of purgatory, all killing, taking of oaths or his requirement of free preaching for everyone, including women, were part of a rejection of the Roman Church and an attempt to return to the practice of the Primitive Church. Sedlák identified these claims as Waldensian and pointed out that Nicholas's opinions were later taken up by some of the radical Hussite factions, mostly the Taborites. The ensuing debate revolved primarily around the "Hussite Waldensianism" of Nicholas's ideas and scholars have not yet reached a consensus on this issue.[357] But while Nicholas's influence on the radial Hussite factions is accepted by the majority of scholars,[358] the extent to which he himself was affected by Waldensian, Wycliffite and other sources continues to cause discrepancies. For instance, F. M. Bartoš argued that Waldensian ideas were mediated to Nicholas through Peter Payne.[359] The concept of "Hussite Waldensianism" was originally developed by Robert Kalivoda, who argued that the radical elements in Nicholas's doctrine were simply a synthesis of the most radical Hussite propositions with popular Waldensian principles.[360] Due to the anti-Church social ideology, represented by the Waldensian heresy,

[355] See above, 71–77.
[356] Sedlák, *Mikuláš*, 51–54. Sedlák's opinion was rejected by Müller, "Magister Nikolaus," 102–109.
[357] Nicholas was classified as a Waldensian heretic also by Josef Pekař, *Žižka a jeho doba* (Žižka and his times), vol. 2 (Prague: Odeon, 1992), 14–18.
[358] An overview of older opinions is summarised by Božena Kopičková, "Pražský radikalismus a valdenství" (Prague radicalism and Waldensianism), *Pražský sborník historický* 20 (1987): 5–34; Prague radicalism is in more detail analysed in Kopičková's subsequent monograph about the leading figure in these circles, see Kopičková, *Jan Želivský*, 9–48 ,196–199.
[359] Bartoš, *Husitství a cizina*, 113–125. The Waldensian influence of Payne over Nicholas was rejected by Pekař, *Žižka a jeho doba*, 14–18.
[360] Robert Kalivoda, *Husitská ideologie* (Hussite ideology) (Prague: Československá akademie věd, 1961), 292–316.

the requirements of these two systems may have – under given circumstances – amalgamated and the radical Hussite factions subsequently adopted some of the Waldensian elements. Kalivoda also pointed out that Nicholas as an educated person may have – with the help of Wyclifism – provided the radical Hussite circles with a fair theoretical background for social change. The subsequent analysis of certain aspects of Nicholas's doctrine, carried out by Jana Nechutová, who examined Nicholas's views on temporal wealth and poverty of the Church, the nature of the Church, simony, observance of the six minimal commands, or the stress on the law of God, outwardly endorsed Kalivoda's theory.[361] Yet Nechutová's investigation serves the opposite purpose as well because the material she assembled arouses doubts about Nicholas's Waldensianism.[362] Concurrently with Nechutová, Howard Kaminsky published his study on Nicholas's doctrine, which he based primarily on an analysis of two of Nicholas's treatises that he had edited, the *Tabule veteris et novi coloris* and the *Consuetudo et ritus primitive ecclesie et moderne*.[363] Kaminsky developed a more restrained position, highlighted Nicholas's ideological consonance with external (Wyclif) as well as internal sources (Matthias of Janov) and closely examined the development of the proclaimed Waldensian ideas in Nicholas's treatises. He showed convincingly that Nicholas's doctrines at first did not go much beyond those of contemporary Hussite theoreticians. However, they took a more radical shape only at a later stage, around 1415. The *modus operandi* and the learned argumentation, full of canonistic constructions, which were typical of Nicholas, complemented certain extreme points traceable in Nicholas's works – all of this led Kaminsky to suggest that Nicholas's doctrine was not Waldensian, but "Waldensianist". A restrained position toward Nicholas's Waldensianism gradually achieved prominence and it is often stressed that the synthesis of Wycliffite-Hussite ideology is on certain level undistinguishable from popular sectarianism, including the Waldensianism.[364] Along these lines, Romolo Cegna reached the conclusion that Nicholas was a typical representative of the medieval Catholic reform movement.[365] His long-standing scholarly interest in Nicholas is based on the close reading of

[361] Nechutová, *Místo Mikuláše*, esp. 61–71. A similar position is held by Paul de Vooght, "Le traité «De usuris» de Nicolas de Dresde," *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* 44 (1977): 150–175.
[362] Pointed out by Kejř, "Z nové literatury o Mikuláši z Drážďan," *Právněhistorické studie* 15 (1971): 225–227.
[363] Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 9–24; see also idem, *A History of the Hussite Revolution*, 204–220.
[364] Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 60. Among historians of the Waldensian movement, this opinion was also expressed by Amedeo Molnár, *Valdenští*, 209–210 and in his other works.
[365] See above, 7.

Nicholas's treatises, a number of which Cegna edited himself.[366] Cegna at first examined Nicholas's participation in the debate on Utraquism in Prague. Based on the dating of one of Nicholas's longest Utraquist polemics, the *Replica rectori scholarum in Corbach*, Cegna argued for Nicholas's primacy in the dispute over the necessity of the lay chalice. However, the chronology of Nicholas's Utraquist treatises, which has been established over the course of time differently as more of the relevant works became accessible in critical editions, refuted this theory.[367] Cegna also meticulously analyzed the authorities that Nicholas quoted in his works and pointed out the central place of Pseudo-Chrysostom's *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* and the significance of the six minimal commandments in Nicholas's teaching. According to Cegna, the denial of purgatory as well as the refusal to swear oaths, which are traditionally labelled as Waldensian, were in Nicholas's interpretation only a radical application of the *lex Dei* and the concept of the Church as a spiritual body. All these appeals for evangelical reform, as Cegna argues, have a bearing on the imitation of Christ in the spirit of the *devotio moderna*, but they are not the results of Nicholas's explicit affiliation with Waldensian heresy.[368] Cegna also noted the later influence of Nicholas's treatises that can be traced in the literature of the Waldensians in Provence, Italy and Germany, which supported some of his theories. Based on a close reading of the *Confessio Taboritarum*, probably the most refined formulation of the programme of Tabor written by Nicholas Biskupec of Pelhřimov, Cegna examined the literary borrowings from Nicholas of Dresden's works that appear here.[369] The Waldensians secured and translated the *Confessio Taboritarum* for

[366] Cegna edited the *De reliquiis et de veneratione sanctorum: De purgatorio*, *Expositio super Pater noster* (with Jana Nechutová), *Puncta*, *Nisi manducaveritis*, *Tractatus de iuramento*.

[367] Krmíčková, *Studie a texty*, 61–85. One of her latest contributions to the chronology of Utraquism in Prague is Helena Krmíčková, "Jakoubkova utrakvistická díla z roku 1414" (Jacobellus' Utraquist treatises from 1414), in *Jakoubek ze Stříbra. Texty a jejich působení*, ed. Ota Halama and Pavel Soukup (Prague: Filosofia, 2006), 171–181.

[368] See one of his latest studies on the vows, Romolo Cegna, "Il *Tractatus de iuramento* di Nicola della Rosa Nera," 429 – 462; idem, "Alcunas sposicions sobre alcuns passage de sant Mt.", in *Valdesi medievali*, 255–268. Cegna also carried out a complex analysis of various aspects of Waldensian ideology, see Romolo Cegna, *Fede ed etica Valdese nel quattrocento. Il «Libro espositivo» e il «Tesoro e luce della fede»* (Torino: Claudiana, 1982); idem, *Medioevo cristiano e penitenza Valdese. Il «Libro espositivo» e il «Tesoro e luce della fede» (parte seconda)* (Torino: Claudiana, 1994).

[369] *Confessio Taboritarum*, ed. Amedeo Molnár and Romolo Cegna (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1983). The Czech translation was published earlier: Mikuláš z Pelhřimova, *Vyznání a obrana Táborů* (Confession and defence of the Taborites), trans. František M. Dobiáš and Amedeo Molnár (Prague: Academia, 1972). There are also older prints of the *Confessio*, the first was already published by Flacius Illyricus in 1568.

themselves and elaborated on it,[370] yet the assumption formulated by Cegna that the Waldensians drew directly on Nicholas Biskupec's models, i.e. on Nicholas of Dresden or Jan Hus, has not been accepted in the scholarship.[371] The afterlife of Nicholas's works, be it among the Waldensians or the Lollards, is doubtless very interesting and research into this matter will certainly achieve valuable results.[372] Whatever case can be made for Nicholas's alleged Waldensianism, the long-lasting discussion about it overshadowed all other possibly interesting aspects of his doctrine. Moreover, influences of other doctrinal systems that could be found in Nicholas's works have been disregarded, such as the doctrines of the Lollards or the Free Spirit.[373]

In sum, the overview of the ideas which the members of the Dresden School presumably held does not alter the present perspective on the School itself. Moreover, it became clear that a closer scrutiny of the doctrinal issue would be hindered by the lack of comparative material. Similarly as the teaching activities, the opinions of the members of the Dresden School, as much as they can be gleaned from the sources, do not point to the actual existence of the group as a School.

[370] The obvious influence of Nicholas Biskupec's work on various Waldensian texts such as the *Tresor e lume de fe* or the *Libro expositivo*, was analyzed by Amedeo Molnár, "Ohlas Táborské konfese u románských valdenských (The reception of the Taborite confession by the Romance Waldensians)." *Strahovská knihovna* 5–6 (1970–1971): 201–208. See also idem, "Tresor e lume de fe. En marge di traité de dogmatique vaudoise," *Communio viatorum* 7/3–4 (1964): 285–289.

[371] Romolo Cegna, "Oportet et haereses esse," *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 3 (1967): 56–64, see also Amedeo Molnár, "Hus' *De matrimonio* and its Waldensian version," *Communio viatorum* 1/2–3 (1958): 142–157.

[372] Among others, the remarkable commentary on the Apocalypse, *Opus arduum valde*, and its connection to the Hussites or Wyclif still deserves attention. Romolo Cegna, who examined copies of this text preserved in Bohemian libraries, is preparing a transcription of this text. For the background of this issue, see Anne Hudson, *Studies in the Transmission of Wyclif's Writings* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).

[373] Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 61 pointed this out and called for an investigation of this link in several places. See also Howard Kaminsky, "The Problematics of later-medieval Heresy," 133–156; or his older study: "The Free Spirit in the Hussite Revolution," in *Millenial Dreams in the Actions*, ed. Sylvia L. Thrupp (The Hague: Mouton, 1962), 166–186.

The Activities of the Disciples

Nicholas's *Tabule* and the Street Propaganda

A distinctive feature of a school is the existence of its supporters or disciples. The narrative sources record a few hints that suggest that the Dresden School indeed had a number of supporters who took an active part in the riots in Prague before the outbreak of the Hussite wars. The *Chronicon Procopii* described that during one such riot in 1414, the supporters of the Dresdeners carried wooden boards painted with antithetical scenes comparing Christ and the Pope. The anonymous tract recorded that the Dresdeners identified the Pope with the Antichrist. The use of antithetical images depicting contradictory scenes from the lives of Christ and the Antichrist is documented on several occasions in 15th-century Bohemia. Such antitheses undoubtedly drew on an older tradition but some of them could be directly connected with the antitheses that appear in a treatise composed by Nicholas of Dresden, the *Tabule veteris et novi coloris*. The link between Nicholas's *Tabule* and the disciples of the Dresdeners in Prague will be examined in the following.[374]

Pictorial caricatures were a favoured and successful means of propaganda, and not only during the Hussite movement.[375] A full cycle of antitheses depicting scenes from the life of Christ and the Pope of unmistakably Bohemian provenance survives from this period. These antitheses have mostly attracted the attention of art historians because they are preserved in two illuminated codices dating from the late 15th and early 16th centuries – the so called Göttingen and Jena codices.[376] Both of them contain an old Czech adaptation of Nicholas's

[374] I have presented some of the following findings in my article "Communicating Texts Through Images: Nicholas of Dresden's *Tabule*," in *Public Communication in European Reformation Artistic and Other Media in Central Europe 1380–1620*, ed. Milena Bartlová and Michal Šroněk (Prague: Artefactum, 2007), 29–37.

[375] Chytil, *Antikrist v naukách*, 139–172. For the theoretical background of Hussite propaganda, see Karel Hruza, "Propaganda, Kommunikation und Öffentlichkeit im Mittelalter," in *Propaganda, Kommunikation und Öffentlichkeit im Mittelalter (11.–16. Jahrhundert)*, ed. Karel Hruza (Vienna: Österreichische Akademi der Wissenschaften, 2002), 9–25.

[376] A facsimile edition of the Jena codex with a commentary in both Czech and English is available, see *The Jena codex* (Prague: Gallery, 2009); critical edition: *Tabule staré a nové barvy Mikuláše z Drážďan ve staročeském překladu* (The Tables of Old and New Colour of Nicholas of Dresden in an Old Czech Translation), ed. Milada Homolková and Michal Dragoun (Prague: Scriptorium, 2016). For the Göttingen codex, see Viktor Svec, *Bildagitation. Antipäpstliche Bildpolemik der böhmischen Reformation im Göttinger Hussitenkodex* (Weimar: VDG, 1994).

Latin *Tabule*. The relationship between Nicholas's original Latin text and its Czech adaptations in these two codices was subject to an enduring discussion. Presently, it is accepted that the illuminated codices were modelled on different examples and adjusted the original Latin text in different ways.[377] This, in consequence, supported the opinion that such pictorial antitheses were widespread among the Hussites. Nicholas's text itself served either as a libretto for certain wall-paintings or painted boards (or standards) that were carried during the street riots in Prague; or, alternatively, Nicholas could have been inspired by some already existing pictorial antitheses and made good use of them in his *Tabule*.

Apart from the pictorial antitheses preserved in the Göttingen and Jena codices, various allusions to these very antitheses can be read in narrative historical sources of Bohemian origin. In one of his sermons, Jan Hus describes a concrete antithesis of Christ riding a donkey and the Pope on a lavishly harnessed horse.[378] This image is subsequently echoed in a number of narrative sources from a later period,[379] where further antitheses were described. This information led to the assumption that wall paintings inspired by Nicholas's *Tabule* had existed in the Bethlehem chapel in Prague, an important centre of the reform movement where preachers (including Hus himself) sermonized in the Czech language. This attractive supposition was, however, rejected.[380]

An important source of information concerning the cycle of antitheses is a tract written around 1417 that directly opposes the text of Nicholas's *Tabule*. In manuscripts it is often entitled *Responsiones ad obiecciones et picturas* and its author is traditionally considered to be

[377] An analysis of the Jena codex was carried out by Miloslav Vlk, "K otázce předlohy Jenského kodexu" (On the model of the Jena codex), *Sborník Národního muzea v Praze* A XVII (1963): 1–19; idem, "Paleografický rozbor Jenského kodexu" (Palaeographical analysis of the Jena codex), *Sborník historický* 14 (1966): 49–74; idem, "Jenský kodex – kodikologický rozbor" (The Jena codex – a codicological analysis), *Sborník Národního muzea v Praze* A XXI (1967): 73–106.

[378] Jan Hus, *Česká nedělní postila: vyloženie svatých čtení nedělních* (Czech Sunday Postil: expositions of Sunday Bible readings), ed. Jiří Daňhelka (Prague: Academia, 1992), 178.

[379] For instance, in the chronicles of Hájek, Theobald or Schwalb, or Weigl's testimonial of Mathias Döring's treatise – information about these sources and their survey, together with a discussion of their information can be found in Chytil, *Antikrist v naukách*, 140–143.

[380] The assumption was based on information from the above sources in combination with an alleged dream that Hus mentioned in one of his letters from the prison in Constance, in which he described rich wall-paintings in the Bethlehem chapel. Miloslav Vlk, "Obrazy v Betlémské kapli. Rozbor historických pramenů" (Paintings in the Bethlehem chapel. An analysis of historical sources), *Časopis Národního muzea* 130/1 (1961): 151–169, eventually refuted the connection between the antitheses and the hypothetical wall-paintings in the Bethlehem chapel. See also Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 27–28.

Stephen of Páleč.[381] The author spoke of many pictures that contrasted scenes from the life of Christ, supported by passages from the Bible, with the pictures of the Antichrist, backed up by Church privileges and decrees. He explicitly mentioned that the heretics attempted to assail the Roman Church in their *tabulis et picturis* (tables and pictures) and described the scenes that appear in several pictures.[382] The *Responsiones* describe several particular paintings for which a source could be found in Nicholas's *Tabule*. However, the themes of the *Tabule* and their attribution to concrete pictures (i.e. their descriptions) in the *Responsiones* were partially mixed up. This led to two different conclusions: either the author of the *Responsiones* was describing (perhaps by heart) some wall-paintings, or that he only copied a text that might have accompanied the *Tabule* with the pictures.[383]

Later on, Flacius Illyricus mentioned a very old book written "roughly a hundred years ago" that contained several opposing pictures of Christ and the Pope accompanied by a text.[384] The scene Flacius described as an example also appears in the *Tabule* along with the satirical verse mentioned by him. Echoes of similar textual antitheses can be read in various later treatises. However, there is yet another kind of evidence attesting to the existence of the particular antitheses that could be connected with Nicholas's *Tabule*.

In 1412, Voksa of Valdštejn probably together with Jerome of Prague and the students of Prague University organized a street procession connected with the protests against indulgences.[385] Their criticism was aimed at the Roman Church and the Pope, and a student dressed up as the whore of Babylon, bedizened with charters and bulls, acted in the procession.[386] Such street processions quickly became widespread and the existence of painted boards in another procession is later mentioned in Prokop's chronicle, who explicitly writes

[381] A transcription of the text based on a single manuscript from the Prague Metropolitan Chapter Library was prepared by Antonín Podlaha and printed in Chytil, *Antikrist v naukách*, 237–247 with an attribution to Stephen of Páleč. The text was also attributed to Stanislav of Znojmo or Jan Hus. For its manuscript tradition, see Pavel Spunar, *Repertorium*, vol. 2, 202–203, no. 412. Here and elsewhere, the *Responsiones* are considered to be a part of a longer treatise refuting certain Hussite ideas, see Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 27–28. For more about this treatise and its manuscript transmission, see below, 157–162.

[382] "...prout lucide apparet in tabulis et picturis ipsorum. Depingunt enim in una parte tabulae papam equitantem et insigniis apostolicae dignitatis utentem ... In alia vero parte depingunt Christum pauperem, crucem suam in humeris bajulantem...", Chytil, *Antikrist v naukách*, 237.

[383] Karel Stejskal, "Poznámky k současnému stavu bádání o Jenském kodexu" (Notes on the present state of knowledge concerning the Jena codex), *Umění* 9 (1961): 13.

[384] Chytil, *Antikrist v naukách*, 168 where he quotes the relevant passage from Flacius.

[385] Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 2, 253.

that the Dresdeners carried *tabulas contra apostolicum scriptas et pictas* (tables with writings and paintings against the pope) in the rebellious events of 1414.[387] Prokop mentions the antithesis of Christ riding a donkey and the Pope on a lavishly harnessed horse – that is, the same as the one referred to by Jan Hus, which also appears in Nicholas's *Tabule*. Both of these street productions had a certain theatrical character. Their main point, however, had to lie in the pictorial performance and not in the spoken word that could not have been of great effect in the dynamics of the street performances. Under such circumstances, perhaps only short satirical melodies or chanting could have been employed which at first sight have nothing to do with polemical literature. The only possible connection is the survival of some short satirical tunes that were frequently composed by the students, who were at the same time active in the street performances.[388] At any rate, the necessity to promptly react to the situation resulted in the embellishment of the painted boards or standards being inspired by the above-mentioned antitheses, whether textual or pictorial. Their impact must have been sufficiently strong, their existence well-known and their authority must have been generally accepted in the given group so that the students could have taken advantage of them without hesitation.

One seemingly minor issue connected to the text tradition of Nicholas's *Tabule*, a text mentioned in connection with the antitheses in the above-mentioned sources, has a strong bearing on the Dresden School disciples' involvement in the street riots. It can also contribute to the debated relationship between the *Tabule* and its illuminations.

This treatise is considered to be one of the oldest in Nicholas's rich literary production and was composed some time around 1412.[389] The text has come down to us in fourteen manuscript copies, of which three contain only excerpts or are incomplete, and another three are believed to represent an independent phase of textual development. As for its content, the *Tabule* comprise a collection of authorities divided into nine parts – the *tabule* or tables – illustrating the contrasts between the praxis of the primitive Church and that of the

---

[386] Svejkovský, "Divadlo," 82, points out a parallel to similar figures that appeared in carnival processions in Nürnberg in the 16th century, see Samuel L. Sumberg, *The Nuremberg Schembart Carnival* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941).

[387] See above, 22–23.

[388] Svejkovský, "Divadlo," 83.

[389] For the list of surviving copies of the text, see Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 28–29, no. 2, edition of the text follows on pages 38–65. Spunar and Vidmanová, 'Review of Master Nicholas of Dresden, The Old Color and the New', p. 209, add to the list a copy from Brno, Moravská zemská knihovna, Mk 92, fols 422^{r}-30^{v}, and question why another codex has been excluded from the list, namely Prague, Archiv Pražského hradu, Knihovna

contemporary corrupted Roman Church. They do so with the help of passages from the Bible and the Church Fathers contrasted with quotations from the Decretals and glosses on Canon Law.

The title *Tabule* has caused some confusion among historians. The whole text has nine parts marked as *tabule*. Each *tabula* gathers material for one theme but could have rendered inspiration for several pictures. In three of the preserved manuscripts the text is entitled *Novus color et antiquus* and this terminology prompted some researchers to think of the treatise in relation to paintings. However, the manuscripts of the *Tabule* themselves contain evidence that *lex divina antiquus color, lex humana novus color*, that is, the old colour represents the divine law and the new colour the human law. Furthermore, it is a well-known fact that such terms were traditional in medieval rhetoric.[390] Nicholas quoted the *Tabule* as the *Cortina de Anticristo* (*cortina* meaning a carpet, a curtain or a drape, but it can also have the figurative meaning of 'a collection of authorities').[391] Apart from this title, some manuscripts read the incipit as *Conversacio Christi opposita conversacioni Antichristi*,[392] which is also preserved in the polemic against the *Tabule*, the above-mentioned *Responsiones*. The copies dating from the later 15th century often read the subsequently widespread and accepted title *Tabule veteris et novi coloris*, or also *Antithesis Christi et Antichristi*.

The structure of the work does not permit an unequivocal opinion to be formed concerning its illuminations. In the preserved copies of Nicholas's *Tabule*, only rubricated headings of every table can be found, together with the numbering of the theses, which to some extent indicate the structure of the text. One copy contains a truncated drawing and this fact together with notes in several other manuscripts such as *Cristus portans crucem – papa equitans in*

Metropolitní Kapituly u sv. Víta, D 50, fols 266^{r}-67^{v}; moreover they exclude from the list Prague, National Library, I D 9, fols 137^{v}-38^{v}. Neither of these is according to my opinion an extract from the *Tabule*.

[390] For medieval rhetorical figures in a Czech context, see Josef Tříška, *Rétorický styl a pražská univerzitní literatura ve středověku* (Rhetorical style and Prague University literature in the Middle Ages) (Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1977). As an interesting example, it can be mentioned that in another treatise written by Nicholas, the *Apologia* composed around 1415, two scribes (Cracow, BJ 2148, fol. 172v and 1690, fol. 249va) designated one part of the text as a *tabula* although – according to the majority of manuscripts – it should read *conclusio* – a fact that indicates the identical perception of both terms as text-division tools.

[391] Dana Martínková and others, eds., *Latinitatis medii aevi lexicon Bohemorum*, vol. 1 (Prague: Academia, 1987), 953.

[392] Such a title in one of the Vienna manuscripts (ÖNB 4343) led Loserth to consider the text a dialogue and to edit the incomplete text based on this manuscript in a corresponding form, see Johann Loserth, "Ein kirchenpolitischer Dialog aus der Blütezeit des Taboritentums," *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen* 46/2 (1907): 107–121.

equo led to the hypothesis that these represented certain instructions for painters.[393] The structure of the whole text is so confusing so that it has not been unequivocally clarified even by its critical edition.[394] Nevertheless, the most controversial issue concerning the relationship between the original text of the *Tabule* and its supposed illuminations still lies in the question of whether the Latin text of the *Tabule* was written first and then illuminated (if at all), or whether it was some wall-paintings (or other pictorial medium) that existed first and provided inspiration for Nicholas's *Tabule* – in short, which medium affected the origin of the other.

František Šmahel came up with an intriguing hypothesis concerning the *Tabule*. He tried to explain the position of some of the tables in the illuminated codices from Jena and Göttingen through the layout and perception of the wall-paintings in the house at the Black Rose in Prague where Nicholas and his colleagues supposedly lived and worked.[395] As Šmahel argued, the distribution of the wall-paintings in the house may match the layout of the tables in the Göttingen codex where they appear in a slightly distorted order: first comes the ninth table, followed by tables 5 to 8 and completed by tables 1 to 4. This could correspond to tables 5–8 and 1–4 being on the side walls and the ninth table on the central pillar in the atrium at the Black Rose House. From the codicological point of view, this hypothesis does not rest on very sound foundations as the order of the quires, especially in the Jena codex, is so distorted that it cannot offer solid evidence for any such conclusion. Nevertheless, from another point of view, this does not matter at all. For Šmahel rightly pointed out that the most powerful effect of the wall-paintings that presumably did exist could have been reached only through an audio-visual performance during which a learned interpreter with a good command of Latin assisted in the collective perception of the paintings that were closely connected with the text.[396]

However, the function of Nicholas's original Latin *Tabule* and the question of its connection to the early Hussite visual propaganda remain unclear.[397] In an extensive recent analysis, Milena Bartlová challenges the function of the text anew and suggests that the *Tabule*

[393] These opinions are surveyed and discussed by František Šmahel, "Die Tabule veteris et novi coloris als audiovisuelles Medium hussitischer Agitation," *Studie o rukopisech* 29 (1992): 97–98.
[394] Edited by Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*¸ 38–65.
[395] Šmahel, "Die Tabule," 95–105.
[396] Šmahel discussed the question of the visual perception of written texts in Bohemia at the end of the Middle Ages in other studies as well, see for example Šmahel, "Od středověku k novověku: Modi legendi et videndi" (From Middle Ages to Modern Times: Modi legendi et videndi), *Umění* 32 (1984): 318–330; idem, "Das Lesen der unlesbaren Inschriften: Männer mit Zeigestäben," in *The Development of Literate Mentalities in East Central Europe*, ed. Anna Adamska and Marco Mostert (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), 453–467.

was a pictorial-textual kind of book product that connected pictures and text in a very specific way, namely as two equal and interconnected components that only together represented a specialized argumentation.[398] She also proposes that the material antitheses were probably painted on canvas, a technique of public communication that existed in Europe at that time, which, moreover, could be easily exploited during public performances. Bartlová shows how students made possible the transformation of scholarly ideas into the practice of public performances. The students who utilized the antitheses in these street performances could have intentionally made use of the title of the 'tabule': in Medieval Latin the term 'tabula' or 'cortina' could designate a method of scholarly argumentation. Taking advantage of this semantic ambiguity could point to deliberate propaganda or, more precisely, intentional manipulation: the presentation of common visual images as authoritative scholarly evidence. In any case, the semantic structure of the pictures described in the Latin *Tabule* belonged to a university milieu; thus it remains ambiguous how these antitheses could have served as an agent of transfer of the non-conformist ideas of the Hussite reformers to the unlearned laity.[399] Bartlová finds the answer in an essential feature of medieval communication, namely in the dependence on emotions as a crucial component of visual media and the general priority of visual perception in the Late Middle Ages. At the same time it has been pointed out that the function of the mentioned pictorial-textual manuscripts is still not clear. Even though some particulars indicate a connection with preaching, further analysis is required in this matter.[400] Moreover, the question of the role of the original Latin and the subsequent vernacular materials is of great importance in this issue. We still understand very little of the intentions of the author or the function of the Latin text that stood at the beginning of this unique insight into medieval communication.

