

UDC 260.1:929 Hus J.
27-9"13/14"

Jonatan Vinkler

**Text and context: *De Ecclesia* – M. Jan Hus’s fateful text
and its historical “context”**

The paper focuses on the historical and textual circumstances surrounding the most important work of the Czech theologian Jan Hus – the Latin treatise *De Ecclesia* (1413). This comprehensive work, comprising 23 chapters (about 240 typed pages), was not only the medium that brought Hus’s name to the church dignitaries gathered at the Council of Constance but also proved to be fatal for the author himself. For the bill of indictment and finally the sentence on the Czech theologian presented before the Council was mainly composed on the basis of what he articulated in *De Ecclesia*. Another factor contributing to the fame of this text was certainly the slogan created at this Church Council that Hus’s critical thinking on the Church “demolishes the papacy just as much as Christianity demolishes the Koran”, while up to the time of the first textual criticism research into Hus’s writings at the end of the 19th century, *De Ecclesia* was considered the most important and most original of his works. It was essentially influenced by at least two treatises by the English theologian, Biblical scholar and university professor John Wycliffe (1331–1384), namely *De Ecclesia* (1378) and *De potestate papae* (1378), while noticeable textually genealogical links with Wycliffe’s other writings – *De civili dominio*, *De blasphemia*, *De fide catholica*, *De paupertate Christi*, *Ad argumenta aemuli* – and with his sermons have been established. Such a textual genealogy on the level of Wycliffe-Hus theology *about the Church and its structure, indulgences and papal power* signalizes the reproductive reception of Wycliffism and thus through the semantic and operative fields of resistance against the supreme authority of the papal throne reveals the intellectual historical link between Wycliffe, Hus and his Bohemian and German historical successors – the Lutheran Reformation of the 16th century. Like Hus in his treatise *De Ecclesia*, Martin Luther in his *Resolutiones disputationum de indulgentiarum virtute* (1518), in comparable historical conditions, also primarily based

his intellectual arguments on the discussion concerning *indulgences* and on criticism of the shameless brokering with the power of the keys. For like Václav Tiem and his commissioners with the indulgences of Pope John XXIII, a hundred years later Tetzel and the Fuggers right at the beginning gave the indulgences of Pope Leon X (or rather Archbishop Albrecht of Brandenburg) a bad reputation – and gave Luther grounds for thinking not only about indulgences but also such fundamental matters as the “extreme conditions” for God’s grace and salvation (by faith alone).

Key words: Jan Hus, the treatise *De Ecclesia*, the sale of indulgences, doctrine on the church, the Council of Constance

UDC 284.1:274:378(430)"16"

Emidio Campi

Was the Reformation a German event?

The present essay argues that the Reformation is too important to be used merely as the founding myth of a nation, let alone of a confessional hero. It further suggests that reconsidering the Reformation within the framework of the communalization and confessionalization paradigms may assist in a more effective study of its theological tenets and its impact on the rise of early modern Europe, without clinging to ideological or confessional traditions. Having appealed to history, however, we must also abide by history. While there are questions we must raise for ourselves and answer by ourselves, to which the voices of the past may be irrelevant or even fallacious, there are other questions, and these are the most profound, to answer which the voices of the past may freshly intervene. Thus, even a working historian ought not to be shocked or surprised by the perception of the Reformation articulated in 1518 by a (then) obscure Augustinian friar of the Saxon Province: “The church – he said – needs a reformation, but this is not something for one person, the pope, also not many cardinals, [...] but rather for the entire world, or more correctly, for God alone. The time for such a reformation is known only by him who created time.”

UDC 726:929 Vergerij P.P.

Dirk Kottke

The lost epitaph of Pier Paolo Vergerio (1489–1565)

Pier Paolo Vergerio the Younger, a papal nuncio, Catholic bishop, a fierce critic of the papacy and a religious refugee in the Swiss and German lands, was born in the then Venetian town of Capodistria (today Koper/Capodistria in Slovenia) and died in Tübingen, where he was buried in the famous Stiftskirche. A stone memorial and a wooden epitaph

were set up in the church. Both were removed during the Thirty Years' War (in 1635) by Catholic adversaries, but in 1672 they were set up again. However, in the following centuries the memorial and epitaph were lost during renovations. The memorial was found and set up again in the church in 1947, whereas the wooden epitaph remained lost. Based on sources and a survey of the literature, the present article reconstructs the inscription on the lost epitaph. It also establishes that the epitaph was certainly still in the church until after 1855 and most probably disappeared during the 1867 renovation of the church.

