

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

more steadfast than that of any one of the three bishops; but it was the death of Ridley and Latimer, and especially the burning of the Primate of England himself, which, beyond any other martyrdom of the time, filled England with horror, and left the deepest impression on the minds and hearts of Englishmen.

Oxford's work in the Reformation was well-nigh done. The reign of Elizabeth was not without importance to the University, but the history of Oxford during her reign links itself with the future rather than with the past; it was a time of preparation for future work. It was only toward the end that Oxford began really to recover from the torpor into which it had sunk. The chancellorship of Dudley, Earl of Leicester, which lasted from 1564 till 1588, was most beneficial to the University. Though he acted at times in a somewhat arbitrary manner, what he did was in the main useful; and to him the University owes its incorporation by a charter, on which the liberties and privileges it now enjoys chiefly depend.

W. G. S. WHICKER.

ART. IV.—JOHN HUS.

JOHN OF HUSINETZ, better known as John Hus (*i.e.*, John the Goose), was born on July 6, 1369, in the small town of Husinetz, in Southern Bohemia, not far from the Bavarian frontier. He died at Constance, in Germany, on July 6, 1415. So his birthday and his martyrdom, or second birthday according to early Church ideas, were on the same day of the same month. He used the name of John Hus from 1396.

His parents were in fairly comfortable circumstances, and when John had become a youth, he went to the schools at Prague, where we are told he helped to maintain himself by chanting and performing other minor offices in the churches of the city. After some time spent in the primary schools, he went at last to the University of Prague, and in September, 1393, the jubilee year at Prague, he took his degree of B.A. This was followed by his B.Th. in 1394, and his M.A. in 1396. In 1398 he delivered his first lecture, in 1401 became Dean of the philosophical faculty, and in 1403 Rector of the University of Prague. There is no reliable record of his ordination, but it is certain that he was a preacher in 1401.

We find him very early in his career noted as a constant and diligent student of the writings of John Wiclif, our English reformer. It may have been simply from the fact that a Bachelor of Arts in Prague was allowed to lecture on the writings of Masters belonging to Prague, Paris, or Oxford only,

that the attention of Hus was thus early directed to Wiclif; or it may have been that something in the method and matter of the last of the Schoolmen "found" Hus (in the Coleridge sense of the word) in a way that other books did not. That he did study Wiclif, and study him deeply and to some purpose, is, however, the great fact we have to bear in mind, if we wish to understand at all the inner purpose of his life. A manuscript containing five of Wiclif's philosophical writings, written out by Hus in 1398, is still extant, and preserved at Stockholm.

The year 1402 is one of the guiding dates of his life. In that year the preachingship at the chapel Bethlehem, in Prague, became vacant, and Hus was presented to it. The foundation-deed was a very curious one. Dated May 24, 1390, it declares "that it was an institution of the old fathers that the Word of God should not be fettered, but be as free and beneficial as possible to the Church and her members, and deplores that there was as yet no locality in Prague set apart for the office of the preachers; yea, that preachers, especially those who preached in the Bohemian tongue, were for the most part compelled to go about from house to house, and from secret place to secret place. John of Mitheim, therefore, to make better provision for this need for the future, ordained that the incumbent of the new chapel should be a secular priest, whose duty it should be to preach in the Bohemian language in the morning and afternoon of every holy day, except in Lent and Advent, when there was only to be a morning sermon." There were other strict and precise regulations in the deed, including one concerning the endowments and offerings. "A priest who was a preacher ought not to thirst for riches. The preacher was not allowed to appropriate the offerings or gifts collected in the chapel, which were to be kept under three keys, and used for repairs and other requirements, and after a certain time for the maintenance of poor students connected with it, at a rate of five kops each per annum."

It was, then, partly in the University of Prague as teacher and rector, and partly in the pulpit of this Bethlehem church, that John Hus made his mark, first upon the city of Prague, and then upon the Church of Christ at large. I need hardly remind you, that at the beginning of the fifteenth century the Church in Europe, though outwardly one united body, was internally full of dissension, corruption, and rottenness, from head to foot. There was a general feeling abroad that a reformation in doctrine and morals, in head and members, was imperatively necessary if the Church was to do the work she had had committed to her by her Divine Lord, and to preserve her hold upon the world. And it was the mission of

John Hus to do something, not very much, perhaps, but to do something towards preparing the way for this reformation. He belongs rather to the period just before the Reformation, than to the Reformation itself, since we generally and rightly connect the actual movement with the great name of Luther.