---

[397] František Šmahel, "Audiovizuální media husitské agitace" (Audiovisual Media of Hussite Agitation), in *Mezi středověkem a renesancí*, ed. František Šmahel (Prague: Argo, 2002): 232–233.

[398] Milena Bartlová, "Prout lucide apparet in tabulis et picturis ipsorum: Komunikační úloha obrazů a textů v počátcích husitismu" (Prout lucide apparet in tabulis et picturis ipsorum: Communication Role of Images and Texts in the Beginnings of Hussitism), *Studia mediaevalia Bohemica* 3/2 (2011): 249–268.

[399] For more on the matter of Hussite propaganda and the means it employed, see Blanka Zilynská, "From Learned Disputation to the Happening: The Propagation of Faith through Work and Image," in *Public Communication in European Reformation Artistic and Other Media in Central Europe 1380–1620*, ed. Milena Bartlová and Michal Šroněk (Prague: Artefactum, 2007), 55–67.

[400] For more on this issue, see Kimberley A. Rivers, *Preaching the Memory of Virtue and Vice: Memory, Images, and Preaching in the late Middle Ages* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010).

Bartlová's conclusions present a breakthrough in our understanding of images as communication media at the beginning of the Hussite movement.[401] At the same time, the more we understand the function of visual media and the process of communication, the more interesting the form of the textual antitheses in this case seems. It is beyond doubt that the problematic text-tradition of the original Latin text deserves further attention. As described above, most scholarly efforts have been aimed at analysing and comparing the illuminated vernacular adaptations and quite inevitably have not paid special attention to the lengthy Latin treatise composed by Nicholas. This is, of course, more than understandable: the lack of a critical edition of the Latin *Tabule* made such comparisons overly complicated.[402] Later, Kaminsky's critical edition did facilitate such analyses, yet ever since its publication not much attention has been paid to the intricate structure of the Latin text.

In my opinion, several problematic aspects of the structure of the Latin *Tabule* have not been satisfactorily accounted for. A few pieces of information that could enhance our comprehension of this text and its function can be added to the intricate situation concerning Nicholas's *Tabule*.

It has been explained above that the structure of the text has been rich and varied since its very beginnings. The function of the *Tabule* has been so far interpreted mostly with the help of the extant complete copies of text. Nevertheless, the incomplete copies of the *Tabule* still require some attention because their examination could result in the reconstruction of a text that is quite different from the one we know at present. This is even more important since the relationship between the *Tabule* and their later illuminated Czech adaptations is still not entirely clear.

In order to grasp the message of the *Tabule* we need principally to consider its composition. The majority of the tables consist of several numbered clusters of quotations from relevant authorities that aptly contrast the 'old colour', i.e. the Primitive Church, and the 'new colour', i.e. the (modern) Roman Church. The purpose behind such an arrangement was to evoke as vividly as possible the contrast between Christ and Antichrist. The stress on the

[401] See also Milena Bartlová, "Der Bildersturm der böhmischen Hussiten: Ein neuer Blick auf eine radikale mittelalterliche Geste," *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 59 (2010): 27–48.

[402] It should be stressed that neither Chytil, who compared the Latin *Tabule* and its Czech adaptation for the first time, nor Vlk, whose conclusions, achieved through a meticulous analysis of both illuminated codices, still more or less hold true, had the critical edition at hand. See Chytil, *Antikrist v naukách*, 139–172; Vlk, "K otázce předlohy Jenského kodexu", 1–11.

difference between the lives of Christ and Antichrist is also echoed in the incipit of the work in two manuscripts (*Incipit conversacio Cristi opposita conversacioni Anticristi*).[403] In his later treatises, the author himself refers to this text mostly as *Cortina de Anticristo*.[404] Based on the subdivisions of the text, the title *Tabule veteris et novi coloris*, or *Novus color et antiquus*, emerged in the manuscript material during the fifteenth century and the treatise was subsequently spread and recognised under this title.

As for the actual content of the *Tabule*, the very first pair of authorities in the first table can be seen as emblematic of the whole work: it is the antithesis of the humble Christ and the Pope, using the well-known representation of Christ carrying his cross and the Pope riding a lavishly adorned horse. The ensuing criticism of the Pope in this table elaborates on the Donation of Constantine and the corruption stemming from it. The authorities in the second table deal mostly with the corrupted character of the Roman Church and its jurisdictional practice, contrasting Peter and the Pope. The third and fourth tables enlarge upon these thematic oppositions in connection with the Church's jurisdiction.

The fifth table presents a turning point in the whole treatise. It abandons the pattern of opposing arguments and opens with a description of a Black Horseman from the Apocalypse with a balance in his hand – the explanation of the scene follows the gloss on the Apocalypse and attacks those who explain the Scripture differently from how the Holy Spirit commands and who transgress the divine law, such as simoniacs. A second image described here presents Christ driving out the moneychangers from the Temple and is accompanied by biblical quotations divided into four numbered points related to the story of Susanna. These are succeeded by a handful of unnumbered passages from the Canon law, concerning mostly fornication. The abandonment of the principle of alternation might have been caused by the subject matter, since there could not have been any canonical texts defending the sins of simony and fornication.[405] Nevertheless, the change in both form and content is remarkable.

The sixth table concentrates on vestments and criticizes the vanity of clerical garments. The seventh table elaborates on the same topic, using the parable of Dives and Lazarus at its beginning. Another slight change in form appears here. Firstly, there are four numbered points

[403] Prague, Archiv Pražského hradu, Knihovna Metropolitní Kapituly u sv. Víta, A 79/5, fol. 256^{rb}; O 50, fol. 127r. For further variants of the title, see Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 38.
[404] E.g. in his *Expositio super Pater noster*, or *Puncta*, see Sedlák, *Mikuláš*, 8–9.
[405] See Kaminsky, *A History*, 45.

pertaining to the old colour, followed by sets of two opposing arguments, entitled 'primus impugnans indumentum humile et comendans statum' ('The first assailant of humble attire and supporter of pomp'), immediately followed by their 'solucio' ('solution', i.e. rejection). There are five of such pairs altogether. The numbering of these pairs continues into the eighth table that opens with the sixth and seventh *impugnantes* and their 'solutions'. These are then followed by a description of Christ washing the feet of his disciples as opposed to the Pope having his feet kissed. At the end of this table, an opposition of the 'curia Christi' and the 'curia Romana' appears. The ninth table breaks with all previous patterns and is devoted to the coming of the Antichrist, consisting almost entirely of relevant biblical quotations.

As mentioned above, the authorities in each of the nine parts are subdivided into numbered points which in most cases alternate between the old and new colours – and present a fine source for a picture (or two or more opposing pictures) on each theme. In some tables, however, the sequence of individual points is rather cumulative, while in others it does not correspond to either of these systems. The editors of the *Tabule* explained this union of text and pictures by the possibility that 'picture-titles tell their own story, and the sequence of authorities, which do not follow a simple one-for-one pattern of antithesis, bears witness to a principle of grouping that can be best understood in terms of pictures.'[406] The distribution of the arguments as well as the content of individual tables is crucial for comprehending the structure of the *Tabule* as well as its subsequent adaptations, and thus it is best to look at it in full detail:

	color antiquus	color novus
tabula prima	1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13	2, 5, 6, 11
tabula secunda	2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14	1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 13
tabula tertia	2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9	1, 3, 8
tabula quarta	2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17	1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11
tabula quinta	-	-
tabula sexta	1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14	3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12
tabula septima	1, 2, 3, 4, solutio primi – quinti	primus – quintus impugnans
tabula octava	solutio sexti – septimi, conclusio, Christus lavans pedes discipulorum	sextus – septimus impugnans, curia papae
tabula nona	1-18	

It can be seen that the antithetical system is far from straightforwardly applied throughout the work. Moreover, this intricate system is not followed in the same way in all the manuscripts. In some copies the numbered subdivisions appear on new lines as titles, in others the numbers appear either within the text, or in the margins (or both). Moreover, there are discrepancies not only in the distribution of quotations to each colour, but most importantly in the subdivision of the whole work. The lack of symmetry in the nine parts is the most remarkable element, yet we can easily accept that even a treatise based on alternating antitheses does not need to be perfectly symmetrical. But there are further problems, most notably in the transition between tables seven and eight: why does the numbering of the subdivisions in these two tables continue without a break from one to the other table, whereas, in the other tables, the numbering always starts anew? Why are the subdivisions in these two parts formally different from the rest of the treatise? Another question concerns the fifth table, the longest of all: what is the function of it and why does no numbering appear here? Last but not least, why do the eighteen quotations solely to the old colour stand in an individual table without any counterpart at the very end of the whole treatise? Consequently, can a full appreciation of the structural diversity of the Latin *Tabule* explain some of the ambiguous points in the system of illuminations in the later vernacular adaptations preserved in the Jena and Göttingen Codices? Answers to these questions can add much to the understanding of the original function of Nicholas's text and as a result provide valuable insights into the late medieval communication.

Jan Sedlák was one of the first scholars who paid attention to the treatise and tried to sum up its content.[407] He suggested that the text was divided into nine parts, each entitled 'tabula'.[408] Sedlák knew of eleven manuscripts of the *Tabule* (all included in the critical edition) and pointed out that in two manuscripts there were only eight tables because the sixth and seventh tables were connected into one.[409] This, nevertheless, does not entirely correspond to the manuscripts in question. As a matter of fact, none of the extant manuscripts (including

[406] Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 35–36.
[407] Sedlák, *Mikuláš*, 8–14.
[408] Sedlák, *Mikuláš*, 9.
[409] Sedlák, *Mikuláš*, 9, note 5 – namely manuscripts Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 2148, and Prague, National Library, IV G 15.

the thirteen copies the editors of the text examined)[410] divides the text into nine parts by using headings for tables one to nine. The two manuscripts Sedlák had in mind – Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, MS 2148, and Prague, National Library, MS IV G 15 – do indeed have only eight headings, although not as he presented it: both manuscripts read 'tabula octava' ('table eight'), but there is no heading for table nine. Moreover, it seems that Sedlák understood the layout of the tables differently from the editors of the *Tabule*: when one reads his summary of the content of the *Tabule*, it becomes apparent that he considered table five as two tables (one dealing with simony, the other criticizing fornication), and therefore, in his subsequent numbering, his seventh table equals table six of the critical edition, and his eighth and ninth parts correspond to parts of tables seven and eight, namely to the sequence of seven arguments with their solutions ('primus – septimus impugnans') that stretch from table seven to table eight in the edition. Even if Sedlák's division of the text is not fundamentally wrong, his misleading description, in combination with a failure of the critical edition to address the question of the work's structure, has caused much subsequent confusion in understanding the division of the *Tabule*, and more importantly has much bearing on our understanding of the illuminated vernacular versions of the *Tabule*.

Let me repeat that none of the surviving manuscripts includes the heading 'tabula nona' within the text. There is a single apparent exception:[411] In manuscript *S*, the numbers of tables one to five appear in the text and only subsequently were marked by a different hand in the margins. This subsequent corrector numbered as '8' the beginning of the sets of assailants with their solutions in table seven (fol. 33^{v}), and continued with 'tabula nona' at the point where the text reads 'sequitur alia tabula' ('another table follows') on fol. 34^{v}: here, in fact, the papal curia is described (i.e. at the end of table eight). Subsequently, he marked the words 'sequitur tabula ultima' ('last table follows') of the text as 'Tabula ultima de anticristo' ('last table about

[410] Since all these manuscripts will be repeatedly discussed in the following, I will refer to them using the sigla they were assigned in the critical edition. The list is as follows: *B* – Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, A X 66, fol. 296^{r}–304^{r}; *K* – Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 2148, fol. 111^{v}–118^{r}; *L* – Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Hs K 346, fol. 120^{r}–127^{v}; *P* – Prague, National Library, IV G 15, fol. 232va–240ra; *Q* – Prague, National Library, V G 15, fol. 84^{r}–92^{v}; *R* – Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, A 79/5, fol. 256^{rb}–261^{rb}; *S* – Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, N 7, fol. 30^{v}–35^{r}; *T* – Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, O 50, fol. 127^{r}–132^{v}; *V* – Vienna, ÖNB, 4902, fol. 181^{r}–186^{r}; *W* – Vienna, ÖNB, 4488, fol. 67^{rv}; *Y* – Vienna, ÖNB, 4343, fol. 181^{r}–188^{r}; *Z* – Vienna, ÖNB, 4875, fol. 29^{r}–34^{r}; *H* – Herrnhut, Universitätsarchiv, AB.II.R.1.16.a, fol. 61^{v}–63^{v}, fol. 93^{v}–97^{r}.

[411] For the sake of accuracy it has to be said that the heading 'tabula nona' ('table nine') erroneously appears in *V*, on fol. 185^{r} but the sequence of numbers is distorted there to a high extent. This issue will be discussed in full detail later.

Antichrist') in the margin. In sum, the numbering in this manuscript is a result of attempted amelioration, and thus the division of the text into ten parts that seemingly appears there must be rejected. This leaves us with the assumption that the last part of the *Tabule* – a series of eighteen arguments concerning Antichrist of no antithetical character – was not originally a separate table, and thus constitutes a special part of the treatise with an as yet unknown function. It is also possible that it was originally not an integral part of the text.

Working backwards from the end of the tract, another remarkable element in the structure is represented by the series of seven arguments with counter-arguments (i.e. 'primus – septimus impugnans + solutio') that stretches from table seven, after the first four quotations of the table, to table eight. In other words, one might ask: does table eight exist? And if so, in what form? The heading 'tabula octava' ('table eight') at the beginning of the sixth assailant appears only in manuscripts *P* and *K* and in a miscounted form in *V*.[412] Nevertheless, the seven assailants are presented as a coherent section without any break in manuscripts *Q*, *R*, *T*, *S*, *B*, *W*, *Z*, which lack the heading of table eight. In *L*, the beginning of the eighth table is located at the end of the seventh assailant. Thus, it seems unlikely that the sixth assailant marked the beginning of a new part of the text.[413]

Can we then suppose that the material treating the seven *impugnantes* was originally seen as an add-on to the original antithetical structure? There is evidence that the copyists saw a dividing line here: in *S*, for example, a note in the margin of fol. 33^{v} marks the first assailant of table seven as the beginning of the eighth part. In *L*, the first assailant starts on a new line highlighted by a marginal note. However, in other manuscripts, the series of seven assailants follows the four numbered points at the beginning of table seven without any interruption. Remarkable is the division in *T*: here, the scribe combined the numbering of the tables with a system of alphabetical division by letters. Judging by these letters, it seems that a break came only after the end of the seventh assailant in table eight, marked on fol. 132^{r} by the letter 'M'. The preceding letter 'K' marks the beginning of table six (fol. 130^{r}).[414] In *V*, there is a longer omission at this place: after the first point comes the first assailant which could mean that this

[412] Heading 'octava tabula' in *Q* on fol. 89^{v} stands at a miscounted beginning of what is actually table seven.
[413] Even though it appears in the middle of a line of argumentation, the reasons behind the problematic beginning of table eight are unfortunately not discussed in the critical edition.
[414] We can only guess where the obviously missing letter 'L' should have been: at the beginning of table seven, or at the beginning of the first assailant? A barely visible superscript letter 'L' might seem to indicate that it was at

manuscript have been copied from a model where the series of seven assailants presented a separate part. At the end of the series of assailants, some sort of division is marked also in *B*, *L*, *Q*, *R*, *S*, and *V*. To conclude: following the evidence of the extant manuscripts, there is no reason to number table seven and eight as separate tables; rather, it would seem more logical to understand the series of seven assailants with their solutions as a separate and coherent part of the text.

The fifth table presents another strange element in the text. Apart from the fact that it lacks the antithetical character of the earlier tables (and thus the numbering of individual arguments), it is the longest part of the text and appears to bear the form of a tract against simony and fornication. In its middle, it is interrupted by the story of Susanna and the Elders, presented under four numbered points. The beginning of the story (i.e. the first point) is marked in the manuscripts in various ways. In *Q* and *V*, this place is marked as 'sexta tabula' ('table six'); *L* reads 'table five' here (and lacks a heading at the actual beginning of the fifth table); in *T*, there is a new paragraph marked by letter 'I' and a title: 'Here the church is condemned because fornicators and keepers of concubines are in it' ('Hic condempnat ecclesiam, quia fornicarii et concubinarii sunt in ea'); a new paragraph with a title appears also in *R*; in *K* and *B*, the first numbered point of the story appears in a new line. Therefore, the transition in the content of the fifth table (i.e. between the part about simony and the one dealing with fornication) is supported also by manuscript evidence. At any rate, the function and the place of this table in the general context of the *Tabule* are not at all clear.

In the previous description, manuscripts of the *Tabule* where the text is preserved in an incomplete or disturbed manner have been largely ignored. With the help of the above details of the structure of the *Tabule*, I hope the confused order of the tables in these fragments can now be better explained. I will choose only two examples. Manuscript *V* is an incomplete copy, starting with paragraphs seven and eight of the third table, followed by tables four to nine. The fifth table is divided into two,[415] marked as tables five and six, and as a result table six is marked as seven, and table seven as eight. In this table, the order of the numbered points

---

the beginning of table seven – however, there is an omission between the fourth point and the beginning of the first assailant which makes it impossible to decide the matter either way.

[415] As opposed to other headings in this copy which contain only simple numbers, the fifth table reads 'tabula quinta alteram partem continens libri precedentis' ('table five containing another part of the previous tract').

and of the assailants with their counterarguments is completely muddled.[416] As mentioned above, a heading of a new table appears at the beginning of the sixth assailant (although misnumbered as table nine). The parts with the headings 'Curia Cristi' ('curia of Christ') and 'Modus curie Romane' ('mode of the Roman curia') comprise relevant material from the very end of table eight of the edition. The content of table nine is not separated from the previous text in any way.

Even more interesting is the evidence of manuscript *H*, a fragment now kept in Herrnhut, Germany. Here, the text of the *Tabule* has been copied in two places, namely on fols 61^{v}-63^{v} and 93^{v}-97^{r}. Kaminsky seems to have considered only the second part in his preface to the edition of the *Tabule*. He suggested that *H* was written very close to the date of origin of the tract, i.e. around 1412, and that the sets of facing authorities on fols 93^{v}-97^{r} represent an early draft of the text. Nicholas could have compiled here a handful of relevant statements in a way that documents the antithetical plan for the text. The headings 'pars Cristi' ('the side of Christ') and 'pars pape' ('the side of the Pope') that can be found here are in some cases amplified by instructions that document the original picture-text association.[417] Subsequently, Nicholas could have elaborated on this first draft, adjusted and regrouped the authorities in such a way as to contrast the two colours, and this elaborated stage of text development is preserved in most of the extant manuscripts of the *Tabule*.[418]

The evidence of the first part of the text preserved in the Herrnhut fragment adds weight to Kaminsky's suggestion about the work's antithetical form. The first two sets of facing pages (i.e. fols 61^{v}-62^{r}) contain the headings 'prima tabula' and '2^{a} tabula' '(i.e. 'first and second table') at the top of the pages, above the texts of the first (fol. 61^{v}) and the second table (fol. 62^{r}). The quotations are heavily abbreviated (often there is only the first word) and follow one another without breaks. The numbering has the form of superscripts. Both of these parts are underlined and followed by other quotations. On fol. 61^{v}, the third table can be found (with an incomplete number one), the fourth table starts in a new paragraph and is followed without interruption by the part of table five which ends before the series of four numbered points (i.e.

[416] The critical apparatus of the edition does not record such variants; the order is as follows, 'primus, primus impugnans, secundus, solucio primi, quartus, tercius, solucio tercii, solucio secundi, secundus impugnans, tercius impugnans, quartus impugnans, solucio quarti, quintus impugnans, solucio quinti'.

[417] Such as 'pars Cristi que debet depingi baiulans crucem' ('the side of Christ which should be depicted as Christ carrying the cross') on fol. 94^{v} and 'pars pape que debet depingi iuxta tenorem privilegii' ('the side of the Pope which should be depicted as the Pope by the wording of the privilege') on fol. 95^{r}.

before the story of Susanna). On fol. 62^{r}, below the underlined end of the second table, appears the rest of the incomplete first point from the third table, followed by the continuation of table five, i.e. from the story of Susanna onwards. The end of the page corresponds with the end of table five. Lacking any heading, the sixth table starts on fol. 62^{v}: the uninterrupted text fills the whole page and ends on the upper part of fol. 63^{r}. A new paragraph without any title contains the beginning of table seven. The first assailant is then separated and appears in yet another paragraph. However, apart from the first assailant and its counterargument, there is only one quotation from the solution of the second paragraph, which means that most of the assailants and their solutions are missing.[419] The rest of this folio is taken up by text from the end of the eighth table, namely the mode of the Roman curia – the text in versified form appears in one column. The following fol. 63^{v} contains, in abridged form, a list of nineteen numbered quotations from table nine. In sum, the part on fols 61^{v}-63^{v} contains in an abridged form almost the entire text of the *Tabule*, with the exception of the beginning of table five (a gloss on Apocalypse 6 evoking the picture of the black horseman with scales) as well as a few lines from the middle of it (related to the picture of Christ expelling moneychangers from the temple); moreover, it lacks the third through seventh assailants, even though there is evidence that this part was intentionally skipped.

Thus, the text that continues on fol. 93^{v} introduced by the heading of 'statera' ('scales') at the top of the page seems at first sight to complement the previous part. Yet it is not so. What follows is in fact material from the beginning of the fifth table along with authorities that do not appear in the *Tabule*. Underneath the title 'pars Cristi' follow authorities from the second table and one from the sixth table – all of these contain longer pieces of quotations than appear in the *Tabule*. With another title, 'sacerdos' ('priest'), come quotations from tables two, one, and six. On the adjacent fol. 94^{r}, the upper half of the page is left blank and what follows comprises quotations from tables two and four. Such a disorderly distribution of quotations can be found in the rest of this part, too. It should be emphasized that the authorities are for most part the same as in the previous passage (i.e. fols 61^{v}-63^{v}), which means that the text on fols 93^{v}-97^{r} does not complete the previous part. To put it differently, the authorities here are

[418] Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 34–36.

[419] A note 'Infra per totum de preciositate et ornatu vestituum' ('Below all about costliness and sumptuousness of clothing') can probably be understood as a reference to the rest of the missing assailants. Moreover, it seems to indicate that the scribe was copying or making notes from another copy.

grouped differently from the previous part where the system of tables is applied. Moreover, even though the arrangement of the second part indeed evokes contrasts between Christ and the Pope, the distribution of the quotations (i.e. their content) does not follow the antithetical character.[420] As far as the final structure of the *Tabule* is concerned, it is remarkable that there is no material from table five or anything connected with the criticism of vanity regarding clothing, as captured in the seven assailants and counterarguments. Last but not least, the content of table nine appears partially on fol. 96^{v} under the title of 'de Anticristo testes infrascripti' ('below witnesses of Antichrist') in an order different from the one in the *Tabule*.[421]

Regrettably, it is difficult to decide what the relation between the two parts of the text in the Herrnhut fragment was. Can we see a first draft or notes of the author of the text on fols 93^{v}-97^{r} that was subsequently reworked into a new system on fols 61^{v}-63^{v}? That it could not have been the opposite way can be inferred from the fact that the text on fols 61^{v}-63^{v} complies more or less with the structure of the Latin *Tabule* preserved in the extant manuscripts, which therefore seems to represent the later form. Unfortunately, this hypothesis cannot be accepted or fully rejected. Based on the contents, the order of quotations on fols 61^{v}-63^{v} cannot be deduced from the other part. The numbering of the quotations (which appears only here and not in the other part) could have been added later – which may be the reason why it was superscribed. But there is another possibility, namely, that this part was copied from a different model. More evidence would be needed to elaborate this hypothesis.

At any rate, it can be inferred from the above description that the structure of the Latin *Tabule* was highly complex and diverse already at the time of its origin. In this light, if we consider the fact that table five is altogether missing from some of the extant manuscripts (such as *W*), or that some manuscripts openly claim that the text is divided into eight parts only (the title in *L*), and that many of the copies made dividing lines at different places (such as the series of assailants and counterarguments), the structure of the treatise as presented in the critical edition and the structure of Nicholas's text as presumably seen by his

[420] To make it clear by a concrete example: the authorities on fol. 95^{v}, entitled as 'pars Cristi', contain III/7, IV/8/3, IV/9, II/14, III/9, IV/8/2, IV/8/1, IV/9 (where the Roman number stands for the table and the Arabic for the numbered point within each table, and in some cases its sub-parts). The opposing fol. 96^{r} contains under 'pars pape' IV/7/2, IV/10, IV/1/3, IV/7/1 – the first quotation on the page, a gloss of Bartholomew Brixiensis on the nature of papal dispensations (i.e. on C. 15 q. 6 c. 2), does not appear in the *Tabule*.

contemporaries differ substantially from each other. If, for instance, we disregard table five as not being part of the treatise, we would read a text that comprises six sets of clusters of antithetically arranged quotations (this would include the first four numbered points from table seven), followed by a series of seven arguments and counterarguments criticizing sumptuousness of clothing, and rounded off by a cluster of authorities concerning the Antichrist. To accept any such suggestion, however, we have to look for evidence in further sources. Nonetheless, it can be propounded already that the debate on later vernacular adaptations of the Latin *Tabule*, which took the form of the Latin treatise for granted, could have benefited from a full appreciation of the structural diversity of the Latin *Tabule*.