UDC 811.163.6"15":929 Krelj S.

Majda Merše

Krelj's *Postilla slovenska* (1567) and its relationship to Spangenberg's original text

Krelj's *Postilla slovenska* (1567) is a translation of Spangenberg's postil. Already at the end of the 19th century V. Oblak established that Krelj did not keep closely to the original source, but expanded Spangenberg's text with number of additions, most of which are critical ones. This new, more extensive comparison of Krelj's translation with Spangenberg's text was made with the aim of discerning the characteristics of Krelj's translating technique and establishing the extent and types of the additions. It has ascertained that Krelj's additions are diverse, both with regard to their function and their content. In most cases, they were added to facilitate the understanding of the text. For this purpose he included explanatory notes and concrete facts, references to the Old and New Testaments, the evangelists and prophets, quotes from the Bible and from other sources, etc. With his often negatively or positively evaluating comments, Krelj dealt critically with specific ecclesiastic and secular matters, especially the teachings and actions of his religious opponents (the "papists").

Krelj's additions and alterations demonstrate his thorough understanding of biblical content and religious teaching (especially Protestant baselines), his acquaintance with (sinful) human nature and with the everyday life of people of different social strata.

Many explanatory or critical additions are formed as double or triple formulas (e.g. *Siegel* (SA 1559: XXXVIIa) → *Sigill alli pezhah* (KPo 1567: XLVIIIb)) which can be considered from different aspects: with regard to origin, acceptance, word class, the semantic relation between parts of a sentence, etc. In some places Krelj's translation differs from Spangenberg's text in either enhanced or reduced expressiveness, as indicated by the inconsistent use of diminutives, modifiers, phrasemes, interjections, etc. Points of departure from Spangenberg's text also include Krelj's own choice of different linguistic possibilities (e.g. a personal form instead of impersonal, passive instead of active voice and vice versa, with descriptive substitutes for substantive compounds, phrasemes, etc.), partly necessitated by differences in the language systems of German and Slovene. One of the most noticeable, stylistically effective departures from the underlying text is the inconsistent use of a postmodifier (e.g. *durch fein wort* (SA 1559: LXXIXa) → *škusi befedo fvoio* (KPo 1567: CXa)).

UDC 090.1:"16":929 Prešeren J. K.

*Luka Vidmar***A collector of Protestant books – Janez Krstnik Prešeren,
Ljubljana Cathedral provost**

The article deals with the Ljubljana Cathedral provost Janez Krstnik Prešeren, who collected Protestant books both for professional reasons and out of personal interest, although this activity was forbidden in the Catholic Church and the Habsburg Monarchy. Despite his peasant background, he managed a rapid ascent of the social ladder: as an expert in international and ecclesiastical law and church history in the 1680s, he became a counsellor, diplomat and head of the library of the Salzburg archbishops, in 1692 he was appointed the Ljubljana Cathedral provost, and in 1693 was elected the first president of *Academia operosum*. He purchased Protestant books on his numerous journeys, whether in Protestant lands such as Brandenburg or on the black market in Catholic book-trade centres such as Venice. His unshakable faithfulness to the Catholic Church, the Habsburg dynasty and its pro-Catholic policy proved no obstacle to this activity. His library contained works by the predecessors of the Reformation (Savonarola, von Hutten), outstanding German Protestants of the 16th century (Luther, Melancthon) and early Protestant chroniclers of the Reformation (Schard, Sleidanus, Carion). He was also attracted by younger Dutch and German Protestant authors (Penon, Grotius, Conring, Megerlin). He read a considerable number of works connected with the Slovene Reformation: the polemical writings of Peter Pavel Vergerij the Younger, directed against the Tridentine Council and the Inquisition, Trubar's translation of Luther's *Hišna postila* (1595), Dalmatin's *Biblija* and Megiser's *Thesaurus Polyglottus* (1603). He collected many political discussions, essays and pamphlets which in the spirit of the Protestant north and with its arguments attacked the established order of Catholic Europe, especially works by Bocalini, Pallavicini, Sarpi in Leti. He also followed anti-Jesuit literature (Schoppe, abbé Dupré). Prešeren was the greatest Carniolan collector of Slovene and European Protestant books between Valvasor and Zois. He did not seek permission for such reading from the Inquisition or the local ordinary, as he was obliged to do according to the regulations of the Roman Index of Prohibited Books. Nor did he hide these books from his friends of the cathedral chapter and the *Academia operosum*, while before his death he described and bequeathed them together with his other books to the Public Library. In Prešeren's time the anathema which formally still applied to such books had almost entirely lost its force among the social and intellectual elite of the Habsburg Monarchy.