The work of Hus as a reformer divides itself into two great parts; the first from 1402 to 1410, during which he prosecuted reform with the countenance and sanction of his ecclesiastical superiors; and the second from 1410 to 1415, when he found himself in deadly antagonism with them, culminating in the tragedy of his death.

I. In 1403 the authorities at Prague forbade the promulgation at the University of forty-five theses of Wiclif. These had been selected by John Hubner, partly from Wiclif's works, with the addition of the twenty-four theses that had been already condemned by the Synod in London.¹ It would seem that up to 1403, only Wiclif's philosophical works were known in Bohemia, and that his much more important theological writings were but little read or understood. These forty-five theses were, however, condemned by the majority in the chapter, and five years later the interdiction was confirmed, but only to the extent that no one should give them an heretical construction, implying that the theses themselves were inoffensive and colourless. Hus had the full confidence of the Archbishop, and in 1405 was appointed by him Preacher to the Synod; at the opening of which he preached a sermon (as memorable in its way as Dean Colet's famous discourse before Convocation in 1512), in which he laid bare the errors and denounced the sins of the clergy. No one was excluded from the range of his withering denunciations. The Pope, the cardinals, the archbishops and bishops, as well as the clergy and monks, were alike regarded as needing reform. In this he again followed closely in the footsteps of his master, the "doctor of deep thoughts," as he called him, though Hus did not agree with all that Wiclif taught, and in many ways was not so advanced on the road to reform.

He was appointed with two others to investigate some miracles alleged to have been wrought by the blood of Christ in the Church at Wilsnach, near Wittenberg, and they reported that the whole thing was a deception. "A lad was said to have had a miracle of healing performed on his foot; it was proved that his foot was worse than before. Two blind men were asserted to have regained their sight; they admitted before three commissioners, the public notary and other wit-

¹ For John Wiclif, see the splendid work of Mr. Lewis Serjeant in the *Heroes of the Nations Series*: Putnams, 1893.

nesses, that they had never been blind at all, but had merely been afflicted with a painful affection of the eyes." Hus wrote a Latin pamphlet on the matter called "All the Blood of Christ is glorified," in which he denied the existence anywhere of the natural blood of Christ, the whiskers of Christ, the milk of the Virgin Mary, and other similar absurd relics. And if you think that this is merely ancient history, and of no practical importance to us in this closing decade of the nineteenth century, let me remind you that many of the very things that were exposed as frauds in the fifteenth century are still believed in to-day, and visited by thousands of pilgrims, as at Einseideln, in Switzerland, Naples, and elsewhere.

As it was a great part of the work of Wiclif in England to translate the Bible into the language of the people, so it was part of the work of Hus in Bohemia to take men back to the same Divine fount of truth. He urged them continually to search the Scriptures, that in them they might find the things that belonged to their eternal peace, and not to seek for signs and miracles. And here I wish you to note, as indeed all through Hus's work, the extreme moderateness of the positions he took up. He did not, like Wiclif, believe that the substance of the bread and wine remained in the Eucharist after consecration, *i. e.*, he did not so far reject the doctrine of transubstantiation, but, on the contrary, he always and clearly refused to accept Wiclif's teaching on the point. He did not to the same extent as Wiclif reject the traditions of the Church and patristic teaching, but maintained that Holy Scripture should always be explained by reference to both. He was quite clear as to the authority and infallibility of Scripture as the final source of knowledge with regard to Christian doctrine, but he held that Christian doctrine had been authoritatively and fully expounded by the Fathers of the early Church. It was against more modern phases of teaching that he protested. He regarded as silly blasphemies the utterances of some priests who "boasted their superiority to the Virgin Mary, because she only once conceived and bore the Saviour, whereas every priest both could and did create Him daily." So, too, they "boasted that at their will they forgave and retained men's sins, and that thus they sent whom they would to heaven and whom they would to hell. Hus taught that the priest did not himself remit sins, but that God remitted them by the agency of the priest, even if an unworthy one; yea, that circumstances might occur under which remission might be had even without priestly absolution." We see, therefore, how very far John Hus was from what we have come to know as the full Reformation movement, and it is his moderation that makes the concluding years of his life the more remarkable, and his

death the less justifiable, from the Roman Catholic point of view.