The existence of the Herrnhut manuscript introduces one essential implication to the intricate situation concerning the images and the *Tabule*, namely that already around 1412, that is at a time very close to the composition of the *Tabule*, their pictorial decoration was intended as a means for the promotion of the ideas they contained. And because other sources attest to the use of antithetical pictures in the street riots in Prague in 1412 or 1414, the link between Nicholas *Tabule* and the students who carried these antithetical pictures in these street processions becomes more apparent. If the message of the *Tabule* in a simplified version of striking antitheses on portable wooden boards was to be successfully used in the street performances, contemporaries had to be familiar with the existence of the polemic paintings and the accompanying text interpreting their meaning. And it is precisely here that we can see a flash of the influence that the circle around Nicholas did exert on the wider masses. In order to utilize the pictorial potential of the *Tabule* on the spur of the moment (i.e. when preparing for a street performance), previous discussions on how and what to extract from the paintings or the text must have taken place – and the existence of the abridged version of the *Tabule* with its layout from this very period attests precisely to this. The assumption that the Dresdeners in Prague cooperated with the students of the University can moreover be supported by the activity of Friedrich Eppinge – namely his involvement in the struggle over Wyclif's articles in Prague that took place at the University, the result of which was Eppinge's treatise on unjust excommunication from April 1412. At the same time, it should be stressed that both events relate only to the period in Prague and do not apply to possible earlier phases

[421] The list contains IX/1, IX/2, IX/4/1, IX/3, IX/17, IX/7, IX/18, IX/10 together with some additions (Matthew 24, 15; Mark 13, 14); some of the quotations are longer while some are shorter than those in the *Tabule*.

in the existence of the Dresden School. Once settled at the Black Rose House, the German masters did attract some attention amongst the Reformist party supporters.

Propaganda in Germany

There are other activities that may possibly have been shared by the Dresdeners. Closely connected to the question of Waldensianism is the fact that the Dresden School was regarded as the prime agent in the rapprochement of Hussite and Waldensian ideologies. Amedeo Molnár came up with the concept of "waldensich-hussitische Internationale" and tried to show that the synthesis of ideas was followed by the amalgamation of organizational structures, which continued even after the end of the Hussite wars.[422] Molnár understood the missionary work of the people from the Dresden School as the propagation of Hussite ideas in Germany, closely linked with the pro-Waldensian orientation of the Dresden School. The concept of the Waldensian-Hussite international was extensively debated over the course of time in the scholarship,[423] although the Waldensian influence over the Hussite radicals is not at all easy to perceive or trace in the sources. For the present purpose, it is necessary to pay some attention to the travelling enterprises through which the individual members of the School, who were often labelled Hussite emissaries,[424] attempted to disseminate their ideas. The reason for this is to find out whether their missionary vocation could have had a common basis which could be understood as a characteristic trait of the members of the Dresden School.

The travels of the first generation of the Dresden School's teachers, namely Peter, Nicholas and Friedrich Eppinge, do not indicate any common intention. Peter visited Nuremberg in 1405 on his own but we know nothing of the reasons and the background to this voyage. His subsequent travels, now together with Eppinge, were limited to the teaching activities in Dresden. Eppinge's movements are determined by the course of his studies, similarly to Nicholas's, whose whereabouts are even more difficult to trace. On the other hand, a manuscript reference suggests that Nicholas of Dresden propagated his ideas through

[422] Molnár, *Valdenští*, 206–214, who had already used this term – even though to describe the cooperation of the Waldensians with the Taborite radicals – in his earlier studies.
[423] *Friedrich Reiser und die „waldensisch-hussitische Internationale" im 15. Jahrhundert*, ed. Albert de Lange and Kathrin Utz Tremp (Heidelberg, Ubstadt-Weiher, and Basel: Verlag Regionalkultur, 2006), especially the contribution of Albert de Lange (p. 29–74) where he surveys the past discussions of this concept. František Šmahel in his *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 4, 118–144 also devoted a chapter to the Hussite international, though he treated the subject from a wider point of view.
[424] Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 4, 124.

preaching at least on one occasion when he stopped in Žatec in north-western Bohemia and preached to its German population in 1416.[425] Apart from this, only one treatise of Nicholas of Dresden can be considered evidence of a possible promotion of his ideas. The *Replica rectori scholarum in Corbach* was composed after 1415 and brings in a huge number of authorities attesting to the necessity of the lay chalice.[426] The treatise is styled as a letter of the rector of a local school in Wildungen, Germany, to the rector of another school in Corbach. It has been explained above that the *Replica* can be perceived as a kind of "literary epilogue" of Nicholas's because in it he quotes and excerpts his own as well as his colleagues' Utraquist treatises. In 1415, when the debate about Utraquism in Bohemia was concluded, the raison d'être of the *Replica* may very likely have been to disseminate the idea of Utraquism to Germany as the dedication suggests.

As opposed to the first generation, the activities and travels of John Drändorf and Peter Turnau were quite different. For one thing, we know that Drändorf was a fervent preacher and thus, he openly spread his ideas this way. The manifesto he composed together with his fellow Turnau very openly served the same purpose, i.e. to change the affairs of the world. As the detailed sequence of their travels was described above, let me only repeat that they moved around separately. Only in September 1424 did Drändorf join his colleague Turnau in Speyer. At that time Turnau held the position of rector of the local cathedral school. After a short mission to the nearby city of Heilbronn, they returned and worked on a manifesto entitled *Misericors deus*, calling for a change in the existing order. This short exhortation deals with the three *vincula*, i.e. bonds which the Lord imposed on Christians because of their sins. These are unjust excommunication, blind obedience and the third, surpassing the previous two, the secular rule of the clergy. The paragraph on unjust excommunication is rather short. It consists basically of six authorities, yet it is surprising that Turnau (who as an educated lawyer very likely supplied the canonistic authorities) did not utilize the material on the topic compiled by Friedrich Eppinge. It was explained above that Eppinge's *Posicio de excommunicacione* written in Prague in 1412 is the most complex legal treatment of this hot issue and, because it argued the matter based on the difference between the institutional Church and the community of the saints, it supported the conclusion that unjust excommunication is not harmful. It is impossible that this line of argument was unknown to Turnau from his Prague days. However,

[425] See above, 75, no. 21.

out of the six authorities that appear in the manifesto, only three can be read in Eppinge's *Posicio*.[427] On the other hand, the second parts of the manifesto, dealing with blind obedience, consists of passages from the same part of the Canon law as the previous one (namely various canons from C. 11 q. 3 of the *Decretum Gratiani* are quoted), which can also be read in numerous treatises of, for instance, Nicholas of Dresden. Thus, it is also possible that Turnau simply excerpted only one place from the Canon law. Still, it is rather striking that Eppinge's major breakthrough in the matter of unjust excommunication was omitted utterly by his colleague Turnau. In the third part of the manifesto, the secular rule of the clergy is refuted with the help of several Biblical passages and it is argued that the bishops who have secular power are successors of the emperors, and not of Christ or his apostles. The conclusion contains an exhortation to break free from the oppression of these bonds and invites all to verify the validity of the presented claims in the *libris cathenatis*, which are hidden in monasteries and churches. In addition to this, Drändorf composed three letters to the citizens of Weinsberg, a town afflicted by an ecclesiastical ban. Similarly as in the manifesto, Drändorf pointed out the invalidity of the interdict and called for an armed revolt. The establishment very quickly reacted to such appeals and upon Drändorf's arrest, these documents were presented at his trial. The letters and the manifesto were a part of a greater scheme to build a network of communities that failed and both Drändorf and Turnau were burnt as heretics. Interestingly, it is not clear how much of all this was solely Drändorf's activity. Turnau certainly held less radical views than Drändorf and told the inquisitors that he only helped Drändorf unwillingly. During their discussions about the manifesto, Turnau strove to moderate some of Drändorf's views, for example he tried to convince him that priests living in sin still should be obeyed (which was also confirmed during his trial), and he did not partake in the styling of the emotional foreword to the manifesto either. How much of this was manoeuvring in front of the tribunal is impossible to say. Nonetheless, it is clear enough that the *spiritus agens* in the Weinsberg agitation was John Drändorf, who took advantage of the position and the network of contacts that his friend Turnau had established in the area

[426] See above, 31–32.

[427] As a matter of fact, two of them are a part of a single quotation – a passage from the Canon law (C. 11 q. 3. c. 90) is supported by a Biblical quotation (Matth. 5, 11 and Luc. 6, 22); in the same manner they appear at the end of Eppinge's treatise (*Tractatus responsivus*, 133). The third one is another quotation from the Canon Law (C. 11 q. 3 c. 46), see *Tractatus responsivus*, 128.

previously.[428] The two men reached this destination along different paths and the reasons for their opposition to the Church rested on different foundations. Thus, it seems that their joint enterprise was not instigated by the circle of the Germans at the Black Rose House in Prague.

Before settling in Speyer, the cosmopolitan Turnau toured other places, too. Turnau travelled to Zittau, Prague and Bologna to further his studies while his subsequent journey to the East had yet another reason. Turnau claimed that he wanted to see the *mirabilia mundi* and visited Greece and Crete. He nevertheless abandoned the original plan to continue to Jerusalem and returned to Bohemia through Venice. In Prague he informed the Hussite reformers about the customs and rites of the Eastern Church in a short piece of writing.[429] Nevertheless, all these enterprises bear little relation to the grand project Turnau later undertook with Drändorf in Germany.

Bartholomew Rautenstock is another member of the Dresden School who in the course of his missionary work travelled and preached in various places. Following his ordination in 1417, Rautenstock preached to a German congregation in Prague for over a year. After this he married and settled in Germany for ten years. After the death of his wife, he set out on several trips and preached all over Franconia. During his trips Rautenstock took advantage of the network of his friends and his style of itinerant preaching led scholars to suggest that he might have been one of the twelve "apostles" sent by the Taborites to Germany.[430] How long his missionary work lasted remains unknown. What is known for certain is that Rautenstock was ultimately caught by the inquisition and burnt in Nuremberg some time between 1450 and 1460.

The eventful destiny of Peter Payne who travelled a great deal as chief diplomat of the Hussite legacies and who took part in various official negotiations pertain to a later period. Moreover, it has been argued at the very beginning that because of he arrived in Prague only in 1414 when most of the Dresdeners were gone, Payne's contacts with the Dresden School could not have been of a formative nature. His travels, therefore, had nothing in common with the missionary work of the other members of the Dresden School, as described above.

It is clear that the biographical data, which alone disclosed the disparate paths of the individual members of the Dresden School, are an obstacle to the supposition that their

[428] Selge, "Heidelberger Ketzerprozesse," 183–202 brings critical insight to the matter of their cooperation.
[429] His short tract was edited by Bartoš, "Německého husity Petra Turnova spis," 13–25.
[430] Machilek, "Deutsche Hussiten," 280. The sequence of Rautenstock's travels are described above, 60–61.

travelling activities might have represented a common enterprise. In spite of this, it has not been entirely fruitless to examine the matter from a different angle. The missionary activities of the members of the Dresden School are certainly remarkable. Apart from those described above, there might have been others who set out to preach in Germany but are not witnessed by the sources. For all we know, Nicholas of Dresden might have encountered his martyrdom in Germany, in Meissen. Obviously we know nothing about other disciples who might have been inspired by this example. On the other hand, it is also evident that the reasons behind the individuals' travels varied, just like their opinions on various doctrinal matters were different. The members of the Dresden School certainly did not share or promote a distinct programme. Yet the lifestyle, itinerant preaching and the zeal to acquire and spread the truth of the gospel echoed throughout many of their travels. The examination of the possible bonds of the group based on their teaching activities, doctrinal persuasion and the promotional performances of their disciples revealed that their missionary zeal is possibly the only thing that can be regarded as indirect evidence for the existence of this group.

Collecting, Cataloguing and Promoting the Texts: Followers of the Dresdeners

Nicholas of Dresden and his *Opera omnia*

The previous scrutiny of the evidence contemporary with the supposed existence of the Dresden School suggests that the School is a later construct. Nevertheless, the preceding chapters also indicate that in terms of the influence of the School, the situation may have been different. I have shown that some of the supporters of the Dresden School in Prague took an active part in street propaganda in the period when the German masters still lived at the Black Rose House, or shortly afterwards. There are other pieces of information that point to the radiation of the influence of the School, which come from a somewhat later period. In the very first place I would like to discuss the supposition that there were conscious attempts at collecting the treatises of the masters of the School. Such an activity can be regarded as a distinct sign that a school had followers and would indeed provide first-rate circumstantial evidence that the Dresden School existed.

It must be stressed at the very beginning that it was only one member of the School, Nicholas of Dresden, whose treatises were ever collected. Nevertheless, the existence of the "collected editions", as they were called,[431] is such a significant feature for the problem of the existence of the Dresden School that it must be discussed in detail here. Howard Kaminsky in his study on the Dresden School noted that there were a few codices which contained material mostly by Nicholas. To be precise, he listed five manuscripts presently kept in Prague, Brno, Cracow, Bautzen, and Basel which could be regarded as a kind of "collected editions" of Nicholas of Dresden's works. Without further specification, Kaminsky put forward the hypothesis that the mere existence of such collections indicates the existence of the followers of the Dresden School. Because our present knowledge concerning the dating and authorship of the tractates copied in these codices has advanced substantially from Kaminsky's times, and also because new evidence can be added to his original argument, I will survey the relevant manuscripts in some detail.

The five medieval manuscripts that can be considered as attempts at collecting Nicholas of Dresden's treatises are the following:

(1) First of all, a codex presently housed in the National Library of the Czech Republic in Prague, shelf-mark IV G 15, can be justly considered such an attempt.[432] The title *Tractatus Drazdanensis* can still be read on the cover of the codex, which, with four exceptions, contains works only by Nicholas. As the content of the texts in the codex makes clear, it was very likely commissioned by someone from the Hussite milieu. It bears an old shelf-mark of the Prague University and it is also recorded in the old catalogue of the Bohemian Nation College Library.[433] The entry in this old catalogue, however, is rather peculiar due to its brevity and it is possible that it was added to the list only later.[434] It has two scribal explicits from 1417 and it can indeed be dated to the period before 1417. Unfortunately, the codex does not disclose further details concerning its ownership, the only evidence is that before the university it probably belonged to an unknown priest by the name of Zachař.[435]

The four works that were not written by Nicholas are Jan Hus's treatises *De sex erroribus* and *De matrimonio*, Jacobellus of Misa's *Salvator noster* and a treatise *De corea*, presently ascribed to Conrad Waldhauser.[436] The rest of the codex is taken up by ten treatises composed by Nicholas of Dresden, for one of which this is a *codex unicus*. In order of appearance, the manuscript contains Nicholas's *Puncta* and *Super Pater noster*, and further on the *De quadruplici missione* and *Querite primum regnum Dei*. The next four texts deal with the question of Utraquism, namely *Contra Gallum*, *Apologia*, *Sermo ad clerum Nisi manducaveritis* as well as the collection of authorities for the chalice which are nowadays considered a separate text, the so-called *Collecta*. Two other treatises by Nicholas, which are closely associated with each other, appear at the very end of the codex, i.e. the *Tabule veteris*

---

[431] Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 25.
[432] Truhlář, *Catalogus*, vol. 1, 299–300.
[433] Its old shelf-mark is P 9, see *Catalogi librorum vetustissimi universitatis Pragensis*, 112. For additional valuable observations concerning this codex, see Krmíčková, "Paběrky", 199–200.
[434] The entry is entitled *Tractatus magistri N. Dresdensis* and records only five texts of the codex in an unusually short manner. Krmíčková, "Paběrky," 199 explains this by suggesting that the compiler of the catalogue either at first forgot about this codex and supplied its description only later when there was not enough space on the page; or perhaps that the codex was not on the shelf when the catalogue was being compiled; or maybe that it was shelved later instead of some *deperditum*. It should be stressed however that the codex bears no signs of its shelf-mark having been rewritten.
[435] A note "knyez Zacharz" written by a 15th-century hand appears on the rear pastedown of the codex.
[436] *Verfasserlexikon*, vol. 5, 265–266.

et novi coloris and *Consuetudo et ritus primitive ecclesie et moderne*, which survives only in this codex.

(2) A number of Nicholas's treatises are preserved in codex Mk 102 from the Moravian Library in Brno.[437] This collection of Hussite texts dated by a scribal explicit to 1419 lacks further information as regards its history or ownership. It contains twenty seven text units which comprise six treatises by Nicholas, a number that constitutes one third of his whole literary production. Notably, among other treatises, this codex also contains two texts which we encountered in the Prague codex IV G 15, namely Jan Hus's *De sex erroribus* and Waldhauser's *De corea*. It also contains a tract *Ad honorem*, written by Jacobellus of Misa and John of Příbram, which survives in a Cracow manuscript that will be discussed presently. Nicholas's works copied to this codex were all written in 1415. Among them the *Apologia, De quadruplici missione*, and *Querite primum regnum Dei* appear also in the above Prague manuscript. Apart from these, there are three more works by Nicholas, namely *De proprio sacerdote et casibus*, *Dialogus de purgatorio* and *De imaginibus*.

(3) A collection of Hussite texts preserved in the University Library in Cracow, shelf-mark BJ 2148, also reflects the literary legacy of Nicholas to a great extent.[438] It contains texts which deal with various Hussite matters and were composed between 1405 and 1419. One of the texts copied here bears an explicit of February 17, 1414, although the date of the origin of this codex cannot be given more precisely then *post 1419*. A 15th-century hand noted the short content of the codex on the pastedown, which reveals that it must have been in the possession of an opponent of the Hussites: *Decretum concilii Constanciensis contra utriusque speciei communionem cum ceteris tractatibus hereticorum Bohemicorum. Datum per Magistrum Iohannem de Radochoncze*. Further details concerning its ownership or history are not available.

Five texts by Nicholas that appear here were copied also in the above-mentioned codex in Prague – namely the *Apologia*, *Puncta*, *Sermo ad clerum Nisi manducaveritis* together with the authorities entitled *Collecta*, and the *Tabule veteris et novi coloris*, where the above-mentioned explicit appears. Furthermore, the codex contains two other texts by Nicholas, for

[437] Vladislav Dokoupil, "*Soupis rukopisů mikulovské dietrichsteinské knihovny*" (List of manuscripts from the Dietrichstein Library of Mikulov) (Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1958), 177–182. Sometimes an old shelf-mark of this manuscript II.123 appears in the scholarly literature.

[438] There is no modern catalogue for MS 2148, basic information can be found in Bartoš, "Husitika a bohemika," 72–74.

which the Cracow codex represents a *codex unicus*: one of them is a sermon on the text *Quod fuit ab inicio*; the other is a short catechism ascribed to Nicholas and referred to as *Dialogus utilis pro informacione puerum*.[439] Among texts of authors other than Nicholas, the only parallel between this and the other codices analyzed here is a tract *Ad honorem* written by Jacobellus of Misa and John of Příbram, which can also be found in the above-mentioned Brno codex.

(4) Another codex that contains more than a handful of Nicholas's works is a manuscript presently kept in the Stadtbibliothek Bautzen, Germany, shelf-mark 8º 8.[440] Based on the watermarks, the codex must have been produced between 1417 and 1426, but again, there are no further details about its ownership. As far as its contents are concerned, it is closely related to the previously mentioned manuscripts. It includes five texts from Nicholas's literary legacy, all of which are also copied in some of the previously mentioned codices. Two of these, the *Apologia* and *Puncta*, are preserved both in Prague and Cracow; another two (*Contra Gallum* and *Super Pater noster*) are copied only in the Prague codex; and the *De quadruplici missione* can be found in the codices kept in Brno and Prague. In this Bautzen copy, four of Nicholas's texts are copied in the last part of the codex while a few folios between two of them were left blank, which might have accommodated further items by Nicholas. Among other texts that appear in this codex, *De sex erroribus* by Hus and Waldhauser's *De corea* can be found also in Prague and Brno, while *Salvator noster* by Jacobellus was copied to the Prague codex as well.

(5) A manuscript from the University Library in Basel, shelf-mark A X 66, shows some affinity with the above codices and can be considered here as well.[441] This manuscript was in possession of the influential Dominican theologian, John of Dubrovnik, who played an important role in the negotiations with the Hussites at the Council of Basel. This is indicated

[439] The catechism consists of two parts which are to a certain extent independent and for this reason they were catalogued as two units, see Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 32. Havelka, *Husitské katechismy*, 100–110 convincingly showed that it is one homogenous text.

[440] Two descriptions of this manuscript are available: Václav Flajšhans, "Bohemika Gersdorfské knihovny v Budyšíně" (Bohemica of the Gersdorf library in Bautzen), *Časopis musea království českého* 83/1 (1909): 137; Thomas Krzenck, "Die Bautzener Hussitica der ehemaligen Gersdorfschen Bibliothek," *Studie o rukopisech* 31 (1995–1996): 175–176. Both of them give different foliation, which however, does not entirely correspond to the present foliation in the codex.

[441] Bartoš, "Husitika a bohemika," 55–57.

by a note in the codex.[442] Unfortunately, its origin cannot be dated with any precision. It contains several treatises by Jan Hus, Jacobellus of Misa and John Wyclif, out of which only one can be found in the codices described above (Hus's *De matrimonio* in the Prague manuscript). The codex contains four treatises of Nicholas, namely *Tabule veteris et novi coloris*, *Puncta*, and *Sermo ad clerum Nisi manducaveritis* together with the authorities entitled *Collecta*, all of which can be found in the manuscripts in Prague and Cracow. Only the treatise *Puncta* is also preserved in the Bautzen codex.

There are other codices which could be similarly regarded as attempts at copying more of Nicholas's treatises. With certain reservations a codex from the Lobkovic Library in Roudnice, now in the National Library in Prague, shelf mark XXIII F 204, could be mentioned here. It bears an old shelf-mark of this famous collection (MS 322) and contains three texts undoubtedly ascribable to Nicholas – *De imaginibus*, *De quadruplici missione* and *De proprio sacerdote et casibus*. All of these can be found in the codex now in Brno, *De quadruplici missione* survives also in the Prague and Bautzen manuscripts. Ahead of these three treatises, the codex contains a few shorter texts whose style and content, according to F. M. Bartoš, suggest that they could have been written by Nicholas.[443] The notes deal with different human occupations and various sins connected to them (fol. 38r–40r, *De labore corporali*), rebuke the practice connected to penitence (fol. 41r–43v), or women's luxury (fol. 43v–46r); moreover, the relationship between the Church and the state (fol. 46v) as well as a critique of the wrongdoings of priests, especially in relation to the Eucharist (fol. 46v–47r), are briefly discussed, and the concluding passages reproach the neglect of the kiss-of-peace in the liturgy and defend the necessity of the lay chalice (fol. 47v–49v, *De osculo pacis*).[444] Nicholas indeed

[442] The following note can be read on the pastedown: "Hic liber est fratrum Ordinis Predicatorum conventus Basiliensis et est de libris domini Cardinalis Sancti Sixti vulgariter de Regusio nominate. Oretur pro eo."
[443] Bartoš, "Nové spisy," 64–66.
[444] Kateřina Urbánková, "De codicillis manu scriptis Bibliothecae Universitatis Pragensis XXIII F 204 foliis 38r–43v" (M.A. thesis, Masaryk University, 1999), paid attention to some of these texts and transcribed the *De labore corporali* and the text on fol. 41r–43v and argued that while they are closely associated as far as their content is concerned, they differ greatly in style. Nevertheless, the authorities quoted in both texts are characteristic of Nicholas (Urbánková pointed out textual congruences with Nicholas's *Querite primum regnum Dei*) and in my opinion only comparison with more material can convincingly show the connection or disparity between these texts and other texts by Nicholas. At any rate, Urbánková rightly showed that a short text on fol. 40r is an extract, even if somewhat jumbled, from Hus's treatise *De sanguine Christi glorificato* (37–41), which precedes an excerpt from another tract by Hus, *De libris haereticorum legendis*, on fol. 40v.

dealt with all these issues in his works, yet the positive attribution of these notes cannot be resolved here because they have not been found in any other surviving manuscripts.

The circulation of individual texts in the above codices is as follows:[445]

Puncta: 1, 3, 4, 5

De quadruplici missione: 1, 2, 4, 6

Apologia: 1, 2, 3, 4

Sermo ad clerum Nisi manducaveritis: 1, 3, 5

Collecta: 1, 3, 5

Tabule veteris et novi coloris: 1, 3, 5

Super Pater noster: 1, 4

Contra Gallum: 1 , 4

De proprio sacerdote et casibus: 2, 6

De imaginibus: 2, 6

Querite primum regnum Dei: 1, 2

Treatises written by other authors that appear more than once in the manuscripts discussed above could also illustrate the pattern:

Conrad Waldhauser, *De corea*: 1, 2, 4

Jan Hus, *De sex erroribus*: 1, 2, 4

Jan Hus, *De matrimonio*: 1, 5

Jacobellus of Misa, *Salvator noster*: 1, 4

Jacobellus of Misa and John of Příbram, *Ad honorem*: 2, 3

It is obvious from the above survey that a few treatises by Nicholas were copied over and over. The manuscripts now in Prague (1), Brno (2) and Bautzen (4) show very remarkable textual congruence. More closely connected are the Prague and Bautzen codices, which contain eight identical texts. Yet they could not have been copied from one another.[446] The Prague (1) and Cracow (3) codices contain five identical treatises of Nicholas but were also

[445] The numbers refer to the order of appearance of the codices as described above, i.e. Prague IV G 15 = 1, Brno Mk 102 = 2, BJ 2148 = 3, Bautzen 8º 8 = 4, Basel A X 66 = 5, Prague XXIII F 204 = 6. Occurrences of texts in single copies are not included (i.e. *Consuetudo et ritus primitive ecclesie et moderne*, *Dialogus de purgatorio*, *Quod fuit ab initio* and the short catechism).

[446] I have compared the copy of Nicholas's *Apologia* in these three codices in full detail when preparing its critical edition and the critical apparatus justifies this hypothesis. It also demonstrates that all three codices were modelled on different archetypes. For details about the affiliation of these codices, see *Nicolai Dresdensis Apologia*, 61–87.

copied from different originals. The same applies to the manuscripts in Cracow (3) and Basel (5), which hold four common texts. More important is the fact that the above treatises deal with different topics – this adds weight to the assumption that the interest behind their copying was the person of the author. Naturally, all the above evidence is very circumstantial and it is possible only to speculate about it. The above-mentioned codices do not contain writings of a single author only – a fact that hinders labelling them as „collected editions" without objections. On the other hand, the testimony of the Prague codex IV G 15, which is entitled *Tractatus Drazdanensis*, is especially indicative and suggests a real attempt at copying Nicholas's "opera omnia". Moreover, the fact that the contents of this Prague codex shows noticeable congruence with the other above codices makes it possible to assume that some of them were copied from the Prague codex. In other words, some of the scribes could have copied larger chunks of texts from Nicholas's collected edition. This, in consequence, bolsters the suggestion mentioned at the beginning of this chapter: Namely, that Kaminsky rightly observed that there were attempts at collecting and copying Nicholas's treatises. Besides, there are other codices which contain more than one of Nicholas's text which seem to have been copied more frequently and which were mentioned above – for example a manuscript now in Koblenz contains *Puncta*, one of Nicholas's most popular tracts *Apologia*, and the so-called *Sermo 1416*.[447]

Nevertheless, I have also stressed that the above-described evidence relates only to Nicholas of Dresden. It has been said earlier that other members of this group have not left behind enough material for comparison. We may or may not agree with Howard Kaminsky's idea that the existence of these codices attests "to the continued action of his [Nicholas's] German disciples"[448] – although we know nothing about the people who ordered and copied the texts. In either case, there is no evidence for the existence of the followers of the Dresden School itself. However, Kaminsky's argument rested on firmer grounds than the collected treatises, namely on the combination of this manuscript testimony with the circulation of Nicholas's ideas on a theoretical level. Before analyzing this latter supposition, I would like to add another small piece of information about how Nicholas's works reverberated in the

[447] Koblenz, Landeshauptarchiv, Best. 701 Nr. 198. See Eef Overgaauw, *Mittelalterliche Handschriften im Landeshauptarchiv Koblenz*, vol. 2, *Die nichtarchivischen Handschriften der Signaturengruppe Best. 701 Nr. 191-992* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002), 71–76.
[448] Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 25.