UDC 811.163.6"15"929 Dalmatin J.

*Melita Zemljak Jontes****Drushina and Obitel* as technical terms from the Register of the translation of Dalmatin's *Biblija* in the dictionaries of the Slovene language on the *Fran* website**

The article elucidates the use of the common technical terms *Drushina* ('family') and *Obitel* ('family') from the sphere of social terminology, as Jurij Dalmatin recorded them in the Register of his translation of *Biblija*. The author shows to what extent and with which semantic markers these two technical terms occur in historical dictionaries, in contemporary general dictionaries of the Slovene (standard) language and in terminological dictionaries on the *Fran* website, thus showing the (non-)continuity and semantic extension/restriction of the dictionary use of both technical terms from the 16th to the 21st centuries. The headword *družina* is cited in all the dictionaries dealt with, while the headword *obitelj* occurs in only two of the historical dictionaries – in *Besedje slovenskega knjižnega jezika 16. stoletja* and in Pleteršnik's *Slovensko-nemški slovar* – and in only one general dictionary – *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. The headword *obitelj* carries just one meaning, while the headword *družina* has several meanings; it can refer to members of a narrow or broad (blood) relationship or household servants or any other group of people linked by a common goal. Terminological dictionaries offer the meanings of individual technical spheres exclusively for the headword *družina*; in all meanings in the broadest sense it denotes some community, group, complete entity, family, whose narrow technical meanings can nevertheless be linked with the basic meanings of the historical, general and dialect dictionaries. It can be established that the example *družina* from social terminology, such as Dalmatin recorded in the Register of the translation of *Biblija*, in the dictionaries treated (available on the *Fran* website) from the 16th to the 21st centuries is still completely alive, semantically it is also mostly represented in a relatively comparative manner. The word *družina* with its animacy certainly brought about its transfer to other technical spheres, with the common denominator of designating a group of something. The word *obitelj*, also of Slavonic origin according to Pleteršnik, shows animacy in the 16th century, though to a definitely smaller degree than *družina*, but by the end of the 19th century its use was waning, which is confirmed by it being an archaic remnant of the language in the 21st century.

Key words: technical expressions, social terminology, *Drushina*, *Obitel*, *družina*, *obitelj*, Jurij Dalmatin, Register, *Biblija*.

UDC 94(497.4:497.5)
327(497.;497.5):284.1

Vincenc Rajšp

The connection between the Slovene and Croatian Reformations

The connection between the Slovene and Croatian Reformations is illuminated by extensive historical literature but the research to date has dealt with both movements from a standpoint that led to conclusions and evaluation concerning their significance for national development. Much attention was paid to the importance of the reformers' activities in the sphere of language and literature, and to the personalities who were active, but because there were disagreements, these also play a truly important role in the evaluation.

In the Slovene lands the provincial authorities were on the side of the Reformation, shielding it and within the scope of legal possibilities making possible the organization of the Protestant Church by paying the priests, etc. The Protestants in Croatia did not have such support from the authorities. It is true some nobles supported them, e.g. Nikola IV Zrinski and Juraj Zrinski as well as the Croatian Ban Peter Erdödi. But even his power was fairly limited. Among Croats living under the Venetian Republic, which had a clearly defined state policy concerning the Church, the Protestant Reformation had very restricted possibilities for establishing itself.