It was in 1408, while Hus was Rector of Prague University, that the first breach came between him and the Archbishop, and the good feeling which had existed between them was embittered, for in that year he was prohibited from exercising his priestly functions within the diocese, though the final rupture was still to come.

In 1409 there came a Papal bull prohibiting the use of Wiclif's writings in the University. The Archbishop burnt two hundred volumes of them, in spite of the adverse opposition both of the University and of Hus, who continued to preach and to defend Wiclif, whom the Archbishop denounced as heretical. His congregation increased, and Hus became bolder. And so we enter upon the second phase of his quarrel with Rome.

II. On March 15, 1411, he was excommunicated, and the city laid under an interdict. This Hus ignored, and the Archbishop was engaged in arranging a compromise when he suddenly died, September 28, 1411. In 1412 Hus was roused by the preaching of a crusade against Naples and of indulgences commanded by the Pope John XXIII., one of the worst occupants of the Papal throne, and both the crusade and the indulgences were commended by the King. The University was somewhat divided, but ultimately determined that neither the Pope nor the Bishop had the right to draw the sword, because it was said to Peter, "Put up thy sword."

Against this new wickedness Hus thundered from his pulpit. He preached strenuously against the iniquity of the Pope in urging men to take part in a war which had no justification but to secure his own personal ends, and, like Luther at a later date, denounced vigorously the traffic in indulgences as a means of replenishing the Papal coffers. A word in passing as to the meaning of indulgences. There are two phases of the question, which should always be carefully distinguished. The Church has the right to impose certain discipline upon her members. We in the Church of England hardly know what this means, but the Church of Scotland, and many of our Nonconforming brethren, know it full well. Now, a sentence which the Church, in the due exercise of her right of discipline, has pronounced, the Church may, for a proper cause, by indulgence or otherwise, remit. A penalty which the Church has inflicted, the Church can take away. This is one phase, and if indulgences meant no more than this no fault could be found with them. But when she goes further, and claims to remit penalties that God has imposed, and to remit penalties not only in this life, but in the life to

come, and claims to remit them on the ground of the performance of certain things which have no spiritual relation either to the offence or the punishment, but which consist mostly of the payment of sums of money, then she goes beyond her prerogative, interferes with the prerogative of Christ Himself (Who did not say, "Whatsoever I bind in heaven *thou* shalt loose on earth," but only promised to respect the binding and loosing of His Apostles, and did not give them authority over His acts), and claims an authority which can never be exercised by any man or any Church. Hus accordingly declared that not money, but true repentance, was the condition of forgiveness—that the Pope could not know who are the elect, and that the elect only can be saved. The doctrine, therefore, that the Pope cannot err is blasphemous. The people sympathized with Hus, and burnt the Papal bulls in the market-place. Three young men who declared the indulgences to be humbug were executed. Hus and a number of students took up the bodies and buried them in Bethlehem Church. The Cardinal Peter of St. Angelo now interdicted Hus's house, and threatened him with the civil ban; so he left the city at the King's request, and spent his exile in writing his book on the Church, which followed that of Wiclif on the same subject.

The demand for reform had led to the summoning of a council, which met at Constance, a German town in Swabia. Before this council Hus was summoned to appear. He obeyed the summons, and arrived at Constance under a safe conduct on November 3, 1414. He was allowed his liberty for some four weeks, and then the cardinals, on a charge of attempted flight, confined him in a Dominican convent. The Council on May 4, 1415, condemned Wiclif, his writings, his person and his doctrines. On June 5, 7, and 8, Hus was heard. He stated his agreement with Wiclif on the question of the Church, but denied that he agreed with him on the question of transubstantiation.¹ We have not space to go into the details of the trial—if trial it can be called—but must content ourselves with stating that Hus did not have even the semblance of justice awarded to him. The most absurd charges, unsupported by any shadow of evidence, were brought against him. His condemnation was a foregone conclusion. Hus knew this, and would not retract. A specimen may be given of the kind of charge brought against him after he had refuted the graver items. It is taken from the printed proceedings of the

¹ For the whole proceedings against Hus in the Council of Constance the reader is referred to Mr. Wratislaw's excellent monograph published by the S.P.C.K., to which in many other points we are much indebted. This and the articles in Herzog, and the "Encyclopædia Britannica," will furnish fairly complete information on the man and his times.