Hussite setting. This, I believe, might have a more palpable bearing on the existence of the disciples of the Dresden School.

Nicholas is the author of a sharp reaction to the prohibition of the lay chalice, one of the most topical issues of the time, published by the Council of Constance on 15 June, 1415. His *Apologia* was a very popular text, which in spite of being rather lengthy survives in fifteen medieval manuscripts and was frequently copied together with Nicholas's other texts, as was shown above. It is not a Utraquist polemic in the real sense of the word because the necessity of the lay chalice was already argued for and widely accepted by Hussite reformers at this point; furthermore, Utraquism was underway on a practical level, too. The *Apologia* minutely analyzes and refutes the arguments of the Catholic theologians against the lay chalice and proves the inadequacy of the decision of the Council of Constance. By doing so in such an accurate manner, it was labelled "an official statement"[449] or a response of the Hussites to the Council's decree. Yet it could not have been aimed at public reading nor is it likely that it could have provided material for preachers. There are other texts which might have served the purpose of announcing the council's rejection and publicizing it among the wider masses, such as Jacobellus of Misa's concise report written in Czech.[450] From this point of view, the Latin *Apologia* is a lengthy and scholarly treatment of the topic, whose impact can be sought mostly among educated university circles. Therefore, it might be surprising that a thematic index to this text survives in one of the fifteen extant manuscripts of the *Apologia*.[451] Due to rebinding of the codex, the index does not immediately follow the text of the *Apologia* (though it is written by the same scribe), which is probably why it has so far gone unrecognized in the scholarly literature. The *Apologia* was written between July and August 1415 and the index is preserved in a codex that can be dated to a period after 1420.

The index is not strikingly sophisticated in its composition – it consists of alphabetically grouped short glosses, which appear in the margins of the text.[452] These are subdivided by letters A to P, which are noted *in margine* of the text, and the index refers to them as well. The

[449] Bartoš, *Husitství a cizina*, 75.
[450] The Old Czech *Zpráva, jak sněm konstanský o svátosti večeře Kristovy nařídil* (Account of the Council of Constance's decision about Christ's Supper) was edited by Mirek Čejka and Helena Krmíčková, *Dvě staročeská utrakvistická díla Jakoubka ze Stříbra* (Two Old Czech Utraquist works by Jacobellus of Misa) (Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2009), 98–108.
[451] National Library Prague, shelf-mark VII E 27, fol. 70r.

structure of the *Apologia* is elaborate: to put it shortly, the text is divided into six *conclusiones* (i.e. conclusions of the doctors in Constance), each of which is followed by Nicholas's response; the last part of the treatise comprises the full-text version of the decree of the Constance theologians prohibiting the lay chalice and subsequently Nicholas's sharp rejection of their arguments. In the index, this is reflected by cross-references to these conclusions, though in a somewhat peculiar manner: even though the beginnings of each conclusion are distinctly highlighted in this copy of the *Apologia*, the marks in the margins do not always match them. The references to the conclusions complement the references to the glosses and the letters in the index.

It is not necessary to describe the structure of this tool in detail, because for the present purpose its existence alone is an interesting matter. Why should this be so? Indexes and tools facilitating orientation in medieval manuscripts were standard academic tools in this period.[453] Nevertheless, they were limited to the study of the Bible and several standard patristic authorities, such as Augustine, Gregory or Jerome; outside of this context, they appear rather sporadically.[454] Symptomatically, indexes and text-division tools appear more often in 15th-century Bohemia, because the success of the Czech Reformation was to a large extent conditioned by the ability of the Czech reformers to spread their arguments. Thus, the analytical treatment of larger quantities of written material grew in importance. Various systems for basic orientation in manuscripts can be found in Bohemian manuscripts at the turn of the 14th and 15th centuries – the most famous example being the so-called "ukazovadla" ("indicators") used by Jan Hus in some of his treatises. These have to do with the need to denote shorter sections within chapters with the help of letters of the alphabet and survived mainly in treatises connected to preaching where the need to quickly locate a piece of

[452] I have examined this index in detail in my article "*Sed prugdulor, finis sine fine*: O edici *Apologie* Mikuláše z Drážďan" (*Sed prugdulor, finis sine fine*: On the edition of Nicholas of Dresden's *Apologia*), *Studia historica Brunensia* 56/1–2 (2009): 21–36.

[453] See Mary A. Rouse, and Richard H. Rouse, *Authentic Witnesses: Approaches to Medieval Texts and Manuscripts* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991). M. B. Parkes, *Scribes, Scripts and Readers. Studies in the Communication, Presentation and Dissemination of Medieval Texts* (London and Rio Grande: The Hambledon Press, 1991) also contains many helpful observations related to the question of *ordo* and *ordinatio* in medieval manuscripts.

[454] I leave out their existence in the encyclopaedias, botanical treatises and the like, which built on the elaborated system of ordering information in the Arabic culture and are not relevant in this respect. See also Bella Hass Weinberg, "Predecessors of Scientific Indexing Structures in the Domain of Religion," in *The History and Heritage of Scientific and Technological Information Systems. Proceedings of the 2002 Conference*, ed. W. Boyd Rayward and Mary Ellen Bowden (Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc., 2004), 126–134.

information was fundamental.[455] Outside the preaching discourse, indexing was not very usual activity in Bohemia in this period. Nevertheless, there are a few more examples of indexing letters in treatises, where the connection with preaching is not at all evident and where no index survived.[456] The indexes to Wyclif's works that were compiled in Bohemia had probably yet another function.[457] The Bohemian copies were modelled on the system of indexing Wyclif's works devised in England. There, the indexes existed mostly in treatises that were primarily aimed at preachers, as Anne Hudson pointed out.[458] In Bohemia, the indexes were adjusted to serve a new purpose, namely as a quick reference-finder perhaps during a live theological discussion. The contemporary sources suggest that Peter Payne participated in this project as he himself might have needed such a tool at the Council of Basel, where he acted as an important representative of the Hussites.[459] Even if Payne's involvement in compiling all indexes surviving in Bohemia cannot be accepted, he can be credited with at least two of them.[460] However weak it may be, the link between Peter Payne and the compilation of the indexes is of primary importance for the matter at hand.

Anne Hudson noted that the existence of indexes to Wyclif's works is an interesting issue.[461] But if it is understandable in Wyclif's case, the existence of an index to Nicholas of Dresden's *Apologia* is something rather different. Why should anyone feel the urge to locate passages in a treatise which, as I have shown, could not have been useful for, or exploited by,

---

[455] Hus's "indicators" survived only in some of his treatises, such as in his Latin *Postilla* and *De ecclesia*, or in the *Výklady* (Expositions) and *Knížky o svatokupectví* (Books on simony) written in Czech. They are basically an adaptation of the system of sequential marginal notes employed to gloss literary texts, which appeared at the end of the 14th century, see Paul Saenger, *Space Between Words. The Origins of Silent Reading* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997), 260.

[456] I can point out two examples relevant in this context that have not been given any attention: in the first systematic work of the Bohemian reform theology, Matthias of Janov's *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, a single copy out of the six preserved manuscripts contains indexing letters – Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, C 64; in Nicholas of Dresden's *Tabule veteris et novi coloris* letters subdividing chapters are also preserved – Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, O 50, fol. 127r–132v.

[457] Anne Hudson thoroughly analyzed and explained the origins and significance of these tools – some of the pertinent articles were published in her collection of studies, see Anne Hudson, *Studies in the Transmission of Wyclif's Writings* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008); see eadem, "The Hussite catalogues of Wyclif's works," in *Husitství – reformace – renesance. Sborník k 60. narozeninám Františka Šmahela*, vol. 1, ed. Jaroslav Pánek, Jaroslav Boubín, Miloslav Polívka and Noemi Rejchrtová (Prague: Historický ústav, 1994), 401–417.

[458] Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, 105 quotes a prefatory note in the index to Wyclif's *Opus Evangelicum* where it is directly stated that the index should aid those who are to preach the word of God (*verbum Domini euangelizare volentes*).

[459] Šmahel, "Curriculum vitae Magistri Petri Payne," 150; Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, 106.

[460] Hudson, "Accessus ad auctorem: the case of John Wyclif," in *Studies in the Transmission*, n. VII, 333–337, presents evidence that some of the indexes were compiled prior to Payne's arrival in Prague and revises his participation in the indexing project.

[461] Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, 105.

preachers? Neither can Nicholas's authority be compared with that of Wyclif, whose writings were likely to attract a huge amount of attention and thus, an effort to render his texts quickly accessible is understandable. One possible explanation could be the person(s) of the compiler of the index. If in the case of Wyclif's Bohemian indexes there is a link between Peter Payne and a circle of Hussite disciples who compiled these indexes, it might suggest something of the same kind for Nicholas's *Apologia*. The point is that these indexes must have been a collective enterprise, as Anne Hudson has pointed out.[462] The stress on the analytical work with written material would also clarify the existence of an index to a treatise which otherwise does not seem to need it. If we assume that Peter Payne (though his connection with the Dresden School is rather doubtful) played a role in introducing or spreading the indexing method in Bohemia (and this was then used in dealing with Wyclif's works), then the fact that the same method was used to index a treatise by a member of the Dresden School connects the circle of the followers of Payne with those of the Dresden School. An important question – as far as the existence of the Dresden School is concerned – is how the index to the *Apologia* fits into the story chronologically. Unfortunately the available sources do not allow us to reconstruct the exact course of events. We know that the single manuscript with the index to the *Apologia* originated around 1420 in Prague, which is when some of Wyclif's indexes were compiled and when Payne was already in Prague, too.[463] In other words, the connection between Peter Payne and Nicholas of Dresden through the indexing tool apparently exists. If we then assume that it was not Peter himself who indexed Nicholas, then it is logical that it was someone in his circle. Furthermore, only an interest in theoretical issues could explain the otherwise unusual feature of indexing a complicated yet not standard theological treatise in Bohemia at the beginning of the fifteenth century. The important point is that the existence of the index suggests an interest in Nicholas's work in later stages. In sum, we get another hint here that the followers of the School existed – even if the evidence is highly speculative.

[462] Hudson, "Accessus ad auctorem," 341.
[463] However, Payne's own indexes probably originated from a later time, see Hudson, "Accessus ad auctorem," 335–337.

Evidence of Other Sources

It has been discussed above that the ideas of Nicholas of Dresden undoubtedly had an impact on the radical wing of the Hussites.[464] Moreover, Howard Kaminsky also suggested that after 1415 a certain kind of "intellectual activity promoting Nicholas's program" existed.[465] His argument was based on the existence of a list of heretical ideas resembling Nicholas of Dresden's teachings which was directly connected with Nicholas's treatises. Kaminsky drew attention to a parody of a confession that a heretic might have made to an inquisitor, whose text greatly resembles the opinions of Nicholas of Dresden. Kaminsky then argued that another source, a Catholic author's refutation of certain heretical ideas, which goes on to disprove the argumentation of one particular treatise by Nicholas, runs along the same lines as the previously mentioned text. In consequence, this supposition supported the hypothesis that a distinctive program of the Dresden school existed and that it was also promoted on a theoretical level. Therefore, my intention here is to take a closer look at the mentioned sources and scrutinize the relevant manuscript material.

THE *CONFESSIO*

The firstly mentioned source, a parody of a heretical confession, is preserved in three manuscripts presently housed in Prague, Vienna and Wroclaw.[466] It consists of a number of points criticizing Roman Catholic confessional practice and was therefore entitled *Confessio heretica et falsa* or *Confessio hussitarum* or *Articuli hereticorum* by the medieval copyists. Its extremely radical contents suggest that it originated around 1418 but certainly before 1419 when the Taborite movement emerged and when the internal polemics of the Hussites over the Taborites surpassed the anti-Romanism that echoed in the polemics written by the Hussites until that point.[467] This dating is also in accordance with the time of composition of the three extant manuscripts of the *Confessio*:[468]

---

[464] Kaminsky, "Hussite Radicalism," 122–125. A general survey of the history of Tábor, the centre of the radical Hussites, was carried out by František Šmahel, *Dějiny Tábora* (The history of Tábor) (České Budějovice: Jihočeské nakladatelství, 1988–1990).

[465] Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas,* 26. Kaminsky's suggestion inspired much of this argument that attempts to examine the question in detail.

[466] Spunar, *Repertorium*, vol. 2, 95, no. 141.

[467] Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 27.

[468] A critical edition of the text is available in Petra Mutlová, "Vybrané prameny k existenci drážďanské školy" (Selected sources on the existence of the Dresden School), in *Querite primum regnum Dei*, 558–560.

1. Prague, National Library, XII F 30, fol. 40v–41v[469]

This manuscript can be dated to the first half of the 15th century and was most probably written in Bohemia. It bears an old shelf mark of the Jesuit college library in Prague, the so-called *Clementinum*, but further data on its history are not available. In its present condition, it is only a fragment of an originally larger codex which contains mostly *hussitica* from this period.[470] A number of works connected to the Council of Constance can be found here (for example the news concerning the death of Jan Hus), as well as Stanislaus of Znojmo's *Sermo contra errores Ioannis Hus* from 1412,[471] John of Falkenberg's *Tractatus de renunciatione papae*[472] and Mauritius of Prague's reply to the same entitled *Defensio pape Gregorii XII*,[473] or a widely disseminated letter *Eloquenti viro* presently ascribed to Andrew of Brod.[474]

The confession in this codex is entitled *Articuli hereticorum videlicet Wyklephistarum* and its title claims it was written in 1418. The text starts as a satirical confession but drops the satirical tone at the end and concludes with a threat listing what happens to those who are not obedient to the Catholic Church.[475]

---

[469] The manuscript was lost for some time and as such listed by Josef Truhlář, "Paběrky z rukopisů Klementinských" (Gleanings from the Klementinum manuscripts), *Český časopis historický* 10 (1904): 202; later on, the National Library acquired it from a private owner and therefore it is recorded as being in its possession by Emma Urbánková, "Přírůstky rukopisného oddělení Universitní knihovny od vydání tištěných katalogů" (Additions of the Manuscript Department of the University Library since the Publication of the Printed Catalogues), *Knihovna* 1 (1957): 45; for a modern register, see Marie Tošnerová and others, eds., *Průvodce po rukopisných fondech v České republice*, vol. 4, *Rukopisné fondy centrálních a církevních knihoven České republiky* (Prague: Archiv AV ČR, 2004), 100, no. 198.

[470] Only the first part of the codex is preserved. It comprises some 60 folios, although not from the very beginning, because the old numbering starts with the number 25.

[471] Spunar, *Repertorium*, vol. 1, 297–298, no. 811, a transcription based on three codices was published by Jan Sedlák, "Mgri Stanislai de Znoyma Sermo contra quinque articulos Wiclef," *Hlídka* 28 (1911): appendix 47–60.

[472] Printed by Gustav Sommerfeldt, "Johann Falkenbergs Stellung zur Papstfrage in der Zeit vor dem Pisaner Konzil (1408)," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 31 (1910): 426–437.

[473] Jaroslav Kadlec, "Literární činnost mistra Maříka Rvačky" (Literary activity of Master Mařík Rvačka), in *Pocta Dr. Emmě Urbánkové*, ed. Pavel R. Pokorný (Prague: Státní knihovna ČSR, 1979), 148, n. 8; Spunar, *Repertorium*, vol. 1, 308–309, no. 856.

[474] Christina Traxler, "Früher Antihussitismus. Der Traktat *Eloquenti viro* und sein Verfasser Andreas von Brod," *Archa Verbi* 12 (2015): 130–177. Previous polemics about the authorship are represented by Alois Madre, *Nikolaus von Dinkelsbühl. Leben und Schriften* (Münster: 1965), 252–254 and Rudolf Damerau, *Texte zum Problem des Laienkelchs* (Gießen: 1969), 4–17; see also Spunar, *Repertorium*, vol. 2, 204–206, no. 415 and vol. 1, 286, no. 778c. Brandmüller, Walter. "Fata libelli. Eine Hussitica-Handschrift aus Neapel," *Annuarium historiae conciliorum* 11 (1979): 166, no. 31 records another copy preserved in the library of Naples that was copied by a Czech scribe in Constance in 1418. The letter was printed by Hardt, *Magnum oecumenicum*, vol. 3, col. 338–391.

[475] On fol. 41v it reads: "Ego magister Jacobus dictus Hněvek: I budeš sě hněvati, o to péče žádné neměj, přídeť ta hodina, jenž všecko spolu zaplatíš." The gloss plays with the name *Hněvek* where one can hear an allusion to the Czech word *hněvat se*, i.e. be angry: "I am Master Jacobus, called Hněvek: And you will be angry, do not worry about that, there will come an hour when you have to pay for all this."

2. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 4314, fol. 134v–135r[476]

This voluminous codex dates from the second half of the 15th century and a scribal note on fol. 142r specifies its date of origin as 1459. It is very likely that most of the texts in this codex were copied in Bohemia. The confession appears in the second part of the codex among material related to Bohemian negotiations at the Council of Constance, which are certainly of Bohemian origin. Short glosses in Czech as well as entire Czech passages appear here, for example in several sermons by John of Příbram,[477] Šimon of Tišnov[478] and others – that is, in the works of the opponents of the Hussites. The language and the content of the Czech glosses show that the text of the confession was copied to this manuscript by a Czech scribe, apparently someone from a Catholic milieu.

The context in which the confession appears in this codex is rather interesting. It is entitled here as *Confessio heretica et falsa que concordat cum valdensibus*. It is preceded by *Posicio articulorum Iohannis Rozkydale* (fol. 132v), *articuli Johannis Wicleff dudum condempnati Londoniis anno Domini 1380* (fol. 133r–133v) and by *articuli valdensium 32* (fol. 134r)[479]; on fol. 135r it is followed by a few lines entitled *articuli Thaboritarum Prokopa Holého*.[480] All of these were written by one scribe and the sequence of these short texts gives the impression that they were to serve as a kind of comparison. Namely, the tenets of Wyclif and the Waldensians are compared with examples of other sectarian articles. The title of the confession clearly marks its connection with Waldensian teachings.

[476] *Tabulae codicum manu scriptorum praeter graecos et orientales in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asservatorum*, vol. 3, *Cod. 3501–5000*. Ed. Academia Caesarea Vindobonensis (Vienna: Gerold, 1869), 238–239; Karl Schwarzenberg, *Katalog der kroatischen, polnischen und tschechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* (Vienna: Brüder Holinek, 1972), 113–119. Based solely on this copy, the text was printed by Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte*, vol. 2, 688–691. Neither Kaminsky, nor Spunar, *Repertorium*, vol. 2, 95, no. 141, knew about the existence of this print. It is symptomatic that Döllinger listed the text in the table of contents as "Confessio eines Picarden", IX.

[477] Spunar, *Repertorium*, vol. 2, 158–159, no. 301.

[478] Spunar *Repertorium*, vol. 1, 347–348, no. 971.

[479] These articles were printed based solely on this manuscript by Holinka, *Sektářství v Čechách*, 182–183.

[480] Edited by Pavel Spunar, "K literární pozůstalosti kněze Prokopa Holého" (On the literary inheritance of the priest Prokop Holý), in *Pocta Dr. Emmě Urbánkové*, 330–331.

3. Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, I F 773, fol. 171vb–172ra[481]

A scribal explicit on fol. 128r dates this codex to 1409 although an old catalogue of this collection accepts by mistake the date of 1449, which appears on the spine of the codex. A note on the front pastedown apprises that the manuscript belonged to the Corpus Christi Church in Wroclaw; no other data on its ownership or history are available. Among other things, the codex contains excerpts from the work of Matthias of Janov and the *Revelations* of St. Bridget. A welter of shorter German and Latin texts is followed by some of Wyclif's articles condemned in London (fol. 170rb–171vb), which in a shorter version appear also in the Vienna manuscript discussed above. The red title *Hec sunt contra Wyclif* seems to conclude the text of the articles and these are then followed by the *Confessio*. It is entitled here as *Confessio hussitarum dampnabilissima*, though the last word seems to have been added in a different hand. Similarly to the Prague manuscript, the *Confessio* appears in connection with Wyclif's doctrines here, even though the evidence is in this case only circumstantial. The *Confessio* is followed by the articles of Jacobellus of Misa in support of a simplified rite of Mass (fol. 172ra–rb).[482] These two pieces are written in the same hand and since a couple of empty folios follow, a richer selection of heretical articles might have been intended.

In all three surviving manuscripts of the *Confessio*, an attempt can be traced to identify the tenets presented in it with a certain heretical source, either the Waldensian or Wycliffite doctrine. However, a straightforward comparison of various teachings can be seen only in the Vienna codex. Because the Vienna manuscript labels the contents of the *Confessio* as Waldensian, let us take a closer look at these two items as they appear in this codex.[483]

If the two sets of articles in this codex are juxtaposed, an interesting fact immediately catches the eye. The Waldensian articles do not mention the problem of the communion at all – a topic repeatedly dealt with in the *Confessio*, and one which also makes its Hussite context clear. The *Confessio* discusses the importance of administering the Eucharist in both kinds every day and argues that it is of no importance whether it happens before or after meal. Also,

[481] The collection lacks a modern catalogue and the only aid is an old German, partly handwritten, partly typescript, catalogue: Willi Goeber, *Katalog rękopisów dawnej Biblioteki Uniwersyteckiej we Wrocławiu* (Catalogue of manuscripts from the Old University Library in Wroclaw), vol. 5, *I F 661–778*, fol. 789–790. This manuscript is not registered in any of the preliminary lists of Bohemian material housed in Wroclaw, see Anežka Schmidtová, "Z bohemik vratislavské universitní knihovny" (Bohemica from the Wroclaw University Library), *Listy filologické* 83 (1960): 98–105.
[482] Spunar, *Repertorium*, vol. 1, 235–236, no. 634.
[483] I use the edition of the Waldensian articles available in Holinka, *Sektářství v Čechách*, 182–183.

the consecration of the Eucharist can take place at any time. There are further points which can be read only in the *Confessio*: It claims that offerings should not be given for penance, that the Holy Cross should not be worshipped, or that extreme unction is of no use. Neither the Pope nor any other human being should be obeyed, only God; other human inventions (termed here as *instituciones humane*), such as reading canonical hours or participating in everyday sermons, do not need to be observed.

On the other hand, the Waldensian articles mention a number of other points that are not in the *Confessio*. Interestingly, among these may be found the claim that it is not licit to kill and to swear oaths, an opinion which often finds echoes in the Hussite milieu and which can certainly be found in Nicholas of Dresden's teachings. The list marks other typical tenets as Waldensian, for example the requirement that priests should work physically; the opinion that confirmation is not one of the sacraments; that funerals can take place anywhere; that the excommunication of sinful priests is worthless; that holy water does not wash away sins; and that what the priest says during the Mass is useless. The list also records the distinctly Waldensian conviction, namely that the Waldensians alone are the only true followers of Christ and that anyone outside their sect will be damned. According to the articles, the Waldensians also scorn official education and pass on their teachings secretly. They criticize sumptuous decoration in churches, including big bells, and a number of other practicalities, such as the Litany of Rogation days. It is emphasized here that priests should not have any secular possessions. By way of conclusion it is observed that according to the Waldensians the Pope, his cardinals, the prelates and the secular rulers will not be redeemed.

Apart from these, the common points that appear in both sources can be summarized as follows: 1. The Blessed Virgin Mary or any other saint or their relics should not be worshipped. 2. There is no purgatory and thus it is pointless to say prayers for the dead. 3. Ordinations are of no use. 4. Indulgences are worthless. 5. Confession does not have to be said to priests (*Articuli Waldensium*: confession can be made to any person; *Confessio*: confession to God is enough). 6. Neither the Pope nor the bishops or any other prelates have a higher authority than a simple priest. 7. Building of sumptuous churches and decorating them is vainglorious and no one should support it. There should be no images or sculptures in churches and singing during the Mass is of no use.

The survey shows that the common points of the *Confessio* and the Waldensian articles are overshadowed by the differences that they do not share (i.e. from the contents point of view, not quantitatively). It is also evident that the content of the *Confessio* does not wholly correspond to actual Waldensian tenets, neither to those held by Wyclif. Moreover, similar extreme opinions are documented elsewhere in Bohemia in this period.[484] Regardless of how extreme we consider the beliefs that the *Confessio* depicts, the nub of the story lies elsewhere. Namely, if the *Confessio* was copied as an example of Waldensian tenets, we should take it at face value and accept what it reveals about its contemporary reception. The fact that it cannot be identified with one distinct doctrinal system seems to bolster this supposition. Nevertheless, the point here is not to connect the *Confessio* with Waldensian or Wycliffite ideas. Far from trying to classify the array of articles contained in the *Confessio*, the present analysis aims at discovering whether similar ideas were promoted by other sources, which would point to their dissemination on a more general level. The following example will serve this purpose.

THE *COLLECTA ET EXCERPTA*

Around the same time, i.e. in 1418, a Catholic author undertook the task of refuting certain heretical ideas that very much resembled those contained in the above false confession. The treatise consists of two parts that are to a certain extent independent. The first part comprises twenty-one articles of the same tendency as the *Confessio*, while the second has the particular task of refuting the text of Nicholas of Dresden's *Tabule veteris et novi coloris*. In the manuscript material, these two parts are preserved either together or independently, a fact that caused some confusion. Both parts survive together in nine manuscripts, the first part exists in four other separate copies while the second one in another four.[485] The first part is a selection of quotations from Benedict of Alignan's voluminous treatise *Tractatus fidei contra diversos errores* but the inclusion of infant communion, which is a very distinct Hussite novelty, marks

[484] For example, there is an anonymous account on "delicts" of the same kind that were traced in Bohemia in 1416, for details see Kaminsky, "Hussite Radicalism," 111.