The Carniolan Provincial Estates contributed in various ways to spreading the Reformation in Croatia. During the years 1561–1564 the main connecting factor in extending the Reformation in the Slavonic south was the printing of Croatian books in Urach. Although the Carniolan provincial authorities could not take on the considerable financial burden of printing such books (they did finance the work of Primož Trubar), they nevertheless played an important part in getting them printed. They confirmed Trubar's orthodoxy and the linguistic accuracy of his Slovene translations, which were then translated into Croatian. They also helped significantly by organizing the checking of the translations. The first committee sat on 18 August 1559 in Metlika and granted Štefan Konzul a positive evaluation for the translations. The Carniolan Estates thus established that the Croatian books did not disagree with the Augsburg confession, which was one of the basic conditions for printing. Lastly, they performed a significant role in supplying and circulating Protestant books.

Carniola also helped in maintaining the Reformation among the soldiers defending the territory against the Turks. Army preachers worked among the garrisons in Koprivnica, Ivanić-Grad, Petrinja, Sisak, Senj, Ogulin, and Karlovac – after its foundation in 1579, when it became the main centre of defence against the Turks.

The main persons in this cooperation, Primož Trubar, Peter Pavel Vergerij, Ivan Ungnad, Štefan Konzul, Anton Dalmatin, members of the Carniolan Provincial Estates, the Croatian supporters of the Reformation Peter Erdödi and Nikola IV Zrinski, and others, must be given a historically just evaluation, which will be objective only if it includes the

work they accomplished and does not depend on the “values” and even the “advantages” of the 19th and 20th centuries. On such a basis this period will connect rather than divide (national) Slovenes and (national) Croats.

UDC 284.1:282:316.344: "15"(Ljubljana)

Lilijana Žnidaršič Golec

Catholic-Protestant conflicts in Ljubljana in the second half of the 16th century

In the second half of the 16th century, Ljubljana was noticeably marked by conflicts between Catholics and Protestants, especially those who took as their own the confession first presented at the Diet of the Holy Roman Empire in Augsburg in 1530 (*Confessio Augustana*). Both Catholicism and Protestantism (Lutheranism) were defended and attacked in the pulpits and elsewhere in Ljubljana as early as the first half of the 16th century, more precisely from the mid 1520s onwards. But the friction spread and intensified more noticeably after 1550. Although a serious blow was struck at the Protestant camp in Ljubljana with legal proceedings in 1547–1548 against “heretical” priests, sources now known show that the Protestants in the city quickly recovered. In 1552 the Ljubljana citizen Mihael Frankovič denounced before the city law-court the unknown authors of a libellous letter, with which they were said to have spread accusations against the priesthood and some laymen, including Frankovič himself and one of his sons. On the other hand, details from the minutes of the Ljubljana city council reveal that Frankovič was often involved in disputes, which for the most part were not religiously motivated. Nevertheless, the assumption that Frankovič was one of the more zealous anti-Protestants in Ljubljana is not without foundation, as indirectly confirmed by his son Mihael’s career among the priests of Ljubljana Cathedral. The ardent opponents of Protestantism in the 1550s also included priests from the Škofič family, foremost of whom was the vicar general of the Ljubljana diocese, Nikolaj. Said to be Trubar’s “greatest enemy on account of the faith”, he faced several “fronts” opened against him by Ljubljana Protestants. They are said to have spread rumours about Nikolaj after his death, claiming that he had “the legally married mother of his son on lease for over twenty years”, while his son “was to be presented this Saturday before the lawcourt on account of sodomy”.

The conflicts gained a fresh impetus after Primož Trubar returned to the Carniolan capital in 1561 or 1562. From June 1562 until the first months of 1565 Trubar, who had avoided the above-mentioned legal proceedings by taking refuge in Germany, was active in Ljubljana as Superintendent of the Church of the Augsburg (Lutheran) confession in Carniola. Both camps, Catholic and Protestant, now attempted to strengthen their ranks even more with theologically soundly based sermons. The context of these endeavours is seen in an extant section of correspondence, dating from 1564, between Trubar, Krelj and Tulščak on the one hand and the fervent Franciscan Jurij Bravšič (Braosich) on the other. Although it is clear that a real polemic, to which the leading Ljubljana preachers

challenged Bravšič, did not develop, this correspondence between the two sides, so far only partially known to the Slovene public, deserves to be published in full as soon as possible.