[485] An incomplete list can be found in Spunar, *Repertorium*, vol. 2, 202–203, no. 412, which is augmented and corrected in a few points in the following. The copies which I add to Spunar's list are discussed later. There were obviously other copies of both of the analyzed texts which are presently lost: one such manuscript was, for example, in the collection of the parish church of St. Jacob in Brno, old shelf-mark 93; see Sedlák, *Mikuláš*, 2, 13, who was able to see this manuscript while the modern catalogue of the collection registers this copy as lost, see Stanislav Petr, *Soupis rukopisů knihovny při farním kostele svatého Jakuba v Brně* (Catalogue of manuscripts from the library of the parish church of St. Jacob in Brno) (Prague: Masarykův ústav a Archiv Akademie věd ČR, 2007), XIX.

it as a clearly anti-Hussite work. This is bolstered by the author's choice of dealing with ideas displaying particularly strong anti-Hussite tendencies. Moreover, the fact that in nine copies this first part is followed by a text that manifestly associates itself with Nicholas's *Tabule* proves its Hussite connotations beyond any doubt. The first part is usually entitled *Collecta et excerpta de summa Benedicti abbatis Marsilie super capitulo Firmiter credimus* with the incipit *Una est fidelium universalis ecclesia, que vivit in veritate fidei*.[486] The second part is entitled *Incipiunt responsiones ad obiecciones et picturas* and its author is probably Stephen of Páleč, an ardent opponent of the Hussite party.[487] The length of the text and the lack of its edition render it difficult to comprehend its complicated structure and hence to carry out a detailed examination of its contents. Nevertheless, a survey of the manuscripts in which these texts are preserved is the necessary first step which will also suit the purpose of grasping the contents of the treatise. I will limit myself to presenting the most important passages of this treatise. Since the survey of the manuscripts is not aimed at appraising individual copies on account of preparing a critical edition, only basic data are listed.

The copies in which both parts are preserved together are:

1. Basel, University Library, E I 9, fol. 351r–376r[488]
2. Brno, Moravian County Library, R 409, fol. 255rb–281va
3. Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 421, fol. 210v–242v[489]
4. Leipzig, University Library, 602, fol. 3v–43rb[490]
5. London, British Museum, Arundel 458, fol. 107r–156v[491]

[486] Benedict's *Summa* remains unedited. A partial chapter of Benedict's *Summa* on killing is discussed and edited by Kurt Villads Jensen, "War Against Muslims according to Benedict of Alignano, OFM," *Archivum Franciscanum historicum* 89/1–2 (1996): 181–195. See also Martin Grabmann, "Der Franziskanerbischof Benedictus de Alignano († 1268) und seine Summa zum caput 'Firmiter' des vierten Laterankonzils, in *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien, P. Michael Bihl O.F.M. als Ehrengabe dargeboten*, ed. P. Ignatius-Maria Freudenreich (Colmar: Alsatia Verlag, 1941), 59–62.

[487] An inaccurate transcription of this second part based on a single copy was printed by Chytil, *Antikrist v naukách*, 237–238 who used a manuscript from the Prague Chapter Library, shelf-mark O 50. The wording of this copy differs to a great extent from the other manuscripts. See also below, 117.

[488] Bartoš, "Husitika a bohemika," 58–63. According to the catalogue it contains the anti-Hussite polemics of Stephen of Páleč, Johannes Nider and others, and can be dated to the period around 1431.

[489] According to the catalogue, the codex was written around 1440, see Maria Kowalcyzk and others, eds., *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum medii aevi Latinorum qui in Bibliotheca Jagellonica Cracoviae asservantur*, vol. 2, *Numeros continens inde ab 332 usque ad 444* (Wroclaw: Instytut Ossolinianum, 1982), 262–267.

[490] Peter Burkhart, *Katalog der Handschriften der Universitäts-Bibliothek Leipzig*, vol. 5, *Die lateinischen und deutschen Handschriften*, vol. 2/1, *Die theologischen Handschriften* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999), 247–252. The text was copied here in 1431, as the colophon shows. Based on the watermarks, the whole codex originated between 1421 and 1433. It contains also Nicholas of Dresden's *Apologia*.

6. Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, D 119, fol. 4r–137r[492]
7. Vatican, Vatican Library, Ottob. Lat. 350, fol. 209v–241v[493]
8. Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, I F 308, fol. 12ra–54va[494]
9. Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, I Q 87, fol. 58r–122v[495]

The first part, the so-called *Collecta et excerpta*, exists independently in the following copies:

1. Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 423, fol. 74r–97v[496]
2. Prague, National Library, I F 18, fol. 227v–233v[497]
3. Uppsala, University Library, C 188, fol. 141v–176r
4. Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, I F 237, fol. 133ra–165vb[498]

The second part, the *Responsiones ad obiecciones et picturas*, survives separately in four copies:

1. Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 423, fol. 170r–175r[499]
2. Cracow, Dominican Monastery, R XV 14, fol. 321ra–326vb[500]
3. Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, B 22/2, fol. 89r–93v[501]

---

[491] I would like to thank John A. Arnold for correcting my data on the foliation. The manuscript is not registered in Andrew G. Watson, *Catalogue of dated and datable manuscripts c. 700–1600 in the Department of Manuscripts, the British Library*, vol. 1 (London: British Museum, 1979).

[492] Podlaha and Patera, *Soupis rukopisů knihovny metropolitní kapitoly pražské*, vol. 1, 409–410. According to a scribal explicit on fol. 137r, the text was copied to this codex in 1521: "Per me mgrm Wolffgangum organistam de Brunna a.d. 1521."

[493] Jaroslav Prokeš, *Husitika vatikánské knihovny v Římě* (Hussitica in the Vatican library in Rome) (Prague: Orbis, 1928), 56–57. Different information was indicated by Kaminsky, *A History*, 49–50.

[494] Goeber, *Katalog rękopisów*, vol. 2, *I F 300–430*, fol. 10–12. The codex contains scribal explicits of 1458, 1459 and 1463.

[495] Goeber, *Katalog rękopisów*, vol. 14, *I Q 71–120*, fol. 148–149.

[496] *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum medii aevi Latinorum qui in Bibliotheca Jagellonica Cracoviae asservantur*, vol. 2, 269–298. There are three different foliations: according to the oldest red numbers the text is on fol. 88r–111v (with a mistake); another numbering was erased but is still visible (75r–98v).

[497] Truhlář, *Catalogus*, vol. 1, 100–104. The manuscript dates from the second half of the 15th century (it was copied by the famous scribe Ulrich Crux of Telč between 1463 and 1492) and contains various treatises against the heretics. It is interesting that the text of the *Collecta and excerpta* is here immediately preceded by the *Passau Anonymous*, a well-known anti-heretical collection, see Alexander Patschovsky, *Der Passauer Anonymus. Ein Sammelwerk über Ketzer, Juden, Antichrist aus der Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1968), 68–75.

[498] Goeber, *Katalog rękopisów*, vol. 1, *I F 226–299*, fol. 26–29. The codex contains scribal explicits 1428 and 1429. The catalogue registers older foliation, according to which the text is copied on fol. 128ra–160vb. After the end of the *Collecta and excerpta*, there are three empty folios and so it is possible that the scribe might have even intended to copy the *Responsiones*.

[499] *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum medii aevi Latinorum qui in Bibliotheca Jagellonica Cracoviae asservantur*, vol. 2, 269–298. According to two other foliations that appear here, the text is on fol. 187r–192r (old red numbers) or 171r–176r (barely visible modern pencil).

[500] Spunar, *Repertorium*, vol. 2, 203; Zofia Włodek, "Inventaire des manuscrits médiévaux latins, philosophiques et théologiques de la Bibliothèque des Pères Dominicains de Cracovie," *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 14 (1970): 168–173, no. 21.

4. Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, O 50, fol. 133r–137v[502]

Naturally, there might be other copies in which either of these texts survives.[503] Even this tentative outline of manuscripts indicates the intricacy of the way in which these two texts are preserved – and the question of how the two parts relate to each other is of crucial importance for the present argument. Out of the nine codices where they are preserved together, the copyist of the Leipzig manuscript considered the two parts to have been written by the same author.[504] In Cracow 421 both texts were copied by the same scribe and follow each other without any interruption, hence here they must have been considered a coherent text, too. In Wroclaw I Q 87 the two texts were copied one after the other as well, but were given separate titles, although the scribe knew that they were the work of the same author.[505] In Wroclaw I F 308 they were also copied together, but here the scribe considered the two parts to be independent treatises, as revealed by the explicit of the first one and the red title of the second one. A table of contents on the flyleaf shows that a later cataloguer was of the same opinion.

In Cracow 423 both parts appear, but were copied on different sexterns. The whole codex was written by more than one scribe and the watermarks on the folios on which the two parts were written are also different. Nevertheless, both the *Collecta et excerpta* and the *Responsiones* were copied by the same scribe and it is therefore possible that the sexterns were bound and transposed only subsequently. Both parts have rubricated titles and explicits that fail to note that they are the work of one author and thus might have been considered by the scribe as differently authored. However, this still does not exclude the possibility that they were copied from an original where the two texts were part of one coherent tract.

---

[501] Podlaha and Patera, *Soupis rukopisů knihovny metropolitní kapitoly pražské*, vol. 1, 194–195, the end of the treatise is missing from this copy.

[502] Podlaha, *Soupis rukopisů knihovny metropolitní kapitoly pražské*, vol. 2, 522–525. The catalogue dates it to the first half of the 15th century, the majority of the numerous, mostly anti-Hussite items were composed around 1420.

[503] I was not able to verify Kaminsky's reference to a manuscript in Padua, Biblioteca di San Giovanni, MS Pluteo VII, fol. 190r–249r, see Kaminsky, *A History*, 49; nor was I able to see Stuttgart, Würrtembergische Landesbibliothek, MS Theol. fol. 76 XI, fol. 1–116v: *Ex Benedicti, abbatis Massiliensis, libro fidei tractatus duo contra Hussitas scripti a. 1424*; see Bartoš, "Husitika a bohemika," 23, who presented even more confusing information concerning this codex in his article "Po stopách obrazů v Betlemské kapli z doby Husovy" (Tracing the images in the Bethlehem Chapel in Hus's times), *Jihočeský sborník historický* 20 (1951): 122, note 5. Further manuscripts, e.g. those listed in the *Mirabile* digital archive for medieval culture [http://www.mirabileweb.it/], confuse the *Collecta et excerpta* with another summary of Benedict's treatise, such as: Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, MS Lat. Z. 131 (1719), fol. 1–48; Vienna, Dominikanerkonvent, MS 35/36, fol. 5–63; Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3513, fol. 71r–72v.

[504] A preliminary collation of the above copies suggests that this is the copy closest to the lost original; it is certainly one of the oldest among the copies that contains both parts.

Prague O 50 contains an imperfect copy of the *Responsiones* although the only available transcription was printed from this copy. A long omission is evident at the beginning of the text where a passage about the exemplary quality of Christ's poverty has been skipped – in the Leipzig manuscript and both Cracow codices this stretches over two columns or half a folio. Even a perfunctory examination discloses that the wording of this copy is different from that in the other manuscripts. Nevertheless, in this codex the *Responsiones* are immediately preceded by the text of Nicholas's *Tabule veteris et novi coloris* (fol. 127r–132v), which offers a unique witness to the assumed link between this tract and Nicholas's text. Moreover, on the subsequent folios 143r–144r, there is a sample of what seems to be an extract from the *Collecta et excerpta*, i.e. from the first part.

Prague I F 18 at first sight contains the whole text of the *Collecta et excerpta*. Closer inspection reveals that the text is far from complete. The first two chapters present the same text as the other copies but towards the end of the second chapter the text begins to display major discrepancies. This incomplete copy contains only five selected chapters.[506] The last chapter is entitled *Heretici qualiter inpugnant ecclesiam Romanam* and turns out to be an extract from the *Responsiones*. This fact bolsters the hypothesis that the *Collecta et excerpta* and the *Responsiones* were accepted – if not as a single text – at least as two very closely connected parts of one treatise.

Based on the manuscript evidence presented above it seems justifiable to consider the *Collecta et excerpta* and the *Responsiones* one treatise. Since the *Responsiones* contains intertextual references to places that cannot be identified in Nicholas's *Tabule*, it is quite possible that they are somehow connected with the *Collecta and excerpta*. This unfortunately complicates the matter even further and one cannot pursue it without first analysing the *Responsiones* and the *Collecta et excerpta* more closely, a task that exceeds the limits of the present study.

As far as the content of the two parts is concerned, the twenty-one points which the author of the *Collecta et excerpta* chose to defend are very close to the arguments of the false *Confessio*. The major difference is that the *Confessio* does not deal with questions that might

[505] Fol. 112v: "Incipiunt Responsiones ad obiecciones et picturas et est secundus tractatulus eiusdem doctoris."
[506] Namely chapters 1 ('Una est fidelium universalis ecclesia'), 2 ('Ecclesia Romana non defecit sub Silvestro sicut heretici dicunt'), 7 ('Solis sacerdotibus missis et ordinatis licet sacrificia ministrare et predicare'), 6 ('De contempnentibus statuta et sacros canones'), and 18 ('Quomodo heretici dicunt quod soli Deo est confitendum').

rank as academic, i.e. with the Donation of Constantine and the general repudiation of the Roman Church. Neither is it addressed to the problem of excommunicating and persecuting heretics. What stands out in this context is that the *Confessio* disregards the problem of infant communion, which was, as I have pointed out earlier, a very distinct Hussite novelty, which started to be discussed around 1415.[507] On the other hand, the false confession reflects in great detail on a number of practical matters connected to the authority of priests – it analyzes various modes of confession, payments to priests for masses, tithes, extreme unction and the like.

In sum, the *Confessio* is styled in a much simpler tone as it was probably intended as an imitation of a plain heretic's confession. In contrast, the *Collecta et excerpta* must have been written by an educated person who positioned his refutation within the framework of a theoretical discussion of certain theological and canonistic points. Nevertheless, they are similar as far as their contents are concerned. Moreover, the contents clearly show that they were aimed against the Hussites, more specifically against the doctrines of Nicholas of Dresden, as the connection of the *Collecta et excerpta* and the *Responsiones* (and the link with Nicholas's *Tabule veteris et novi coloris*) demonstrated. The context in which the *Confessio* was received among popular sectarians takes the argument a bit further. The fact that its original link to the works of Nicholas of Dresden evaporated and instead the message of the *Confessio* was understood as a sample of Waldensian, Wycliffite or some other heretical ideas, can be understood as a sign of its vigour. Since the opinions that appear in the *Confessio* and in the *Collecta et excerpta* cannot be identified with one distinct heretical system, but show remarkable congruence, they may well have represented an outline of compact opinions. It can therefore be concluded that the ideas analyzed above were indeed promoted on a theoretical level, as Howard Kaminsky originally suggested. On the other hand, from the point of view of the Dresden School such a conclusion does not change the situation much. All the examples primarily pointed to the dissemination of the works and opinions of Nicholas of Dresden. Only circumstantial evidence hints that there might have been other people at work who were interested in more than only Nicholas's ideas.

[507] For the background to this issue, see Helena Krmíčková, "Několik poznámek," 59–69; David R. Holeton, *La communion des tout-petits enfants: Étude du mouvement eucharistique en Bohême vers la fin du Moyen-Âge* (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 1989).

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to examine the existence of the so-called Dresden School and rethink the concept of it that prevails in modern scholarship. I wanted to determine whether the numerous references to the Dresden School that appear in scholarly literature were justifiable. In order to analyze the concept of this particular School, I sought to find out whether it was a clearly defined group in terms of being teaching institution, or rather a community of likeminded people dedicated to a single purpose, or whether any of the activities of its members attest to the existence of the School. I have tried to examine all possible direct and indirect sources coming from the period contemporary with the supposed existence of the Dresden School related both to the alleged members of the School and the School itself. The list of treatises of several of the Dresdeners, in which I summed up older information and supplemented it with my own findings, should serve as a tool of basic orientation for anyone interested in the works of these men. Moreover, I scrutinized the "afterlife" of the Dresden School and considered its existence through the prism of its possible sphere(s) of influence. Several texts and manuscripts were examined and analyzed for this purpose.

As a starting point, I surveyed a number of historiographical sources from the 15th century that refer in one way or another to the Dresden School or its members. The information contained in these sources is to a large extent contradictory. The only positive evidence derived from them is that there were some Germans who were expelled from Dresden after 1411 and who settled in Prague after this date. Enea Silvio Piccolomini's information that these men were previously in Prague and left the town as a consequence of the Kutná Hora decree in 1409 is not corroborated by any other witness; moreover, a comparison of the sources which Piccolomini exploited suggests that this piece of information is in all likelihood his own addition to the story. Only a later interpolation to an otherwise reliable source – the chronicle of Laurence of Březová – states that Peter of Dresden alone lived in Prague at some point, left it and eventually returned. The assumption that a group of Germans originally studied at Prague University and made a full circle by coming back to support the Reform

movement in Bohemia cannot therefore be supported. Based solely on the historiographical sources, the teaching activity of the people connected to the Dresden School as an institutional body also lacks firm evidence. Moreover, critical assessment of the sources revealed that the only name that can be undoubtedly connected with the Dresden phase of the School is that of Peter of Dresden. The majority of these sources were concerned with the question of the introduction of the lay chalice and perceived this as the main reason behind the expulsion of the School from Dresden. Without exception it was Peter of Dresden who was mentioned in connection with this practice. The chronology of the beginnings of Hussite Utraquism, as determined by modern scholarship, however, refuted Peter's role in this issue.[508] Other tenets held by the members of the School point to its anti-papal character but only in one case were these beliefs labelled Waldensian in contemporary writing. All sources agree that once these Germans settled in Prague, they promptly associated themselves with the Czech representatives of the Reform movement and that some of the men played a significant role in religious developments in Prague before the outbreak of the wars. Yet the picture gleaned from the narrative sources is rather fuzzy and certainly does not provide grounds for considering the German masters as a determinate group of scholars.

The next step in disentangling the riddle of the Dresden School was to combine the information extracted from historiographical sources with the available biographical data of the people involved. In other words, I attempted to picture the story of the Dresden School through the prism of the relevant people. In the case of Nicholas of Dresden, a critical appraisal of the sources allows for only one positive conclusion, namely that he studied in Erfurt until 1405 and worked in Prague for some time after 1412.[509] There is no evidence for Nicholas's activity in the period between 1405 and 1412, when he may or may not have worked at the *Kreuzschule* in Dresden. The only fact that can be accepted without doubt is that between 1412 and 1415 Nicholas worked in Prague and the numerous treatises he composed there had a palpable influence on the reformist circles connected with Prague University. However, he did not spend his last days in Prague (although his possible martyrdom in Germany is not supported by source evidence). Regarding Peter of Dresden, the picture is even more obscure. The survey of both positive and negative evidence of university registers

[508] A critical survey of the origins of the lay chalice in Bohemia and Peter's role in it can be found in Krmíčková, *Studie a texty*, 3–15.
[509] Nevertheless, I pointed out that there is room for doubt even concerning Nicholas's studies in Erfurt.

implies that Peter studied in Prague. Two names figure in the registers of Prague University which can be connected with Peter of Dresden and it followed from my survey that the identification of Peter with Peter of Dreste (bachelor in Arts 1374) seems to be more reasonable. Peter's presence is positively attested to in Nuremberg in 1405; along the way from there he might have stayed in Zwickau and Chemnitz; and from 1407 until ca. 1411 he worked at the *Kreuzschule* in Dresden; subsequently moving to Prague where he also died. The authorship of several extant treatises ascribed to Peter of Dresden is doubtful, above all in the case of the well-spread and very popular Aristotelian compendium. Some of the copies of this tract contain evidence about Petrus Gerticz as their author, who is often identified with the famous rector of the *Kreuzschule* in Dresden – this connection and identification has far-reaching implications for the history of the Dresden School. Friedrich Eppinge started his academic career at the University of Heidelberg and left it some time after 1406. Whether he went to Prague after this point or straight to Dresden, where his presence is positively attested, is impossible to decide due to lack of source evidence. He certainly worked in Dresden as a co-teacher of Peter of Dresden and followed him to Prague around 1412. In Prague, Eppinge's career reached the apex during the dispute over Wyclif's teachings in 1412. The defence of the article on unjust excommunication was one of the most remarkable and influential contributions of Friedrich Eppinge to the Hussite movement. It is considered the most complex treatment of a pressing issue of the period and illustrates the possible legal orientation of the people connected to the Dresden School. Eppinge most probably died in Prague shortly after 1412 as there is no further evidence of his life in the sources. John Drändorf is the only one of the supposed group about whose family background we are better informed. This nobleman from Saxony studied in Leipzig, Dresden and Prague, although the sequence of his study-travels is not clear. However, at the *Kreuzschule* in Dresden, Drändorf certainly studied under Peter of Dresden and Friedrich Eppinge; after 1411 he moved to Zittau where he studied together with another man connected to the Dresden School, Peter Turnau; subsequently he moved to Prague. Drändorf was ordained a priest at Lipnice in 1417 and worked as a parish priest in southern Bohemia. Most probably as a consequence of the outbreak of the wars in Bohemia, around 1424 he left for Germany to carry out an astonishing travelling enterprise. After months of assiduous travelling, Drändorf teamed up with his former colleague and friend Peter Turnau in Speyer and tried to carry out a plan to change the

existing social order. They composed a manifesto calling for armed revolt resulting in his arrest. John Drändorf was burned as a heretic in 1425. Peter Turnau is connected with the Dresden School solely because of the claim by John Drändorf and also because he fell victim to the same process in 1425 as his friend Drändorf. Turnau came from a wealthy family from Prussia and studied in Zittau in 1411 where he met John Drändorf for the first time. During his inquisition process, Turnau refused to connect his presence in Prague after 1412 with the bursa at the Black Rose House and thus, it may be possible that he had no contacts with the circle of German masters there. At the end of 1414 Turnau left Prague for Bologna where he obtained a degree in law, a fact that brings him closer to the legal orientation of the Dresden School. In 1422, Turnau journeyed to the East; on his way home from Crete he stopped shortly in Prague and continued to Germany. He obtained the position of rector of a local cathedral school in Speyer in 1423, in 1424 he was joined by John Drändorf, and in consequence of their attempt at a revolt he was burnt at the stake by the inquisition – just as Drändorf – in 1425. Another man burnt by the German inquisition, Bartholomew Rautenstock, confessed to have studied in Prague with Peter and Nicholas of Dresden and his testimony is the only explicit mention of the bursa at the Black Rose House in Prague. Rautenstock was also ordained at Lipnice in 1417 along with John Drändorf and subsequently worked as a priest in Prague. Later he married and settled down in Germany, although some time after his wife's death he set out to preach again in Bohemia and then in Germany. He was caught and burnt by the inquisition in Nuremberg at an unknown date, but at the latest in the middle of the 15th century. A hint that the German masters in Prague had some sympathizers is presented by Conradus Stoecklin, who glossed a commentary on Nicholas Lira's *Postil* copied by John Drändorf in Prague. This vague link is the only connection that can be drawn between the otherwise unknown Stoecklin and the Germans active in Prague after 1412. Last but not least, a direct link between the famous English supporter of the Hussites, Peter Payne, and the Dresden School must be rejected. Payne left England some time around 1413 and travelled through Germany (where he may or may not have got in touch with the prominent Waldensian emissary Friedrich Reiser); it is certain that Payne did not reach Prague before late 1414. The chronology of his travels proves that he could not have had contacts with the Germans before this date in Dresden. The suggestion that Payne was admitted to the conservative board of Masters of Prague University only in 1417 because of his contacts with the German radicals at the Black Rose House and

his refusal to swear an oath must be rejected as well, as the analysis of the Statutes concerning the oath-proceedings at Prague University showed.[510] Another weak link between Payne and the teaching activities of the Dresdeners in Prague, namely the existence of mnemonic verses composed by Payne, the *Dicta*, cannot be accepted either. The only connection between Payne's activities and the Dresden School in Prague is thus constituted by circumstantial evidence, namely by his participation in compiling indexes for Wyclif's works in the 1430s.

In sum, the biographical data of the people considered to be members of the Dresden School do not justify the supposition that the School existed and operated as a group. First of all, there is no evidence that the group was connected to Prague University before 1409 and moved to Germany as a consequence of the Kutná Hora Decree of 1409. Some of the men might have studied at Prague University before this date, but they did not flee from there together. As far as the Dresden phase of the group is concerned, only Peter of Dresden and Friedrich Eppinge as teachers and John Drändorf as a student can be traced at the *Kreuzschule*, yet even they did not move to Prague together after their expulsion from Dresden in 1411. Moreover, there is only circumstantal evidence for the identification of Peter of Dresden as the rector of the *Kreuzschule* in Dresden with the author(s) of the treatises that survive and are ascribed to him. The most famous member of the Dresden School, Nicholas of Dresden, can be unequivocally linked with the activity of the School only in the Prague period. The same holds true for other men, namely Bartholomew Rautenstock and Conrad Stoecklin. John Drändorf studied both in Dresden and in Prague and can be linked with two other students of the School on two occasions: together with Bartholomew Rautenstock he was among the radicals who were ordained at Lipnice in 1417; and together with Peter Turnau Drändorf took part in the travelling and exhorting enterprise in Germany. Yet Turnau during his interrogation refused to admit to having anything in common with the German masters either in Dresden, or in Prague. Peter Payne cannot be directly connected to the Dresden School in either place although he might have been in touch with the German masters or their students in Prague after 1414, that is, when the two leading figures of the bursa in Prague – Peter and Nicholas – were most probably not active there any more. Therefore there is also a dearth of positive evidence for accepting the activity of the Dresden School in Prague on institutional grounds.

[510] Nodl, "*Iurare vel promittere*," 55–56.

The conclusion of this part – which tried to look for "hard evidence" on the history of the Dresden School – would inevitably be negative and as such would also be misleading. In the Middle Ages, the institutional ties between the various parts of a university were relatively vague and the contemporary perception of scholars was naturally very different from our modern point of view.[511] It is highly probable that the Dresden masters were matriculated at Prague University and read their lessons at the Black Rose House that belonged to the Bohemian University nation – even though there is only circumstantial evidence for it. It should be stressed that the lack of direct evidence does not hinder the acceptance of this assumption. To argue the case further, however, it is necessary to complement this first step of the analysis with other types of evidence.

The literary output of the Dresdeners, which was analyzed subsequently, disclosed valuable hints for the history of the Dresden School. The survey of treatises supposedly authored by Peter of Dresden revealed some topics and foci that may have been considered as original or unconventional in the given period. One such example is Peter's interest in the still popular modistic grammar that can be interpreted as evidence for his innovative teaching activities in Prague. Peter's treatment of logic, which is in some aspects also influenced by the theory of modes of signifying, indicates the important place it had in the logic curriculum. The hypothesis that Peter's texts were used as textbooks at Prague University is substantiated by some of the surviving copies that used to be in the possession of the college libraries in Prague. The connection of these texts with Prague University therefore seems to be beyond question. The most intricate piece among Peter's writings, the *Parvulus philosophiae naturalis*, suggests that the author of this highly popular compendium was the same person as the rector of the *Kreuzschule* in Dresden and the teacher at the Black Rose House in Prague – yet this identification does not rest on irrefutable grounds. In addition, the circulation of medieval copies of Peter's treatises revealed a strong connection between the universities in Prague and Erfurt, a fact that adds weight to some of the points made in the course of the present analysis (e.g. Peter of Dresden's travels; or Nicholas of Dresden's studies in Erfurt). The single treatise of Friedrich Eppinge on unjust excommunication and its popularity indicated that the hypothetical circle of the Germans was well connected and respected among the Hussite reformers in Prague. The same holds true for the rich literary legacy of Nicholas of

[511] For a survey of medieval terminology relevant for the Prague University, see Šmahel, "Scholae, collegia et

Dresden. The existence of common literary enterprises of John Drändorf, Peter Turnau, and Conradus Stoecklin confirmed the strong links between the Dresdeners, which, in consequence, support the assumption that the Dresden School might have existed.

Further indirect evidence that could point to the existence of the School was analyzed as the next step. Four topics served this purpose: the alleged teaching activities of the Dresdeners, the doctrine the members of the Dresden School might have shared, the possible activities of the disciples, and the later followers of the Dresdeners.

The situation at the *Kreuzschule* in Dresden showed that the circulation of nonconformist ideas under Peter of Dresden as rector was the single-handed activity of this one man. And even though Peter's activity inspired two members of the *Kreuzschule* to follow him to Prague, this does not allow the hypothesis that the Dresden School was transferred to Prague on institutional grounds to be accepted. The situation in Prague was rather different. A number of sources attest to that fact that Peter and Nicholas ran a bursa at the Black Rose House where many topical issues of the time were discussed. The attractive flow of ideas spreading from this bursa found vivid echos in the life of Hussite Prague. Yet the treatises that could be connected to the teaching activities of Peter of Dresden, Nicholas of Dresden, or Peter Payne focused on various and dissimilar topics and lack any common features. On the whole, the two phases of the School – in Dresden and in Prague – cannot be connected as far as its staff and the ideas that were promoted by its alleged members are concerned.

The issue of the doctrines shared by the members of the School is closely connected to the teaching activities. In my opinion it is precisely here that the history of the Dresden School started: the accusation (found in the medieval narrative material) that the Dresdeners were involved in spreading Waldensian ideas is probably the first instance when they were treated as a group. The problem is twofold. On the one hand, the narrative sources do not contain sufficient evidence on the members' Waldensianism; on the other hand, it is only the treatises of Nicholas of Dresden where grounds exist for an analysis of his Waldensian persuasion. The results of previous scholarship dealing with the doctrinal impact of the School were based exclusively on the teachings of Nicholas of Dresden and are largely contradictory. From the point of view of the present analysis, such results are at any rate less important – as long as the Dresden School cannot be identified as a distinct group, it is not possible to speak about its

bursae universitatis Pragensis," 85–102.

doctrinal impact. This ambivalence can be illustrated by a couple of further particulars that emerged during the course of the this study. For example, the teachings of Matthias of Janov, an influential authority who inspired many of the Hussite reformers but whose doctrine was known only locally, are reflected upon in the works of Nicholas of Dresden and Friedrich Eppinge – a fact that might support the acquaintance of the Dresdeners with specifically Bohemian sources and consequently highlight the bonds between the individual members of the group. By contrast, a major breakthrough in the matter of unjust excommunication treated by Friedrich Eppinge in Prague is utterly disregarded in the manifesto that John Drändorf composed together with Peter Turnau in Germany later on. This fact is especially significant regarding the bonds – or the lack of them – among the group members: Drändorf and Turnau strove to convince the audience of their manifesto that unjust excommunication was not harmful, thereby implying fundamental societal consequences. For this purpose, Eppinge's text would have supplied them with a valuable array of arguments and first-rate evidence for their cause. It is hard to understand and interpret the reasons why they would not have used it, unless they simply did not have Eppinge's treatise in their possesion. Therefore, with respect to the available comparative material, it must be concluded that the individuals connected to the Dresden School do not represent an ideologically definable or homogeneous group. Yet it is likely that many of the Dresdeners's treatises must have been doctrinally challenging if many of them found lively respones and vivid echos in the contemporary discourse.

A slightly different picture emerged from the analysis of the possible disciples of the Dresden School. Some of the primary sources alluded to activities in which the members of the group together with their friends and like-minded colleagues had taken part. The textual tradition of a treatise by Nicholas of Dresden, the *Tabule veteris et novi coloris* written around 1412, was carefully examined in the first place. During the street riots in Prague in 1412 and 1414, wooden boards with antithetical illuminations based on this treatise were carried by the supporters of the Hussites. Nicholas's *Tabule* have been available in a critical edition for some time, but the scrutiny of the surviving manuscripts and especially a closer look at the fragments of the text (that have so far escaped the attention of scholars) revealed interesting links between Nicholas and the students of Prague University. The existence of an abridged version of the Latin *Tabule* from ca. 1412 suggests that the pictorial potential of the text was most probably intended for promotion. In order to transform the lenghty Latin text into

pictorial tools that were successfully utilized during the street performances (for which we have evidence), previous debates must have taken place. This, in consequence, indicates that the School had influence on the wider masses and must have had disciples or followers of some kind. Even though I would like to emphasize that this supposition is tied solely to the Prague period of the School, it is an actual glimpse of the influence exerted by the circle of the Dresdeners.

Another activity shared by some of the members of the Dresden School was their itinerant preaching and their travelling enterprises. Nevertheless, a survey of the travels of the pertinent individuals showed that these did not have much in common. With the exception of John Drändorf and Peter Turnau's efforts in Germany, the hypothesis that people from the Dresden School propagated certain Hussite ideas in Germany, or that their travels indicate a common intention, cannot be accepted. The travelling enterprises and the missionary vocation cannot be considered a characteristic trait of the members of the Dresden School.

The actual existence of the School's disciples and followers can be classified as indirect evidence for the existence of the whole School. That is why the problem of the followers was subsequently placed in the focus of further investigation. Coeval evidence on the existence of the Dresden School has been supplied with information coming from a later period. A very distinct sign of the existence of a school is the existence of collected works by the masters of the school. In the case of the treatises of Nicholas of Dresden, such conscious attempts might have been carried out. However, this evidence relates only to Nicholas of Dresden, a fact that creates an obstacle to making the assumption that these collected editions can be regarded as a sign of the activity of the followers of the Dresden School, and not only of Nicholas. Nevertheless, the investigation into one particular example of how Nicholas's works reverberated in the Hussite setting showed that there was more to this problem. The existence of an index to Nicholas's treatise *Apologia* made it possible to connect – even if only circumstantially – the circle of the Bohemian compilers of indexes to Wyclif's works, possibly including Peter Payne, with the indexing attempt made for the *Apologia*. In other words, the connection between the indexing tools to John Wyclif's works and Nicholas of Dresden indicates the possible existence of a larger number of people who were inspired by the Dresdeners and therefore can be regarded as their followers.

Such a highly speculative idea naturally needed further substantiation. To a certain extent, this is provided by the evidence from the 15th-century manuscript sources that were examined in the next step of the research. I took up and elaborated upon Howard Kaminsky's suggestion that after 1415 there existed "intellectual activity promoting Nicholas's program."[512] This hypothesis was based on the existence of two treatises dealing with similar heresies that were very much in the line of argumentation of Nicholas of Dresden's works, and in one case even directly connected to it. The scrutiny of unedited manuscript material resulted in a critical assessment of the textual tradition of these two texts. The *Confessio*, a parody of a confession that a heretic might have made to an inquisitor written around 1418, criticizes Catholic confessional practice. Interestingly, in some manuscripts, the parody was copied in such a way as to serve as an example of Waldensian or Wycliffite tenets. Much more complex was the case of the other analyzed treatise, the *Collecta et excerpta*. This refutation of a number of heretical ideas by a Catholic author seems to comprise two parts which are to a certain extent independent with the second part directly opposing a tract by Nicholas of Dresden. Both parts are amply preserved and a critical appraisal of the extant copies revealed that they must have been part of a longer tract, directly linked to the refutation of Nicholas's *Tabule veteris et novi coloris*. Moreover, the content of these two sources clearly shows that they were aimed against the Hussites, as the refutation of infant communion, a very distinct Hussite novelty, proved. Both the *Confessio* and the *Collecta et excerpta* address very similar heretical ideas and refute them, which permits the following conjecture: because the opinions that appear in both of these treatises cannot be identified with one distinct heretical system but they show remarkable congruence, they may therefore have represented an outline of particular ideas. As there is a direct link between the *Collecta et excerpta* and a treatise by Nicholas of Dresden, it can be concluded that Nicholas's ideas were indeed promoted on a theoretical level as Kaminsky originally suggested. This, however, brings us back to the very beginning – this evidence points again only to the dissemination of the works and opinions of Nicholas of Dresden alone, and not of the Dresden School.

The matter is further complicated by the methodological ambiguities in defining a school or a group of scholars at the beginning of the fifteenth century. The term "group" was often used in earlier scholarship without precise theoretical definition. In one of the pioneering

[512] Kaminsky, *Master Nicholas*, 26.

studies into the history of Hussite radicalism by Howard Kaminsky, the Taborites were for example, classified as the pupils of Jacobellus of Misa because of their defence of several tenets voiced by Jacobellus and because of their appeals to his authority.[513] The reception of the beliefs of an individual (in the present study this might be the case of Nicholas of Dresden) was also traditionally considered to be a form of doctrinal influence. For the matter at hand, it is important that signs of the doctrinal impact of the Dresden School were sought in the works of the Hussite radical preachers, or later in the environment of the Unity of the Czech Brethern and elsewhere. The most revealing example is represented by the *Confessio Taboritarum* by Nicholas Biskupec of Pelhřimov, who utilized Nicholas of Dresden's treatise *De purgatorio* to a large extent.[514] Although the intricate network of textual borrowings between these two treatises may reveal interesting facts, there is one essential implication in such an approach for the present study: the alleged doctrinal influence relates only to Nicholas of Dresden and not to the whole group. Nicholas's doctrines indeed spread among the radical Hussites, as further examples from manuscript material indicate, however, they should not be taken as a sign that the group as a whole had some kind of impact.[515] Even though there are other figures from the later period who had some contacts with the Dresdeners, they cannot be directly classified as the followers of the Dresden School due to a dearth of further evidence.[516] Such a conclusion cannot be surprising, as even in the case of John Wyclif and the Lollards, a problem of much greater significance that is far better and more richly documented than the Dresden School, the religious identity of the followers is a very complex matter.[517]

---

[513] That Tabor's defence of a simplified ritual was based on Jacobellus' requirement was later endorsed by Jacobellus himself who referred to the original unity of spirit between himself and the Taborites, see Kaminsky, "Hussite Radicalism," 123.

[514] See above, 116–117.

[515] For example a marginal note by an anti-Hussite copyist in one copy of Nicholas's tract *De purgatorio* preserved in Chapter Library, Prague, D 52, fol. 21v, claims that the errors of Nicholas were adopted by the Taborites: "Errores Nicolai de Czerucz theotonici contra purgatorium, quos receperunt et defenderunt Thaborite cum ceteris malis. … Sequentem tractatum nulli cautum est legere"; see Patera and Podlaha, *Soupis rukopisů knihovny metropolitní kapitoly pražské*, vol. 1, 361.

[516] Such is the case of John Jičín, the only Prague master to join the radical faction of the Taborites. He held doctrines similar to Nicholas of Dresden and he is linked to the Dresdeners in Prague in the chronicle *The Beginnings of Hussitism*; for more, see above, 69. Another figure whose connection to the Dresden School is obscure but sometimes referred to is Laurentius of Reichenbach, a Silesian priest and later possibly a secretary to Prokop Holý, the leader of Tabor, whose name was mentioned during the interrogation by John Drändorf; see above, 68–69.

[517] See e.g. Jeremy Catto, "Fellows and Helpers: The Religious Identity of the Followers of Wyclif," in *The Medieval Church, Universities, Heresy, and the Religious Life*, ed. Peter Biller and Barrie Dobson (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1999), 141–161. An example of similar methodological problem is e.g. the intricate case of the school of Chartres: opinions that Chartres with its cathedral school represented an important educational

To conclude, none of the sources analyzed above, either from the period contemporary with the activities of the Dresden School, or from the period that followed immediately, contain evidence that the Dresden School ever existed in an institutionalised form. The *Kreuzschule* in Dresden and the bursa at the Black Rose House in Prague did not have much in common, although there were a few people who were active in both places. The circle of the people connected to the bursa in Prague, however, did exert some influence on the representatives of the Reform movement, although this pertains chiefly to Nicholas of Dresden. On the other hand, the direct evidence that there were people interested in the ideas and works of Nicholas of Dresden can be indirectly connected with the activities of the circle of reformers around Peter Payne. Taking this speculation a bit further, we might interpret these hints as if there were people who could be regarded as the sympathizers or disciples of the bursa run by the Dresdeners in Prague. The existence of the followers of the Dresden School might consequently point to the actual existence of the School at least at this level. The above-mentioned indirect evidence that comes from a later period indicates that the whole idea of the Dresden School spread only in the later stages.

In sum, there is no verifiable evidence that the Dresden School existed in the lifetime of its alleged members and their immediate followers. Yet, in some sense the School definitely existed (and exists today): as an historiographical construct and fiction. In all likelihood, the affinity of some men with one great master or teacher (Peter or Nicholas of Dresden) caused and created a later perception of the Dresdeners as a group. The question remains as to how the fabrication of the concept of the Dresden School developed subsequently. Only the contemporary phases of the existence of the Dresden School were analyzed here. The examination of subsequent periods is beyond the scope of the present study – for one thing it moves into a time beyond the medieval period, and for another, how the tradition was constructed and how this historiographical construct developed is a research question in its own right. As stated above, the aim of the present study was to contribute to a more accurate

---

centre of humanist tradition in the early 12th century prevailed until 1970 when Richard Southern dismissed the innovative value of its intellectual programme – see Richard W. Southern, "Humanism and the School of Chartres," in *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies* (New York and Evanston: Harper&Row, 1970), 61–85; idem, "The Schools of Paris and the School of Chartres," in *Renaissance and the Renewal in the twelfth century*, ed. Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable with Carol D. Lanham (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 113–137. However, subsequent responses changed the appreciation of this School once again, such as Winthrop Wetherbee, "The School of Chartres," in *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jorge J. E. Gracia

picture of the Dresden School and to understand the role the Dresden School played in the Czech Reformation at the beginning of the fifteenth century.

and Timothy B. Noone (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2002), 36–44; Édouard Jeauneau, *Rethinking the School of Chartres*, transl. Claude Paul Desmarais (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009).

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Basel, University Library, A X 66
Bautzen, Stadtbibliothek, 8^{o} 8
Brno, Moravian Library, Mk 102
R 432
Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 421
423
1690
2148
Dessau, Georg HS 50, fol. 25v–29r
Herrnhut, Unitätsarchiv, AB.II.R.1.16.a
Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Hs K 346
Koblenz, Landeshauptarchiv, Best. 701 Nr. 198
Leipzig, University Library, 602
Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, A 40/1
A 79/5
A 163
C 64
D 52
D 118
D 119
M 56/1
O 50
Prague, National Library, I F 18
III G 28
IV G 15
V E 28
V G 19
V H 28
VII E 27
X D 10
XII F 30
XIV F 20
XXIII F 204
Prague, National Museum, XII F 4
Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 4314
4343
4550
Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, I F 237
I F 308
I F 773
I Q 87

Primary Sources

Aeneae Silvii Historia Bohemica. Ed. Dana Martínková, Alena Hadravová, and Jiří Matl. Foreword by František Šmahel. Prague: Koniasch Latin Press, 1998. New textual edition: Piccolomini, Aeneas Silvius. *Historia Bohemica*. Ed. Joseph Hejnic and Hans Rothe. 3 vols. Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2005.

Album seu matricula facultatis juridicae universitatis pragensis ab anno Christi 1372, usque ad annum 1418. Monumenta historica universitatis Carolo-Ferdinandae Pragensis, vol. 2/1. Pragae: Joan. Spurny, 1834.

Album studiosorum universitatis Cracoviensis. Vol. 1. *Ab anno 1400 ad annum 1489*. Ed. A. M. Kosterkiewicz. Cracoviae: Typis et impensis universitatis Jagellonicae, 1887.

Das älteste Stadtbuch von Dresden 1404–1436. Ed. Elisabeth Boer. Dresden: Historische Kommission der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, 1963.

Anonymi Ratisbonensis Farrago Historica rerum Ratisponensium ab Anno Christi DVIII usque ad Annum Christi MDXIX. Ed. Andreas Felix Oefelius. Rerum Boicarum scriptores nusquam antehac editi 2, 498–523. Augustae Vindelicorum sumptibus Ignatii Adami et Francisci Antonii Veith bibliopolarum, 1763.

Catalogi librorum vetustissimi universitatis Pragensis. Die ältesten Bücherkataloge der Prager Universität. Ed. František Šmahel and Zuzana Silagiová. Corpus christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 271. Turnhout: Brepols, 2015.

Chronicon Procopii notarii Pragensis. Ed. Konstantin Höfler. Fontes rerum Austriacarum I, *Scriptores*, vol. 2, 67–78. Vienna: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1856.

Confessio Taboritarum. Ed. Amedeo Molnár and Romolo Cegna. Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1983.

Cristianvs Schoettgenivs. *Dissertativncvla de Antiqvissimis literarvm in terris svperioris Saxoniae fatis*. Dresden: Harpeter 1748.

Daňhelka, Jiří, ed. *Drobné spisy české* (Shorter Czech writings). Opera omnia Iohannis Hus IV. Prague: Academia, 1985.

Das Bakkalarenregister der Artistenfakultät der Universität Erfurt 1392–1521 (Registrum baccalariorum de facultate arcium universitatis studii Erffordensis existencium). Ed. Rainer C. Schwinges and Klaus Wriedt. Jena and Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer Verlag, 1995.

Die drei ältesten Stadbücher Dresdens (1404–1476). Ed. Jens Klingner, Robert Mund, Thomas Kübler, and Jörg Oberste. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag 2007.

Doelle, Ferdinand. “Ein Fragment der verlorengegangenen Prager Universitätsmatrikel aus

dem 14. Jahrhundert." In *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle*, vol. 3. *Per la storia ecclesiastica e civile dell' età di mezzo*, 88–102. Studi e testi, 39. Rome: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1924.

Döllinger, Ignaz von (ed.). *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*. Vol. 2. *Dokumente vornehmlich zur Geschichte der Valdesier und Katharer*. 2nd ed. New York: B. Franklin, 1970.

Fliege, Jutta. "Eine hussitische Sammelhandschrift in der Stadtbibliothek Dessau." *Studien zum Buch- und Bibliothekswesen* 4 (1986): 25–35.

Georgius Fabricius Chemnicensis. "Annalium urbis Misnae libri tres." In *Rerum Misnicarum libri VII*. Leipzig: E. Voegelin, 1569.

Geschichtschreiber der Hussitischen Bewegung in Böhmen 1–3. Ed. Konstantin Höfler. Fontes rerum Austriacarum I, *Scriptores*, vol. 2, 6, 7. Vienna: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1856–1866.

Heimpel, Hermann, ed. *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren aus dem Jahre 1425: Akten der Prozesse gegen die deutschen Hussiten Johannes Drändorf und Peter Turnau, sowie gegen Drändorfs Diener Martin Borchard*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1969.

Hus, Jan. *Česká nedělní postila: vyloženie svatých čtení nedělních* (Czech Sunday Postil: expositions of Sunday Bible readings), ed. Jiří Daňhelka. Prague: Academia, 1992.

Johann-Christophorus, *Dissertatio historica de Petro Dresdensi*. Leipzig: Ch. Michaelis, 1678.

"Johannis de Ragusio Tractatus quomodo Bohemi reducti sunt ad unitatem ecclesiae." In *Monumenta conciliorum generalium seculi decimi quinti*, vol. 1, ed. František Palacký and Ernestus Birk, 133–286. Vienna: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1857.

Kapp, Johann Erhard. *Kleine Nachlese einiger, grössten Theils noch ungedruckter, und sonderlich zur Erläuterung der Reformations-Geschichte nützlicher Urkunden*. Vol. 3. Leipzig: n.p., 1730.

Kleineidam, Erich. *Universitas studii Erffordensis. Überblick über die Geschichte der Universität Erfurt im Mittelalter 1392–1521*. Vol. 1, *1392–1460*; vol. 2, *1460–1521*. Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1964–1969.

Knod, Gustav C. *Deutsche Studenten in Bologna (1289–1562). Biographischer Index zu den Acta nationis Germanicae universitatis Bononiensis*. Berlin: Decker, 1899.

Laurentii Hochwarti canonici Ratisp. Catalogus episcoporum Ratisponensium in libros III divisus. Ed. Andreas Felix Oefelius. Rerum Boicarum scriptores nusquam antehac editi, vol. 1, 159–242. Augustae Vindelicorum sumptibus Ignatii Adami et Francisci Antonii Veith bibliopolarum, 1763.

Lehmann, Paul. *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*. Vol. 2, *Bistum Mainz und Erfurt*. Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928.

Liber decanorum facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Pragensis ab anno Christi 1367 usque ad annum 1585. Vol. 1/1. Prague: Joan. Nep. Gerzabek, 1830.

Mag. Joannis Hus Super IV. Sententiarum. 2 vols. Ed. Wenzel Flajšhans and Marie Komínková. Prague: J. R. Vilímek, 1905.

Magistri Hieronymi de Praga Quaestiones, Polemica, Epistulae. Ed. František Šmahel and Gabriel Silagi. Corpus christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 222. Turnhout: Brepols, 2010.

Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg von 1386–1662. Vol. 1, *Von 1386 bis 1553*. Ed. Gustav Toepke. Heidelberg: Selbstverlag des herausgegebers, 1884.

Die Matrikel der Universität Köln. Vol. 1, *1389–1475*. Ed. Hermann Keussen. 2nd ed. Bonn: Verlag von P. Hanstein, 1928.

Die Matrikel der Universität Wien. Vol. 1, *1377–1450*. Graz and Cologne: Böhlau in Komm., 1956.

Master Nicholas of Dresden. The Old Color and the New. Ed. Howard Kaminsky, Dean Loy Bilderback, Imre Boba and Patricia N. Rosenberg. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s. 55. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1965.

Matrikel der Universität Leipzig. Codex diplomaticus Saxoniae regiae, Hauptteil II, Band 16–17. Ed. Georg Erler. Leipzig: 1895–1897.

Metryka Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego z lat 1400–1508 (Metrica Universitatis Cracoviensis a. 1400–1508). Ed. Antoni Gąsiorowski, Tomasz Jurek and Izabela Skierska. 2 vols. Cracow: Towarzystwo naukove – Societas Vistulana, 2004.

Mistra Jana Husi Tractatus responsivus. Ed. S. H. Thomson. Prague: s.n., 1927.

Nicola della Rosa Nera detto da Dresa (1380?–1416?), De reliquiis et De veneratione sanctorum: De purgatorio. Ed. Romolo Cegna. *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 23 (1977).

Nicolai Dresdensis Apologia. De conclusionibus doctorum in Constantia de materia sanguinis. Ed. Petra Mutlová. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2015.

Nicolai Dresdensis Expositio super Pater noster. Ed. Jana Nechutová and Romolo Cegna. *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 30 (1990).

Nicolai (ut dicunt) de Dresda vulgo appellati de Čerruc (De Černá růže id est de Rosa Nigra [†1418]) Puncta. Ed. Romolo Cegna. *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 33 (1996).

Palacký, František, ed. *Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus vitam, doctrinam, causam in Constantiensi concilio actam et controversias de religione in Bohemia annis 1403–1418 motas illustrantia*. Prague: F. Tempsky, 1869.

Petri Payne Anglici Positio, replica et propositio in concilio Basiliensi a. 1433 atque oratio ad Sigismundum regem a. 1429 Bratislaviae pronunciatae. Ed. František Michálek Bartoš. Tábor: Taboriensis ecclesia evangelica fratrum Bohemorum, 1949.

"Petri Zatecensis Liber diurnus de gestis Bohemorum in concilio Basileensi." In *Monumenta conciliorum generalium seculi decimi quinti*, vol. 1, ed. František Palacký and Ernestus Birk, 287–357. Vienna: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1857.

Podlaha, Antonius, ed. *Liber ordinationum cleri*. Vol. 9, *1395–1416*. Prague: Sumptibus s. f. metropolitani capituli Pragensis, 1910–1922.

Die Rektorbücher der Universität Heidelberg 1: *1386–1410*. 3 vols. Ed. Jürgen Miethke. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1986–1999.

Schlesinger, Ludwig. *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Saaz bis zum Jahre 1526*. (Städte- und Urkundenbücher aus Böhmen, Band 2.) Prague, Leipzig, and Vienna: Selbstverlag des Vereines für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen, 1892.

Šmahel, František. *Verzeichnis der Quellen zum Prager Universalienstreit 1348–1500*. Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum 25. Warsaw, Wrocław, Cracow, and Gdańks: Ossolineum, 1980.

Tabule staré a nové barvy Mikuláše z Drážďan ve staročeském překladu (The Tables of Old and New Colour of Nicholas of Dresden in an Old Czech Translation. Ed. Milada Homolková and Michal Dragoun. Prague: Scriptrotium, 2016.

Thomas de Erfordia, *Grammatica speculativa*. Ed. and transl. Geoffrey L. Bursill-Hall. London: Longman, 1972.

Urkunden der Markgrafen von Meissen und Landgrafen von Thüringen 1407–1418. Codex diplomaticus Saxoniae regiae 1, Abtheilung B, vol. 3. Ed. Hubert Ermisch. Leipzig: Giesecke&Devrient, 1909.

Vavřinec z Březové. *Kronika husitská* (The Hussite Chronicle). Ed. Jaroslav Goll. Fontes rerum bohemicarum, vol. 5, 327–541. Prague: 1893.

Vavřinec z Březové. *Husitská kronika. Píseň o vítězství u Domažlic* (Hussite chronicle. Song on the victory at Domažlice). Translated and annotated by Franišek Heřmanský, Marie Bláhová and Jan Blahoslav Čapek. Prague: Svoboda, 1979.

Veršované skladby doby husitské (Rhymed poems from the Hussite period). Ed. František Svejkovský. Prague: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd, 1963.

von der Hardt, Hermann. *Magnum oecumenicum Constantiense concilium*. Vol. 3. Frankfurt and Leipzig: n.p., 1698.