In fact, right to the end of the 16th century, when preachers and teachers of the Augsburg confession left Ljubljana on the orders of the Provincial Prince, adherents of both main confessions, coming from all strata of the city's inhabitants, contributed to the religious conflicts in Ljubljana with their hostile words and actions. In interpreting and consequently understanding the Catholic-Protestant tensions in Ljubljana – at the end of the 16th century the city had about 6000 inhabitants, with more than two-thirds being Lutherans – we certainly cannot overlook the conditions, events and personages who left their mark within a broad geographical area. This is particularly true concerning the lands of the Holy Roman Empire, whose most southerly region was Carniola with the so-called Austrian Istria.

UDK 27-185.32:176
316.74:2

Božidar Debenjak

Die Erbsünde. Über die Natur der verbotenen Frucht

Historische Definierung der Erbsünde im Bezug auf die Sexualität (Tertullian, Augustin). Die Sexualität als solche ist sündig, nur zulässig, wenn sie auf die Reproduktion zielt. Ein Blick in die Bibel: die Schlange spricht die bezeichnenden Worte über die Erbsünde: „Ihr werdet sein wie Gott und wissen, was gut und böse ist.“ Das Wie-Gott-Sein-Wollen führt in die Verderbnis. Die Natur der menschlichen Sexualität und ihre Dimensionen. Es lässt sich nicht vermeiden, zu beurteilen, welche biblische Bestimmungen über die Sexualität als Legales oder Ceremoniales und welche als Morales zu betrachten sind. Aber das Wesen der Erbsünde ist ein Streben nach dem unbegrenzten Tun „wie Gott“. Der Mensch als verfehelter Demiurg.

UDC 94(497.4)"16":272:929 Ferdinand II

Vanja Kočever

Ferdinand II at the head of the Counter-Reformation: The nobility and confessional-political conditions in Carniola in the first third of the 17th century

This article presents the period during the rule of Archduke and Emperor Ferdinand II (1595–1637) in the Duchy of Carniola – the central Slovene historical province. This period at the turn of the 16th century was marked primarily by the Provincial Prince's Counter-Reformation, the Catholic Renewal, the political-confessional conflict between the Protestant Provincial Estates and the Catholic ruler, as well as external wars.

In Slovene history writing, the figure of Ferdinand II is often presented in the shadow of Tomaž Hren, the Bishop of Ljubljana, who led the Counter-Reformation committee in Carniola and engaged in fierce conflicts with the Protestant nobility in the Provincial Assembly, yet despite his own fervour in his home region, he actually only implemented Ferdinand's political programme. Ferdinand carried out his Counter-Reformation policy gradually and within legal boundaries, in accordance with the programme formulated in 1598 by the Lavantine bishop Jurij Stobej. This study presents the progress of the Provincial Prince's Counter-Reformation in the case of Carniola, focusing on the period after 1603, when the Archduke had already won a key political victory over the Provincial Estates of the Inner Austrian lands by not confirming the religious concessions from the Pacification of Bruck (1578), and the provinces, including Carniola, had already been combed through by Counter-Reformation committees. Despite the success of the Counter-Reformation, which converted all the Carniolan population to Catholicism except the nobility, the nobles themselves mostly still persisted in the Augsburg Confession and in the period 1604–1609 led a decisive opposition to the Counter-Reformation policy of the court. The Protestant nobility of Carniola, together with their Styrian and Carinthian colleagues, demanded the restoration of the religious concessions, which was flatly rejected by the emperor. In the realm of domestic politics, life was marked by the conflict between the Protestant nobility and Bishop Tomaž Hren, which considerably eased the emperor's position. In the following stage, 1610–1624, the Protestant nobles were rendered politically passive, although the majority still persisted in their faith. Conflicts with the Jesuits calmed down, and the conflict with Bishop Hren also lessened, which indicates the weakening of the Protestant side. Then the Provincial Prince, who had been strengthened by his army's victories in the Holy Roman Empire from 1625 to 1630, finally and decisively took over the initiative. Ferdinand's political and military strength influenced the process whereby the Protestant nobility in Carniola began to cross over into the Catholic confession. The wave of conversions began in 1625 with the Auerspergs converting to Catholicism and reached its peak when the emperor, using a special patent in 1628, commanded the nobles still persisting in Protestantism to convert within one year or else leave the country. Approximately one third of the nobles then left. New Catholic aristocratic families, mostly from Italy and the Military Frontier, moved in. Among the nobles who remained and converted there were many lukewarm Catholics.