Weissenborn, Hermann J. C., ed. *Acten der Erfurter Universitaet*. Vol. 1, *1. Päpstliche Stiftungsbullen. 2. Statuten von 1447. 3. Allgemeine Studentenmatrikel, erste Hälfte (1392–1492)*. Geschichtquellen der Provinz Sachsen und angrenzender Gebiete, vol. 8. Halle: Otto Hendel, 1881.

Želivský, Jan. *Dochovaná kázání z roku 1419* (Surviving sermons from 1419). Ed. Amedeo Molnár. Prague: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd, 1953.

Secondary Literature

Althoff, Gerd. *Family, Friends and Followers. Political and Social Bonds in Early Medieval Europe*. Translated by Christopher Carroll. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Bachmann, Adolf. "Beiträge zur Kunde böhmischer Geschichtsquellen des XIV. Und XV. Jahrhunderts." *Mittheilungen der Vereines für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen* 35/3 (1896/97): 209–222.

Bartlová, Milena. "Der Bildersturm der böhmischen Hussiten: Ein neuer Blick auf eine radikale mittelalterliche Geste." *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 59 (2010): 27–48.

_____. "Prout lucide apparet in tabulis et picturis ipsorum: Komunikační úloha obrazů a textů v počátcích husitismu" (Prout lucide apparet in tabulis et picturis ipsorum: Communication Role of Images and Texts in the Beginnings of Hussitism). *Studia mediaevalia Bohemica* 3/2 (2011): 249–274.

Bartoš, František Michálek. "Německého husity Petra Turnova spis o řádech a zvycích církve východní" (A treatise on the customs and rites of the Eastern Church by the German Hussite Peter Turnov). *Věstník Královské české společnosti nauk* 1 (1915): 1–25.

_____. "Studie k Husovi a jeho době. 1. Hus a valdenství" (Studies on Hus and his Times. 1. Hus and Waldensianism). *Časopis Národního muzea* 89 (1915): 1–8.

_____. "Do čtyř pražských artikulů" (To the four Prague articles). *Sborník příspěvků k dějinám hlavního města Prahy* 5/2 (1925): 50–91.

_____. *Literární činnost M. Jana Rokycany, M. Jana Příbrama, M. Petra Payna* (The literary work of M. Jan Rokycana, M. Jan Příbram, M. Petr Payne). Sbírka pramenů k poznání literárního života československého, vol. 3, no. 9. Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1928.

_____. *Husitství a cizina* (Hussitism and Foreign Countries). Prague: Čin, 1931.

_____. "Husitika a bohemika několika knihoven německých a švýcarských" (Hussitica and bohemica from several German and Swiss libraries). *Zvláštní otisk z Věstníku Královské české společnosti nauk* 1931/1 (1932): 72–74.

_____. "Nové spisy Petra a Mikuláše z Drážďan" (New works of Peter and Nicholas of Dresden). *Reformační sborník* 8 (1941): 64–67.

_____. "Po stopách obrazů v Betlemské kapli z doby Husovy" (Tracing the images in the Bethlehem Chapel in Hus's times). *Jihočeský sborník historický* 20 (1951): 121–127.

Betts, Reginald Robert Betts. *Essays in Czech History*. London: The Athlone Press, 1969.

Biller, Peter. "Goodbye to Waldensianism?" *Past and Present* 192 (2006): 3–33.

Bláhová, Marie. "Česká historiografie v husitské revoluci" (Czech historiography in the Hussite revolution). In *Husitství – reformace – renesance. Sborník k 60. narozeninám Františka Šmahela*, vol. 2, ed. Jaroslav Pánek, Jaroslav Boubín, Miloslav Polívka and Noemi Rejchrtová, 439–448. Prague: Historický ústav, 1994.

Boh, Ivan. "A Late-Mediaeval Assessment of the Scope of Logic: An Analysis of Parvulus logice." *Studia mediewistyczne* 22/1 (1983): 3–36.

Boehmer, Heinrich. "Magister Peter von Dresden." *Neues Archiv für Sächsische Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 36 (1915): 212–231.

Brandmüller, Walter. "Fata libelli. Eine Hussitica-Handschrift aus Neapel." *Annuarium historiae conciliorum* 11 (1979): 142–170.

_____, ed. *Handbuch der bayerischen Kirchengeschichte*. Vol. 1. *Von den Anfängen bis zur Schwelle der Neuzeit* 2. *Das kirchliche Leben*. St. Ottilien: Eos Verlag, 1999.

Bursill-Hall, Geoffrey L.. *A Census of Medieval Latin Grammatical Manuscripts*. Stuttgart – Bad Cannstatt: Fromann – Holzboog, 1981.

Butte, Heinrich. *Geschichte Dresdens bis zur Reformationszeit*. Mitteldeutsche Forschungen, Band 54. Köln and Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1967.

Bylina, Stanisław. *Rewolucja husycka*. 3 vols. Warsaw: Neriton – Polskie Towarzystwo Historyczne – Instytut historii PAN, 2011–2016.

The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy. Ed. Charles B. Schmitt, Quentin Skinner, and Eckhard Kessler. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Campi, Luigi. "Una difesa del determinismo dell'ultimo Wyclif attributa a Peter Payne."

Rivista di storia della filosofia 4 (2015): 829–871.

Catto, Jeremy. "Fellows and Helpers: The Religious Identity of the Followers of Wyclif." In *The Medieval Church, Universities, Heresy, and the Religious Life*, ed. Peter Biller and Barrie Dobson, 141–161. Studies in Church History, Subsidia, vol. 11. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1999.

Cegna, Romolo. "Oportet et haereses esse." *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 3 (1967): 56–64.

_____. "Appunti su Valdismo e Ussitismo: la teologia sociale di Nicola della Rosa Nera [Cerruc]." *Bollettino della Societa di Studi Valdesi* 130–131 (1971–1972): 3–34, 3–42.

_____. "Ancora un incontro con Nicola di Cerruc detto da Dresda." *Communio viatorum* 20 (1977): 17–32.

_____. "Początki utrakwizmu w Czechach w latach 1412–1415" (The beginnings of Utraquism in Bohemia in the years 1412–1415). *Przeglad historyczny* 69 (1978): 103–114.

_____. "Encore sur Nicolas de Dresde." *Communio viatorum* 22 (1979): 277–281.

_____. "La tradition pénitentielle des Vaudois et des Hussites et Nicolas de Dresde," *Communio viatorum* 25 (1982): 137–170.

_____. *Fede ed etica Valdese nel quattrocento. Il «Libro espositivo» e il «Tesoro e luce della fede»*. Torino: Claudiana, 1982.

_____. *Medioevo cristiano e penitenza Valdese. Il «Libro espositivo» e il «Tesoro e luce della fede» (parte seconda)*. Torino: Claudiana, 1994.

_____. *De fraternitate Christi (Variazioni sul pensiero di Nicola della Rosa Nera detto da Dresda)*. In *In memoriam Josefa Macka (1922–1991)*, ed. Miloslav Polívka and František Šmahel, 87–101. Prague: Historický ústav, 1996.

_____. "Nicola della Rosa Nera e le origini del radicalismo antisimoniaco dello Speculum aureum." *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 34 (2001): 59–74.

_____. "Il *Tractatus de iuramento* di Nicola della Rosa Nera." *Aevum. Rassegna di Scienze storiche linguistiche e filologiche* 82/2 (2008): 429–489.

_____. "Alcunas sposicions sobre alcuns passage de sant Mt.". In *Valdesi medievali*, ed. Marina Benedetti, 255–268. Torino: Claudiana, 2009.

Čejka Mirek, and Helena Krmíčková. *Dvě staročeská utrakvistická díla Jakoubka ze Stříbra* (Two Old Czech Utraquist works by Jacobellus of Misa). Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2009.

Chytil, Karel. *Antikrist v naukách a umění středověku a husitské obrazové antithese* (Antichrist in the teachings and art of the Middle Ages and Hussite pictorial antitheses). Prague: Česká akademie, 1918.

A Companion to Jan Hus, ed. František Šmahel in cooperation with Ota Pavlíček. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2015.

A Companion to the Reformation in Central Europe, ed. Howard Louthan and Graeme Murdock. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Copenhaver, Brian P. *Peter of Spain: Summaries of Logic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Čornej, Petr. "Tzv. Kronika univerzity pražské a její místo v husitské historiografii." (The so-called Chronicle of the Prague University and its place within the Hussite historiography). *AUC–HUCP* 23/1 (1983): 7–25

_____. *Rozhledy, názory a postoje husitské inteligence v zrcadle dějepisectví 15. století* (Views, opinions and attitudes of the Hussite intellectuals in the mirror of the 15th century's historiography). Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1986.

_____. *Velké dějiny zemí koruny české* (The Great History of the Czech Lands). Vol. 5, *1402–1437*. Prague and Litomyšl: Paseka, 2000.

_____. *Tajemství českých kronik: cesty ke kořenům husitské tradice* (The secrets of the Czech chronicles. Ways to the roots of the Hussite tradition). Prague and Litomyšl: Paseka, 2003.

_____. *Historici, historiografie a dějepis* (Historians, historiography and history). Prague: Karolinum, 2016.

Covington, Michael A. *Syntactic Theory in the High Middle Ages. Modistic Models of Sentence Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

de Vooght, Paul. "Le traité «De usuris» de Nicolas de Dresde," *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* 44 (1977): 150–210, 45 (1978): 181–235.

Doležalová, Eva. *Svěcenci pražské diecéze 1395–1416* (Ordinands of the Prague dioceses 1395–1416). Prague: Historický ústav, 2010.

Dumała, Andrzej I. "*Parvulus philosophiae naturalis* Piotra z Drezna." *Studia Antyczne i Mediewistyczne* 4/39 (2006): 273–294.

Ermisch, Hubert. "Die älteste Schulordnung der Kreuzschule zu Dresden." *Neues Archiv für sächsische Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 13 (1892): 346–347.

Friedrich Reiser und die „waldensisch-hussitische Internationale“ im 15. Jahrhundert, ed. Albert de Lange and Kathrin Utz Tremp. Heidelberg, Ubstadt-Weiher, and Basel: Verlag Regionalkultur, 2006.

Fudge, Thomas A. *Jerome of Prague and the Foundations of the Hussite Movement*. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.

_____. *Jan Hus Between Time and Eternity: Reconsidering a Medieval Heretic*. Lanham MD: 2016.

_____. *The Trial of Jan Hus: Medieval Heresy and Criminal Procedure*. Oxford: 2013.

_____. *The Memory and Motivation of Jan Hus, Medieval Priest and Martyr*. Europa sacra, vol. 11. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.

_____. *Jan Hus. Religious Reform and Social Revolution in Bohemia*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2010.

_____. *The Magnificent Ride. The First Reformation in Hussite Bohemia.* Ashgate: Aldershot, 1998.

Gabriel, A. L. Review of *Speculum philosophiae medii aevi: Die Handschriftensammlung des Dominikaners Georg Schwartz († nach 1484)*, by Maarten J. F. M. Hoenen. *Speculum* 71/1 (1996): 158–159.

Gąsiorowski, Antoni. *Księga Promocji Wydziału Sztuk Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego z XV wieku (Liber promotionum Facultatis Artium in Universitate Cracoviensi saeculi decimi quinti)*. Cracow: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 2000.

Gelehrte im Reich. Zur Sozial- und Wirkungsgeschichte akademischer Eliten des 14. bis 16. Jahrhundert. Ed. Rainer Christoph Schwinges and Markus Wriedt. Berlin: Duncker&Humblot, 1996.

Girgensohn, Dieter. *Peter von Pulkau und die Wiedereinführung des Laienkelches. Leben und Wirken eines Wiener Theologen in der Zeit des großen Schismas*. Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, vol. 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.

Gonnet, Jean, and Amedeo Molnár. *Les Vaudois au Moyen Age*. Torino: Claudiana, 1974.

Grabmann, Martin. *Die Philosophia pauperum und ihr Verfasser Albert von Orlamünde. (Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des philosophischen Unterrichtes an den deutschen Stadtschulen des ausgehenden Mittelalters)*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters, vol. 20/2. Münster: Aschendorff, 1918.

_____. “Handschriftliche Forschungen und Funde zu den philosophischen Schriften des

Petrus Hispanus, des späteren Papstes Johannes XXI." *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Abteilung* 9 (1936): 1–137.

_____. "Der Franziskanerbischof Benedictus de Alignano († 1268) und seine Summa zum caput 'Firmiter' des vierten Laterankonzils. In *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien, P. Michael Bihl O.F.M. als Ehrengabe dargeboten*, ed. P. Ignatius-Maria Freudenreich, 50–64. Colmar: Alsatia Verlag, 1941.

Haberkern, Phillip N. *Patron Saint and Prophet. Jan Hus in the Bohemian and German Reformations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Hantzsch, Viktor. *Dresdner auf Universitäten vom 14. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert*. Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte Dresdens, vol. 19. Dresden: Verlagshandlung Wilhelm Baensch, 1906.

Haupt, Herman. "Waldenserthum und Inquisition im südöstlichen Deutschland seit der Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts." *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 3 (1890): 337–411.

Havelka, Emil. *Husitské katechismy* (Hussite catechisms). Prague: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1938.

Herold, Vilém. *Pražská univerzita a Wyclif. Wyclifovo učení o ideách a geneze husitského revolučního myšlení* (Prague University and Wyclif. Wyclif's doctrines about the Ideas and the genesis of the Hussite revolutionary thought). Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1985.

_____. "Zum Prager philosophischen Wyclifismus." In *Häresie und vorzeitige Reformation im Spätmittelalter*, ed. František Šmahel, 133–146. Munich: Oldenbourg, 1998.

_____. "Ideové kořeny reformace v českých zemích." In *Dějiny politického myšlení*, vol. 2/2, *Politické myšlení pozdního středověku a reformace*, ed. Vilém Herold, Ivan Müller, and Aleš Havlíček, 161–236. Prague: Oikoymenh, 2011.

_____. "The Spiritual Background of the Czech Reformation: Precursors of Jan Hus." In *A Companion to Jan Hus*, ed. František Šmahel and Ota Pavlíček, 69–95. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2015.

Hlaváček, Petr. "Curriculum vitae domini Wieczemili (†1411), plebani ecclesiae beatae Mariae virginis in Zacz. Poznámky k církevnímu životu v královském městě Žatci na přelomu 14. a 15. století (Curriculum vitae domini Wieczemili (†1411), plebani ecclesiae beatae Mariae virginis in Zacz. Comments on the ecclesiastical life in the royal town of Žatec at the turn of the 14th and 15th centuries)." *Sborník okresního archivu v Lounech* X (2001): 34–47.

Holeton, David R. *La communion des tout-petits enfants: Étude du mouvement eucharistique en Bohême vers la fin du Moyen-Âge*. Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 1989.

Holinka, Rudolf. *Sektářství v Čechách před revolucí husitskou* (Heresies in Bohemia before the Hussite revolution). Bratislava: Filosofická fakulta university Komenského, 1929

Holodňák, Petr, and Ivana Ebelová, ed. *Žatec*. Prague: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2004.

Horčička, Adolf. "Ein 'Chronicon breve regni Bohemiae saec. XV'." *Mittheilungen des Vereines für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen* 37/4 (1898/9): 454–467.

Hoyer, Siegfried. "Peter von Dresden und die Anfänge der Hussitenbewegung." *Dresdner Hefte. Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte* 65 (2001): 62–69.

Hruza, Karel. "Propaganda, Kommunikation und Öffentlichkeit im Mittelalter." In *Propaganda, Kommunikation und Öffentlichkeit im Mittelalter (11.–16. Jahrhundert)*, ed. Karel Hruza, 9–25. Vienna: Österreichische Akademi der Wissenschaften, 2002.

Hudson, Anne. "The Hussite catalogues of Wyclif's works." In *Husitství – reformace – renesance. Sborník k 60. narozeninám Františka Šmahela*, vol. 1, ed. Jaroslav Pánek, Jaroslav Boubín, Miloslav Polívka and Noemi Rejchrtová, 401–417. Prague: Historický ústav, 1994.

_____. *The Premature Reformation. Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

_____. "Cross-Referencing in Wyclif's Latin Works." In *The Medieval Church: Universities, Heresy, and the Religious Life*, ed. Peter Biller and Barrie Dobson, 193–215. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1999.

_____. *Studies in the Transmission of Wyclif's Writings*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.

Die Hussiten: Die Chronik des Laurentius von Březová 1414–1421. Ed. Josef Bujnoch (Slavische Geschichtsschreiber, Band XI). Graz, Vienna, and Cologne: Verlag Styria, 1988.

Jan Hus. 600 Jahre Erste Reformation, ed. Andrea Strübind and Tobias Weger. Munich: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2015.

Jan Hus Zwischen Zeiten, Völkern, Konfessionen: Vorträge des internationalen Symposions in Bayreuth vom 22. bis 26. September 1993. Ed. Ferdinand Seibt. Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1997.

Jensen, Kurt Villads. "War Against Muslims according to Benedict of Alignano, OFM." *Archivum Franciscanum historicum* 89/1–2 (1996): 181–195.

Jeroným Pražský: Středověký intelektuál, mučedník české reformace a hrdina národní tradice

(Jerome of Prague. Medieval intellectual, martyr of the Czech Reformation and the hero of national tradition). Ed. Ota Pavlíček. Prague: Filosofia, 2018.

Jeauneau, Édouard. *Rethinking the School of Chartres*. Translated by Claude Paul Desmarais. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

Jukl, Jakub Jiří. "Německého husity Petra Turnova spis po řádech a zvycích církve východní" (A treatise on the cusstoms and rites of the Eastern Church by the German Hussite Peter Turnov). *Theologická revue* 75/3–4 (2004): 436–451.

Kadlec, Jaroslav. "Literární činnost mistra Mařika Rvačky (Literary activity of Master Mařík Rvačka)." In *Pocta Dr. Emmě Urbákové. Spolupracovníci a přátelé k 70. narozeninám* (Honour to Dr. Emma Urbánková. Colleagues and Friends for her 70th Birthday), ed. Pavel R. Pokorný, 145–164. Prague: Státní knihovna ČSR, 1979.

Kalivoda, Robert. *Husitská ideologie* (Hussite ideology). Prague: Československá akademie věd, 1961.

Kaminsky, Howard. "Hussite Radicalism and the Origins of Tábor 1415–1418." *Medievalia et Humanistica* 10 (1956): 102–130.

_____. "The Free Spirit in the Hussite Revolution." In *Millenial Dreams in the Actions*, ed. Sylvia Lettice Thrupp, 166–186. The Hague: Mouton, 1962.

_____. *A History of the Hussite Revolution*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967.

_____. "The Problematics of later-medieval Heresy." In *Husitství – reformace – renesance. Sborník k 60. narozeninám Františka Šmahela*, vol. 1, ed. Jaroslav Pánek, Jaroslav Boubín, Miloslav Polívka and Noemi Rejchrtová, 133–156. Prague: Historický ústav, 1994.

_____. "The Problematics of 'Heresy' and 'The Reformation'." In *Häresie und vorzeitige Reformation im Spätmittelalter*, ed. František Šmahel, 1–22. Munich: Oldenbourg, 1998.

Kärkkäinen, Pekka. "Psychology and the Soul in Late Medieval Erfurt." *Vivarium* 47/4 (2009): 421–443.

Kejř, Jiří. "Z disputací na pražské univerzitě v době Husově a husitské (On disputations at the Prague University in the Times of Hus and Hussitism)." *Sborník historický* 7 (1960): 47–78.

_____. "Z nové literatury o Mikuláši z Drážďan," *Právněhistorické studie* 15 (1971): 221–229.

_____. *Dějiny pražské právnické univerzity* (History of the Prague University of Law).

Prague: Karolinum, 1995.

_____. *Z počátků české reformace* (From the beginnings of the Czech reformation). Brno: L. Marek, 2006.

Kneepkens, C. H. "Some Notes on the Revival of Modistic Linguistics in the Fifteenth Century: Ps.-Johannes Versor and William Zenders of Weert." In *John Buridan and Beyond. Topics in the Language Sciences, 1300–1700,* ed. Russell L. Friedman and Sten Ebbesen, 69–119. Copenhagen: Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, 2004.

Das Konstanzer Konzil als europäisches Ereignis, ed. Gabriela Signori and Birgit Studt. Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2014.

Kopičková, Božena. "Pražský radikalismus a valdenství" (Prague radicalism and Waldensianism). *Pražský sborník historický* 20 (1987): 5–34.

_____. *Jan Želivský* (John of Želiv). Prague: Melantrich, 1990.

Köpstein, Horst. "Ohlasy husitského revolučního hnutí v Německu (International reception of Hussitism)." In *Mezinárodní ohlas husitství*, ed. Josef Macek, 223–283. Prague: Nakladatelství Československé Akademie věd, 1958.

_____. " Zu den Auswirkungen der hussitischen revolutionären Bewegung in Franken." In *Aus 500 Jahren deutsch-tschechoslowakischer Geschichte,* ed. Karl Obermann and Josef Polišenský, 11–40. Berlin: Rütten&Loening, 1958.

_____. "Über die Teilnahme von Deutschen an der hussitischen revolutionären Bewegung – speziell in Böhmen." *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 11/1 (1963): 116–145.

Krauze-Błachowicz, Krystyna. "Johannes Glogoviensis' Concept of Construction." *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric* 6/19 (2003): 31–37.

_____."*Modi significandi* in Johannes Glogoviensis' Grammar." *Mediaevalia. Textos e estudos* 23 (2004): 75–84.

Krmíčková, Helena. *Studie a texty k počátkům kalicha v Čechách* (Studies and texts concerning the origins of the lay chalice in Bohemia). Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 1997.

_____. "Několik poznámek k přijímání maličkých 1414–1416" (A couple of notes on the communion of children 1414–1416), *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity* C 44 (1997): 59–69.

_____."Příspěvek k edici kázání Mikuláše z Drážďan *Sermo ad clerum Nisi manducaveritis*" (Contribution to the Edition of Nicholas of Dresden's tract *Sermo ad clerum Nisi manducaveritis*). *Listy filologické* 123 (2000): 251–299.

_____."The Janovite Theory and the Renewal of the Lay Chalice." In *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice, Volume3: Papers from the XIXth World Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences, Bratislava, 1998*, ed. Zdeněk V. David and David R. Holeton, 63–68. Prague: Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, 2000.

_____. "Jakoubkova utrakvistická díla z roku 1414" (Jacobellus' Utraquist treatises from 1414). In *Jakoubek ze Stříbra. Texty a jejich působení*, ed. Ota Halama and Pavel Soukup, 171–181. Prague: Filosofia, 2006.

_____. "Paběrky z rukopisů univerzitních" (Gleanings from the University manuscripts). In *Campana codex civitas. Miroslao Flodr octogenario*, 179–211. Brno: Archiv města Brna, 2009.

_____. "Kronikář Vavřinec z Březové" (Laurentius of Březová as a chronicler). In *Pro defensa veritatis evangelice*, 33–59. Brno: Masaryk University, 2015.

Krzenck, Thomas. *Johannes Hus. Theologe, Kirchenreformer, Märtyrer*. Gleichen: 2011.

Kurze, Dietrich. *Quellen zur Kerzergeschichte Brandenburgs und Pommerns*. Veröffentlichungen der historischen Kommission zu Berlin, Band 45/6. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1975

Kybal, Vlastimil. *M. Matěj z Janova. Jeho život, spisy a učení.* (M. Matthias of Janov. His life, works and doctrine.) Prague: Královská česká společnost nauk, 1905.

Lahey, Stephen E. "The Sentences Commentary of Jan Hus." In *A Companion to Jan Hus*, ed. František Šmahel and Ota Pavlíček, 130–169. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2015.

_____. "Peter Payne Explains Everything that Happens." In *Jan Hus 1415 a 600 let poté*, ed. Jakub Smrčka and Zdeněk Vybíral, 129–143. Tábor: Husitské museum, 2015.

Lalla, Sebastian . *Secundum viam modernam. Ontologischer Nominalismus bei Bartholomäus Arnoldi von Usingen*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2003.

Lehmann, Paul. "Mitteilungen aus Handschriften VIII. Zu den sprachlogischen Traktaten des Mittelalters." *Sitzungberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Abteilung* 1944/2 (1944): 1–34.

Loserth, Johann. "Ein kirchenpolitischer Dialog aus der Blütezeit des Taboritentums." *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen* 46/2 (1907): 107–121.

Macek, Josef. *Prokop Veliký*. Prague: Naše vojsko, 1953.

Magistri Iohannis Hus Tractatus De ecclesia. Ed. S. H. Thomson. Prague: Komenského

evangelická fakulta bohoslovecká, 1958.

Magistri Iohannis Hus Polemica. Ed. J. Eršil. Prague: Nakladatelství Československé Akademie věd, 1966.

Machatschek, Eduard. *Geschichte der Bischhöfe des Hochstiftes Meissen in chronologischer Reihenfolge*. Dresden: C.C. Meinhold & Söhne, 1884.

Machilek, Franz. "Ein Eichstätter Inquisitionsverfahren aus dem Jahre 1460." *Jahrbuch für fränkische Landesforschung* 34/35 (1975): 417–446

_____. "Deutsche Hussiten." In *Jan Hus zwischen Zeiten, Völkern, Konfessionen: Vorträge des internationalen Symposions in Bayeruth vom 22. bis 26. September 1993*, ed. Ferdinand Seibt, 267–282. Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1997.

_____. "Aufschwung und Niedergang der Zusammenarbeit von Waldensern und Hussiten im 15. Jahrhundert (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Verhältnisse in Deutschland)." In *Friedrich Reiser und die „waldensisch-hussitische Internationale"*, ed. Albert de Lange and Kathrin Utz-Tremp, 277–316. Heidelberg, Ubstadt-Weiher, and Basel: Verlag Regionalkultur, 2006.

_____. "Von der 'Dresdner Schule' in Prag zu Friedrich Reiser und Stephan von Basel – 'Deutsche Hussiten' im 15. Jahrhundert." In *Jan Hus. 600 Jahre Erste Reformation*, ed. Andrea Strübind and Tobias Weger, 43–92. Munich: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2015.

Marin, Olivier, *L'archevêque, le maître et le dévot. Genèses du mouvement réformateur pragois (années 1360–1419)*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2005.

Marmo, Costantino. "A Pragmatic Approach to Language in Modism." In *Sprachtheorien in Spätantike und Mittelalter*, ed. Sten Ebbesen, 169–183. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1995.

Medieval Lives and the Historian. Studies in Medieval Prosopography. Ed. Neithard Bulst and Jean-Philippe Genet. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1986.

Meltzer, Otto. "Die Kreuzschule zu Dresden bis zur Einführung der Reformation (1539)." *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte und Topographie Dresdens unde seiner Umgebung* 7 (1886): 1–62.

_____. "Über die älteste Schulordnung der Kreuzschule zu Dresden." *Neues Archiv für sächsische Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 14 (1893): 291–311.