A Jesuit chronicle records that 133 persons were considered to have converted during the years 1627–1633; most of these are likely to have belonged to the nobility. In his list (1629) Philipp Hainhofer cited somewhat fewer than 102 aristocratic persons who left Carniola between 1628 and 1629. These included 32 adult males, who cannot all be definitely classed as Carniolan. Nevertheless, on the basis of these data we can deduce that approximately one third of aristocratic countrymen left Carniola, or one quarter of all the members of the Provincial Estates.

Moreover, on the basis of several sources we know that in the period 1630–1635, 36 new countrymen from several noble families (these numbered between 22 and 27) moved into Carniola.

UDC 274:316.35
261:284

Nenad H. Vitorović

Protestant Christianity and Pluralism

The present paper argues that although it was only through Enlightenment policies (starting with the Peace of Westphalia and especially with the American and French Revolutions) that pluralism in the sense of individual freedom of thought and speech of equal citizens was finally being gradually institutionalized, its anticipation can be traced back to the Protestant Reformation as a venture towards the source of Christianity. The paper's aim is not to claim any primacy of Protestantism (or Christianity) over the Enlightenment, but rather to show that these accomplishments of modernity are by no means Christianity's Other, which Christianity would constantly have to either withstand or conform to, but rather something that it actually calls for itself.

For this purpose the paper first establishes a common denominator of all the major currents of the 16th century Protestant Reformation as being the "fresh" appreciation of the very core of Christianity: the Gospel as an announcement, which in its most condensed form can be expressed as the claim that the crucified Jesus of Nazareth is the risen Messiah, the Christ, i.e., the Son of God, the ruler of all creation, yet which, taking into consideration the Protestant understanding of the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament, implies the justification of godless people solely by faith in him. However, no matter how short the forms this message can take, it can never be abstracted from the person of Jesus: his life; his character; his encounters with people, his teaching, his suffering and atoning sacrifice, his resurrection.

In the light of the Gospel thus understood, the Reformers' demand for a state-guaranteed monopoly of a certain form of Christianity (including a state-guaranteed monopoly of the truth claim of the Gospel itself), turns out to be a distant consequence of controversies between the factions of early Christians, once they were in a position to turn to their worldly leaders for help: from the standpoint of historical impact a particular consequence of certain sharpened arguments of St. Augustine, which were additionally strengthened in connection with other factors throughout the following centuries. St. Augustine's interpretation of the relevant passages of the biblical texts which he relies on in order to ground the need for coercion to orthodoxy via the force of worldly authorities is shown to be unconvincing from the perspective of Protestant biblical exegesis. With it also falls the foundation of the "public manifestation of religion", as one of the primary tasks of the worldly authorities, which was formulated by the leading Protestant reformers, despite their emphasis on freedom of conscience.

UDC 284.1:316.323.6
27-72:322

Marko Kerševan

Protestantism at a time of crisis and criticism of modern society

The article draws on the historical-sociological thesis that Protestant Christianity is interwoven with features of modern western society such as: individualism, work ethics, enterprise and market orientation, rationalisation together with the development of science and technology, the tendency towards the nuclear family, increasing gender equality, political democratisation, secularisation and desacralisation, and the rise of nationalisms. Protestantism gave support and encouragement to those features, and was itself – in its own social modes of existence – under their influence. However, it could also inhibit and critique their absolutisations. What might be the possibilities of Protestantism in the situation of the crisis of modern society compared to the possibilities of other currents of Christianity as well as other religions or spiritualities? The article is especially concerned with the relationship between the principle of religious freedom and the Protestant understanding of faith. The Protestant understanding of faith as an “inner” personal relationship between God and man is even today a strong support for the principle of religious freedom in a religiously pluralistic society, which also requires (self)restraint in outward expression.