_____. "Johannes Drändorf, der erste mit Namen bekannte Kreuzschüler." *Dresdner Geschichtsblätter* 10/2 (1901): 21–28.

_____. "Ein Traktat Peters von Dresden." *Dresdner Geschichtsblätter* 16/4 (1907): 193–

202.

Merlo, Grado Giovanni. “Itinerari storiografici dell’ultimo decennio.” In *Valdesi medievali*, ed. Marina Benedetti, 11–21. Torino: Claudiana, 2009.

Molnár, Amedeo. “Hus’ *De matrimonio* and its Waldensian version.” *Communio viatorum* 1/2–3 (1958): 142–157.

_____. “Tresor e lume de fe. En marge di traité de dogmatique vaudoise.” *Communio viatorum* 7/3–4 (1964): 285–289.

_____. “Ohlas Táborské konfese u románských valdenských (The reception of the Taborite confession by the Romance Waldensians).” *Strahovská knihovna* 5–6 (1970–1971): 201–208.

_____. *Valdenští. Evropský rozměr jejich vzdoru* (Waldensians. European extension of their opposition). Prague: Ústřední církevní nakladatelství, 1973.

_____. *Gesammelte Beiträge zur deutschen und europäischen Universitätsgeschichte: Strukturen, Personen, Entwicklungen*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Morée, Peter. “Not Preaching from the Pulpit, but Marching in the Streets: The communist use of Jan Hus.” In *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice, Volume 6: Papers from the Sixth International Symposium on the Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice, sponsored by the Philosophical Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic held at Vila Lanna, Prague, 23–25 June 2004*, ed. Zdeněk V. David and David R. Holeton, 283–296. Prague: Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, 2007.

Müller, Johannes. “Die Anfänge des sächsischen Schulwesens.” *Neues Archiv für sächsische Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 8 (1887): 1–40, 243–271.

Müller, Joseph Theodor. “Magister Nikolaus von Dresden.” *Zeitschrift für Brüdergeschichte* 9 (1915): 80–109.

Mutlová, Petra. “Vybrané prameny k existenci drážďanské školy” (Selected sources on the existence of the Dresden School). In *Querite primum regnum Dei. Sborník příspěvků k poctě Jany Nechutové,* ed. Helena Krmíčková and others, 553–560. Brno: Matice moravská, FF MU, 2006.

_____. “Communicating Texts through Images: Nicholas of Dresden’s *Tabule*.” In *Public Communication in European Reformation*, ed. Milena Bartlová and Michal Šroněk, 29–37. Prague: Artefactum, 2007.

_____. “*Sed prugdulor, finis sine fine*: O edici *Apologie* Mikuláše z Drážďan” (*Sed prugdulor, finis sine fine*: On the edition of Nicholas of Dresden’s *Apologia*). *Studia historica Brunensia* 56/1–2 (2009): 21–36.

_____. “Mikuláše z Drážďan Sermo ad clerum 1416, kritická edice” (Nicholas of Dresden’s Sermo ad clerum 1416, a critical edition). *Studia historica Brunensia* 62/1 (2015): 295–312.

Nechutová, Jana. Review of *Master Nicholas of Dresden. The Old Color and the New*, by Howard Kaminsky, Dean Loy Bilderback, Imre Boba and Patricia N. Rosenberg. *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské university* C 13/15 (1966): 198–200.

_____. *Místo Mikuláše z Drážďan v raném reformačním myšlení* (Nicholas of Dresden’s place in the early Reformation ideology). Prague: Academia, 1967.

Neues allgemeines deutsches Adels-Lexikon, vol. 2. Ed. E. H. Kneschke. 2nd ed. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1996.

Neumann, Augustin. “Glossy v Drändorfově postile (The glosses in Drändorf’s Postil).” *Hlídka* 41/11 (1924): 457–465.

New Perspectives on Historical Writing. Ed. Peter Burke. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001.

Nodl, Martin. *Dějepisectví mezi vědou a politikou: úvahy o historiografii 19. a 20. století* (Historiography between Science and Politics: Reflections of historiography of the 19th and 20th centuries). Brno: Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury, 2007.

_____. “*Iurare vel promittere*. Příspěvek k problematice pražských univerzitních statut” (*Iurare vel promittere*. A contribution to the problem of the statues of Prague University). *AUC–HUCP* 47/1–2 (2007): 49–57.

_____. *Dekret kutnohorský* (The Kuttenberg Decree). Prague: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2010.

_____. *Das Kuttenberger Dekret von 1409. Von der Eintracht zum Konflikt der Prager Universitätsnationen*. Köln – Weimar – Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 2017.

Parkes, M. B. *Scribes, Scripts and Readers. Studies in the Communication, Presentation and Dissemination of Medieval Texts*. London and Rio Grande: The Hambledon Press, 1991.

Patschovsky, Alexander. *Der Passauer Anonymus. Ein Sammelwerk über Ketzer, Juden, Antichrist aus der Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts*. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1968.

Pekař, Josef. *Žižka a jeho doba* (Žižka and his times). 3rd ed. Prague: Odeon, 1992.

Pelzel, Franz Martin. *Lebensgeschichte des Römischen und Böhmischen Königs Wenceslaus*. Vol. 2. Prague and Leipzig: in der von Schönfeldischen=Meißnerischen Buchhandlung, 1790.

Pinborg, Jan. *Die Entwicklung der Sprachtheorie im Mittelalter*. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967.

Pocta Dr. Emmě Urbákové. Spolupracovníci a přátelé k 70. narozeninám (Honour to Dr. Emma Urbánková. Colleagues and Friends for her 70th Birthday). Ed. Pavel R. Pokorný. Prague: Státní knihovna ČSR, 1979.

Prantl, Carl von. *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande*, vol. 4. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel, 1870.

Richter, Otto. *Geschichte der Stadt Dresden*. Dresden: Baensch, 1900.

_____. "Dresdens Bedeutung in der Geschichte." *Dresdner Geschichtsblätter* 16/4 (1907): 185–193.

Rivers, Kimberley A. *Preaching the Memory of Virtue and Vice: Memory, Images, and Preaching in the late Middle Ages*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2010.

Rouse, Mary A., and Richard H. Rouse. *Authentic Witnesses: Approaches to Medieval Texts and Manuscripts*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991.

Saenger, Paul. *Space Between Words. The Origins of Silent Reading*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Sborník přednášek věnovaných životu a dílu anglického husity Petra Payna-Engliše 1456–1956 (The collection of lectures dedicated to the life and work of the English Hussite Peter Payne-Engliš 1456–1956). Ed. Josef Polišenský. Prague: Universitas Carolina, 1957.

Schmidtová, Anežka. "Z bohemik vratislavské universitní knihovny" (Bohemica from the Wroclaw University Library). *Listy filologické* 83 (1960): 98–105.

Schmutz, Jürg. *Juristen für das Reich. Die deutschen Rechtsstudenten an der Universität Bologna 1265–1425*. 2 vols. Basel: Schwabe, 2000.

Schwinges, Rainer Christoph. "Zur Prosopographie studentischer Reisegruppen im Fünfzehnten Jahrhundert." In *Medieval Lives and the Historian. Studies in Medieval Prosopography*, ed. Neithard Bulst and Jean-Philippe Genet, 333–341. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, 1986.

_____. *Deutsche Universitätsbesucher im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert. Studien zur Sozialgeschichte des Alten Reiches*. Stuttgart: Steiner-Verlag Wiesbaden, 1986.

_____. "Das Reich im gelehrten Europa. Ein Essay aus personengeschichtlicher Perspektive." In *Heilig – Römisch – Deutsch. Das Reich im mittelalterlichen Europa*,

ed. Bernard Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter, 227–250. Dresden: Michel Sandstein Verlag, 2006.

Sedlák, Jan. "Mgri Stanislai de Znoyma Sermo contra quinque articulos Wiclef." *Hlídka* 28 (1911): appendix 47–60.

_____. *Mikuláš z Drážďan* (Nicholas of Dresden). Brno: Hlídka, 1914.

_____. *Studie a texty k náboženským dějinám českým*. 2 vols. Olomouc: Matice Cyrilometodějská, 1914–1915.

Seibt, Ferdinand. *Hussitica. Zur Struktur einer Revolution*. Cologne and Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1965.

_____. "Von Prag bis Rostock: Zur Gründung der Universitäten in Mitteleuropa." In *Festschrift für Walter Schlesinger*, ed. Helmut Beumann, 406–426. Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1973.

Selge, Kurt-Victor. "Heidelberger Ketzerprozesse in der Frühzeit der hussitischen Revolution." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 82 (1971): 167–202.

Sirridge, Mary. "Thomas of Erfurt." In *Sourcebook in the History of Philosophy of Language: Primary source texts from the Pre-Socratics to Mill*, ed. Margaret Cameron, Benjamin Hill, and Robert J. Stainton, 295–303. Cham: Springer, 2017.

Sommerfeldt, Gustav. "Johann Falkenbergs Stellung zur Papstfrage in der Zeit vor dem Pisaner Konzil (1408)." *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 31 (1910): 421–437.

Soukup, Pavel. *Jan Hus*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2014.

_____. "Jan Hus und der Prager Ablassstreit von 1412." In *Ablasskampagnen des Spätmittelalters. Luthers Thesen von 1517 im Kontext*, ed. Andreas Rehberg, 485–500. Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter, 2017.

Southern, Richard W. *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies*. New York and Evanston: Harper&Row, 1970.

_____. "The Schools of Paris and the School of Chartres." In *Renaissance and the Renewal in the twelfth century*, ed. Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable with Carol D. Lanham, 113–137. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

Spinka, Matthew. *John Hus. A Biography*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Spunar, Pavel and Anežka Vidmanová. Review of *Master Nicholas of Dresden. The Old*

Color and the New, by Howard Kaminsky, Dean Loy Bilderback, Imre Boba and Patricia N. Rosenberg. *Listy filologické* 90/2 (1967): 208–210.

Spunar, Pavel. "K literární pozůstalosti kněze Prokopa Holého" (On the literary inheritance of the priest Prokop Holý). In *Pocta Dr. Emmě Urbánkové. Spolupracovníci a přátelé k 70. narozeninám* (Honour to Dr. Emma Urbánková. Colleagues and Friends for her 70th Birthday), ed. Pavel R. Pokorný, 325–347. Prague: Státní knihovna ČSR, 1979.

Stejskal, Karel. "Poznámky k současnému stavu bádání o Jenském kodexu" (Notes on the present state of knowledge concerning the Jena codex). *Umění* 9 (1961): 1–30.

Stočes, Jiří. "Die Prager Juristenuniversität nach 1409 – Agonie, Auslaufmodel oder die Suche nach einem neuen Anfang?". *AUC–HUCP* XLIX/2 (2009): 65–70.

_____. *Pražské univerzitní národy do roku 1409* (Prague University Nations until 1409). Prague: Karolinum, 2010.

Süß, Peter A. *Grundzüge der Würzburger Universitätsgeschichte 1402–2002. Eine Zusammenschau*. Neustadt an der Aisch: Degener, 2007.

Svatoš, Michal, ed. *Dějiny Univerzity Karlovy* (A history of the Charles University). Vol. 1, *1347/48–1622*. Prague: Karolinum, 1995.

Svejkovský, František. "Divadlo raného a vrcholného feudalismu a krize divadla za husitství" (Theatre in the early and high Feudalism and the crisis of theatre during the Hussite period). In *Dějiny českého divadla*, vol. 1, ed. František Černý and others, 24–84. Prague: Academia, 1968.

Šmahel, František. Review of *Nicola della Rosa Nera detto da Dresa (1380?–1416?). De reliquiis et De veneratione sanctorum: De purgatorio*, by Romolo Cegna. *Husitský Tábor* 2 (1979): 158–159.

_____. "Kvodlitební diskuse ke kvestii principalis Michala z Malenic roku 1412 (The *quodlibet* disputation on the *questio principalis* of Michal of Malenic from 1412)." *AUC–HUCP* 21/1 (1981): 27–52.

_____. "Od středověku k novověku: Modi legendi et videndi" (From Middle Ages to Modern Times: Modi legendi et videndi). *Umění* 32 (1984): 318–330.

_____. *Dějiny Tábora* (The history of Tábor). 2 vols. České Budějovice: Jihočeské nakladatelství, 1988–1990.

_____. "Die Tabule veteris et novi coloris als audiovisuelles Medium hussitischer Agitation." *Studie o rukopisech* 29 (1992): 95–105.

_____. "Fakulta svobodných umění" (Faculty of Arts). In *Dějiny univerzity Karlovy*, vol. 1, *1347/48–1622*, 101–134. Ed. Michal Svatoš. Prague: Karolinum, 1995.

_____. “Curriculum vitae Magistri Petri Payne.” In *In memoriam Josefa Macka (1922–1991)*, ed. Miloslav Polívka and František Šmahel, 141–160. Prague: Historický ústav, 1996.

_____. “Crypto- et semi-vaudois dans la Bôheme hussite.” *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 217/1 (2000): 101–120.

_____. *Idea národa v husitských Čechách* (The idea of a nation in the Hussite Bohemia). Prague: Argo, 2000.

_____. *Husitská revoluce* (The Hussite revolution). 4 vols. Prague: Karolinum, 1995–1996. German edition: *Die Hussitische Revolution*. 3 vols. Translated and edited by Thomas Krzenck and Alexander Patschovky. Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften, 43. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2002.

_____. “Audiovizuální media husitské agitace” (Audiovisual Media of Hussite Agitation). In *Mezi středověkem a renesancí*. Ed. František Šmahel, 231–237. Prague: Argo, 2002.

_____. “Das Lesen der unlesbaren Inschriften: Männer mit Zeigestäben.” In *The Development of Literate Mentalities in East Central Europe*, ed. Anna Adamska and Marco Mostert, 453–467. Turnhout: Brepols, 2005.

_____. “Magister Peter Payne: Curriculum vitae eines englischen Nonkonformisten.” In *Friedrich Reiser und die „waldensisch-hussitische Internationale“*, ed. Albert de Lange and Kathrin Utz-Tremp, 241–260. Heidelberg, Ubstadt-Weiher, and Basel: Verlag Regionalkultur, 2006.

_____. “Návraty bájné kněžny Libuše a jiné folklórní záznamy v publicistice husitského věku” (Returns of Princess Libuše and other folkloric accounts in reports from the Hussite era). In *Querite primum regnum Dei. Sborník příspěvků k poctě Jany Nechutové*, ed. Helena Krmíčková and others, 535–543. Brno: Matice moravská, FF MU, 2006.

_____. *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter: Gesammelte Aufsätze / The Charles University in the Middle Ages: Selected Studies.* Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007.

_____. *Jan Hus. Život a dílo* (Jan Hus. Life and Work). Prague: Argo, 2013.

Tomek, Wácslav Wladivoj. *Základy starého místopisu Pražského* (Fundamentals of the old topography of Prague). Vol. 2, *Nové Město Pražské* (New Town of Prague). Prague: Královská česká společnost nauk, 1866.

_____. *Dějepis města Prahy* (Topography of the city of Prague). Prague: 1875.

Traxler, Christina. “Früher Antihussitismus. Der Traktat *Eloquenti viro* und sein Verfasser

Andreas von Brod." *Archa Verbi* 12 (2015): 130–177.

Truhlář, Josef. "Paběrky z rukopisů Klementinských" (Gleanings from the Klementinum manuscripts). *Věstník České Akademie císaře Františka Josefa pro vědy, společnost a umění* 7 (1898): 660–664; *Český časopis historický* 10 (1904): 201–202.

Tříška, Josef. *Literární činnost předhusitské pražské univerzity* (Literary work of the pre-Hussite University). Prague: Universita Karlova, 1967.

_____. *Rétorický styl a pražská univerzitní literatura ve středověku* (Rhetorical style and Prague University literature in the Middle Ages). Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1977.

_____."Příspěvky k středověké literární universitě" (Contributions to the medieval literary university). *AUC–HUCP* 9/2 (1968): 5–43.

Uhlirz, Mathilde. "Petrus von Dresden. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Laienkelches." *Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereines für die Geschichte Mährens und Schlesiens* 18 (1914): 227–238.

Urbánek, Rudolf. K počátkům kronikářské činnosti kancléře Nového města Pražského Prokopa písaře (On the beginnings of the chronicle of Prokop, the chancellor of the Prague New Town). In *Sborník prací k poctě 75. narozenin akademika Václava Vojtíška,* ed. Václav Husa, 157–178. Prague: Universita Karlova, 1958.

Urbánková, Kateřina. "De codicillis manu scriptis Bibliothecae Universitatis Pragensis XXIII F 204 foliis 38r–43v." M.A. thes., Masaryk University, 1999.

Valdesi medievali. Bilanci e prospettive di ricerca, ed. Marina Benedetti. Torino: Claudiana, 2009.

Verboon, Annemieke R. "Brain Ventricle Diagrams: A Century After Walther Sudhoff. New Manuscript Sources from the XVth century." *Sudhoffs Archiv. Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 98/2 (2014): 212–233.

_____. "Transmitting school-philosophy. Thomistic commitments regarding sense perception in a 15th-century Cologne student manuscript." In *Bücher und Identitäten. Literarische Reproduktionskulturen der Vormoderne*, ed. Eckhart Lutz, Nicole Eichenberger, and Crisitne Putzo, 1–43. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2017 (pre-publication version).

Vlk, Jan, ed. *Dějiny Prahy* (History of Prague). Vol. 1, *Od nejstarších dob do sloučení měst pražských [1784]* (From the oldest times to the union of the towns of Prague [1784]). Prague and Litomyšl: Paseka, 1997.

Vlk, Miloslav. "Obrazy v Betlémské kapli. Rozbor historických pramenů" (Paintings in the

Bethlehem chapel. An analysis of historical sources). *Časopis Národního muzea* 130/1 (1961): 151–169.

_____."K otázce předlohy Jenského kodexu" (On the model of the Jena codex). *Sborník Národního muzea v Praze* A XVII (1963): 1–19.

_____. "Paleografický rozbor Jenského kodexu" (Palaeographical analysis of the Jena codex). *Sborník historický* 14 (1966): 49–74.

_____. "Jenský kodex – kodikologický rozbor" (The Jena codex – a codicological analysis). *Sborník Národního muzea v Praze* A XXI (1967): 73–106.

Wei, Ian P. *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris. Theologians and the University, c. 1100–1330*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Weinberg, Bella Hass. "Predecessors of Scientific Indexing Structures in the Domain of Religion." In *The History and Heritage of Scientific and Technological Information Systems. Proceedings of the 2002 Conference,* ed. W. Boyd Rayward and Mary Ellen Bowden, 126–134. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc., 2004.

Wetherbee, Winthrop. "The School of Chartres." In *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jorge J. E. Gracia and Timothy B. Noone, 36–44. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2002.

Zilynská, Blanka. "From Learned Disputation to the Happening: The Propagation of Faith through Work and Image." In *Public Communication in European Reformation Artistic and Other Media in Central Europe 1380–1620*, ed. Milena Bartlová and Michal Šroněk, 55–67. Prague: Artefactum, 2007.

_____. "Johann Hoffmann: Prager Student, antihussitischer Repräsentant und Bischof von Meissen." *Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis* XLIX/2 (2009): 81–98.

Zupko, Jack. "Thomas of Erfurt." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2015 Edition)*, ed. Edward N. Zalta. Available at: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/erfurt/

Subsidia

Bartoš, František Michálek. *Soupis rukopisů Národního musea v Praze* (Catalogue of manuscripts of the National Museum in Prague). 2 vol. Prague: Melantrich, 1926–1927.

Biografický slovník českých zemí (Biographical dictionary of the Czech lands). Vol. 8. *Brun–By*. Ed. Jana Brabencová and others. Prague: Academia, 2007.

Biographisch-bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon. Vol. 1. Ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Bautz.

Hamm: Bautz, 1990.

Brepolis Databases. Brepols Publishers. Accessible through *Litterae ante portas* server: [http://litterae.phil.muni.cz/index.php].

Brodský, Pavel. "Rukopisy Otakara Kruliše-Randy v knihovně Národního muzea (Manuscripts of Otakar Kruliš-Randa in the library of the National Museum)." *Miscellanea oddělení rukopisů a vzácných tisků* 7/2 (1990): 19–30.

Burkhart, Peter. *Katalog der Handschriften der Universitäts-Bibliothek Leipzig*. Vol. 5. *Die lateinischen und deutschen Handschriften*. Vol. 2. *Die theologischen Handschriften*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999.

Dokoupil, Vladislav. *Soupis rukopisů mikulovské dietrichsteinské knihovny* (List of manuscripts from the Dietrichstein Library of Mikulov). Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1958.

Dragoun, Michal. *Soupis středověkých rukopisů knihovny Národního muzea. Doplňky ke katalogům F. M. Bartoše, J. Vašici a J. Vajse*. Prague: Národní muzeum – Scriptorium, 2011.

Flajšhans, Václav. "Bohemika Gersdorfské knihovny v Budyšíně" (Bohemica of the Gersdorf library in Bautzen). *Časopis musea království českého* 83/1 (1909): 133–138.

Fliege, Jutta. *Die lateinischen Handschriften der Stadtbibliothek Dessau. Bestandverzeichnis aus dem Zentralinventar mittealterlicher Handschriften (ZIF).* Berlin: Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, 1986.

Goeber, Willi. *Katalog rękopisów dawnej Biblioteki Uniwersyteckiej we Wrocławiu* (Catalogue of manuscripts from the Old University Library in Wroclaw). Vol. 1. *I F 226–299*; vol. 2, *I F 300–430*; vol. 5, *I F 661–778*; vol. 14, *I Q 71–120*.

Keller, Karl Heinz. *Die mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Eichstätt*. Vol. 3. *Aus Cod. st 471 – Cod. st 699*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2004.

Kowalcyzk, Maria, Miecislaus Markowski, Jerzy Zathey, and Marian Zwiercan, eds. *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum medii aevi Latinorum qui in Bibliotheca Jagellonica Cracoviae asservantur*. Vol. 2, *Numeros continens inde ab 332 usque ad 444*. Wroclaw: Instytut Ossolinianum, 1982.

Krzenck, Thomas. "Die Bautzener Hussitica der ehemaligen Gersdorfschen Bibliothek." *Studie o rukopisech* 31 (1995–1996): 153–178.

Latinitatis medii aevi lexicon Bohemorum. Ed. Dana Martínková, Zuzana Silagiová and others. 20 vols. Prague: Academia, 1987–.

Lexikon české literatury. Osobnosti, díla, instituce (Lexicon of Czech literature. Personalities,

works, institutions). Ed. Vladimír Forst and others. 4 vols. Prague: Academia, 1985–2008.

Lexikon des Mittelalters. CD–ROM. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag, 2000.

Lohr, Charles H. "Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries, Authors: Narcissus – Richardus." *Traditio* 28 (1972): 281–396.

Overgaauw, Eef. *Mittelalterliche Handschriften im Landeshauptarchiv Koblenz*. Vol. 2. *Die nichtarchivischen Handschriften der Signaturengruppe Best. 701 Nr. 191-992*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002.

Patera, Adolf, and Antonín Podlaha. *Soupis rukopisů knihovny metropolitní kapitoly pražské* (Catalogue of manuscripts of the Metropolitan Chapter Library in Prague). 2 vols. Prague: Česká akademie císaře Františka Josefa pro vědy, slovesnost a umění, 1910–1922.

Petr, Stanislav. *Soupis rukopisů knihovny při farním kostele svatého Jakuba v Brně* (Catalogue of manuscripts from the library of the parish church of St. Jacob in Brno). Prague: Masarykův ústav a Archiv Akademie věd ČR, 2007.

Podlaha, Antonín, ed. *Doplňky a opravy k soupisu rukopisů knihovny metropolitní kapitoly pražské* (Supplements and corrections to the catalogue of manuscripts of the Metropolitan Chapter in Prague). Prague: Sumptibus S. F. Metropolitani capituli Pragensis, 1928.

Prokeš, Jaroslav. *Husitika vatikánské knihovny v Římě* (Hussitica in the Vatican library in Rome). Prague: Orbis, 1928.

Repertorium Initiorum Manuscriptorum Latinorum Medii Aevi. Ed. Jacqueline Hamesse and Sławomir Szyller. Leuven: Brepols, 2008.

Richterová, Alena. *Děčínské rukopisy ze sbírky Františka Martina Pelcla (1734–1801), nyní ve fondech Národní knihovny České republiky* (The Děčín manuscripts from the collection of František Martin Pelcl (1734–1801), now in the National Library of the Czech Republic). Prague: Národní knihovna, 2007.

Schwarzenberg, Karl. *Katalog der kroatischen, polnischen und tschechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*. Vienna: Brüder Holinek, 1972.

Schum, Wilhelm. *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der Amplonianischen Handschriften-Sammlung zu Erfurt*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1887.

Spunar, Pavel, and František Michálek Bartoš. *Soupis pramenů k literární činnosti M. Jana Husa a M. Jeronýma Pražského* (List of sources pertaining to the literary activity of Master Jan Hus and Master Jerome of Prague). Prague: Historický ústav ČSAV, 1965.

_____. *Repertorium auctorum Bohemorum provectum idearum post Universitatem Pragensem conditam illustrans*. 2 vols. Wroclaw, Warsaw, Cracow, Gdańsk, Łodź, and Prague: Academia Scientiarum Polona – Academia Scientiarum Bohemica, 1985–1995.

Tabulae codicum manu scriptorum praeter graecos et orientales in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asservatorum. Ed. Academia Caesarea Vindobonensis. Vienna: Gerold, 1864–1899.

Thurn, Hans. *Die Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Würzburg*. Vol. 2/1, *Handschriften aus benediktischen Provenienzen*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1973.

Tošnerová, Marie, Pavel Brodský, Marta Hradilová, and Stanislav Petr, eds. *Průvodce po rukopisných fondech v České republice*. Vol. 4, *Rukopisné fondy centrálních a církevních knihoven České republiky*. Prague: Archiv AV ČR, 2004.

Truhlář, Josef. *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum Latinorum, qui in c.r. Bibliotheca publica atque Universitatis Pragensis asservantur*. 2 vols. Prague: Regia societas scientiarum Bohemicae, 1905–1906.

Tříška, Josef. *Životopisný slovník předhusitské pražské univerzity 1348–1409* (Biographical dictionary of the pre-Hussite Prague University 1348–1409). Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1981.

Urbánková, Emma. "Přírůstky rukopisného oddělení Universitní knihovny od vydání tištěných katalogů" (Additions of the Manuscript Department of the University Library since the Publication of the Printed Catalogues). *Knihovna* 1 (1957): 41–64.

Verfasserlexikon. Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. 14 vols. Ed. Wolfgang Stammler and Karl Langosch, red. Christine Stöllinger-Löser. 2nd ed. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1978–2008.

Włodek, Zofia. "Inventaire des manuscrits médiévaux latins, philosophiques et théologiques de la Bibliothèque des Pères Dominicains de Cracovie." *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 14 (1970): 155–186.