UDK 886.2"14/15":929 Dudić A.
261:284

Luka Ilić

Ein frühneuzetlicher Gelehrte zwischen Konfessionen:

Die protestantischen Vernetzungen von Andreas Dudith (1533–1589)

In der bisherigen Historiographie gilt Andreas Dudith von Orehovica (auch Sbardellati) als eine umstrittene Figur: Autoren wie Quirinus Reuter und Georg Michael Lingelsheim haben ihn als Reformierten angesehen; von anderen wurde er, wegen seiner Freundschaft mit Fausto Sozzini und Jacobus Paleologus, als Anhänger des Antitrinitarismus bezeichnet. Ab 1579 lebte Dudith im lutherischen Breslau und wurde dort in der St. Elisabeth-Kirche beigesetzt – das voraussetzt, dass die Kirchenleitung hat seinen Glauben als evangelisch betrachtet.

Der von kroatischen und italienischen adligen Familien stammende und in Buda geborene Dudith hat in Breslau, Venedig und Padua studiert. 1562 wurde Dudith römisch katholischer Bischof von Knin, 1563–1567 war er Bischof von Fünfkirchen. 1562–1563 als Vertreter des ungarischen Klerus auf dem Konzil von Trient, setzte er sich für Reformen ein. Er verließ die alte Kirche um 1567 und erklärte sich für konfessionsneutral. Die letzten

Jahre seines Lebens verbrachte Dudith in Polen, wo er u.a. in Krakau wohnte. Zwischen 1576 und 1579 hielt er sich in Mähren auf, und assoziierte sich mit dem *Unitas Fratrum*.

Es kann nachgewiesen werden, dass Dudith in ein weitreichendes reformiertes Netzwerk eingebunden war. Dazu gehörten schweizerische Theologen wie Théodore de Bèze aus Genf, mit dem er ab dem Ende der 1560er Jahre im Kontakt stand, sowie Josias Simler und Johannes Wolf in Zürich. Im Alten Reich war er durch seinen Briefwechsel mit den Heidelberger Professoren Girolamo Zanchi, Thomas Erastus und mit dem in Breslau geborenen Zacharias Ursinus verbunden. Gleichzeitig führte Dudith eine Korrespondenz mit Gelehrten, die mit der reformierten Theologie sympathisierten, den sogenannten Kryptokalvinisten, in Wittenberg, Leipzig, Nürnberg und Altdorf. Zu diesem Kreis gehörten auch Johannes Crato von Krafftheim (ebenso aus Breslau gebürtig) und Hubert Languet; beide waren zeitweise am Wiener Hof tätig gewesen.

Das reformierte Netzwerk von Dudith soll durch die Untersuchung seiner umfangreichen und in der größtenteils bereits veröffentlichten Korrespondenz dargestellt werden. Neben Dudiths Briefwechsel stellt seine teilweise rekonstruierte Bibliothek ein weiteres Quellenkorpus dar, das deutlich macht, welche Bücher reformierter Autoren er besaß. Auf der Grundlage seiner Anmerkungen und Marginalien kann seine Auseinandersetzung mit den Werken der Zeitgenossen untersucht werden. Es wird gefragt, wie sich Dudiths reformiertes Netzwerk entwickelt hat und welche Themen für die Korrespondenz zentral waren. Bestimmte theologische Fragen erscheinen wiederholt in Dudiths Briefen in den Jahren, die er in Schlesien verbrachte, und es ist offensichtlich, dass seine Abendmahlsauffassung der reformierten Position ähnelt. Der Vortrag untersucht, wie die zentralen Themen des schriftlichen Austauschs Dudiths seine Interessen im Zeitraum, in dem sie geschrieben wurden, widerspiegeln.

Prevod povzetkov v angleščino: *Margaret Davis*
Bibliografska obdelava: *Alojz Cindrič*