Council. "That Magister John Hus granted this proposition, that John Hus was a person in the Godhead, and that there were more persons than three in the Godhead; proved to be true by one Doctor of Theology from common report and fame, by one abbot from common fame, and by a vicar of the cathedral at Prague, who said he had heard it from the mouth of John Hus as articulated." The proof was demanded and was not given. He claimed that his views on the Church were the same as those of St. Augustine of Hippo. He based his reform of the Church on conscience and on the Scriptures, and not on ecclesiastical authority. But it was of no avail. Ecclesiastical authority asserted its supremacy over conscience then as so frequently before and since, and on July 6, 1415, his sentence was read, and John Hus was burnt at Constance, his death being, according to the very laws by which he was tried, a judicial murder.

We grant that he was not a great man, that he was not an original thinker, that he gave the world no constructive theology. He was, regarded in these aspects, but a shadow and echo of Wiclif. But this defect does not diminish the glory of his martyrdom. His moral tenacity, his inflexible firmness, his indomitable constancy, his purity, humility, fear of God, fidelity to his conscience as though it were his king—these give him a moral splendour that far outshines mere speculative intellectual brilliancy. He was a martyr for conscience' sake, and faced his doom with a power and endurance "born of" a faith deeply rooted in the Divine Christ. He represents historically a transition period, belongs to the close of the scholastic epoch, being a disciple of Wiclif, "the last of the schoolmen," as Mr. Serjeant so finely calls him. The time of the fulness was not yet. That was to come in Luther and in Cranmer, and the martyrs of the English Reformation.

What is, in conclusion, the lesson of his life to us? Is it out of date? Has its necessity passed away? Would I could think so. But I cannot in the face of the Papal Encyclical addressed to the English people a few months ago. With the spirit of that letter I have no quarrel. I sympathize with it. I agree with it. But in the closing portion (addressed, it is true, to English Roman Catholics and not to the nation at large, but showing us, all the same, what we should be expected to acquiesce in if we made terms with Rome in her unchanged condition) there are three matters dealt with that indicate very plainly that the battle which John Hus fought is not yet ended, and it is because the conviction grows upon me with daily increasing force that the battle of the Reformation will have to be fought over again, and fought, it may be even to the death, that I urge the consideration of the points, upon you.

We are invited to pray, but our prayer is to be addressed to the Virgin Mary. The prayer is partly to take the form of the Holy Rosary, a form of senseless prayer akin to the praying-wheels of Thibet. And if we pray to the Virgin in this way, we are promised three hundred days' indulgence. If it were not meant in all seriousness by the holy man who sits in the chair of St. Peter at Rome, I should characterize it as a jest, though a jest which approaches very nearly to an insult to the English people. But it is meant seriously, and we must so treat it. I refuse the Pope's indulgence and repudiate it with all my soul. I know that whatever punishment my Heavenly Father may see fit to impose on me for my sins, will be remedial chastisement intended to influence me for good and to fit me for the enjoyment of His presence; and I decline for my own good to have that remedial work shortened by one hour, let alone by three hundred days, here or hereafter; and especially when the indulgence is to be gained by such unspiritual means as the use of the Rosary. I will pray with the spirit, but I will pray with the understanding also, and my intellect revolts against any such mechanical means of prayer as that recommended by the Holy Father. And again, if I am to pray, I will pray to Him who has promised to hear me, and not to her, however great and exalted and blessed she may be, of whose power to hear I have no sure warrant in Holy Writ, and of whose power to answer, I venture to indulge in a strong scepticism. Such are not the means whereby reunion will be achieved. They involve tampering with truth and conscience; and, since fidelity to conscience was the watchword of the Reformation and has been the secret of all our progress ever since,¹ I call upon you to remember this and live by it, and, if necessary, to die for it. "Stand fast in the liberty for which your fathers were content to suffer and to die, the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

FREDERIC RELTON.



ART. V.—ARCHBISHOP PARKER'S CONSECRATION.

PART I.

THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH (S.J.) has published a pamphlet by the Catholic Truth Society, 1895, entitled "The Doctrine of Intention." His main object appears to be to prove that the consecration of Parker, the first Archbishop of Canterbury under Queen Elizabeth, was invalid by reason of the want of

¹ Delivered, in substance, as one of the series of lectures in St. Margaret's, Westminster, on "The Leaders of the Reformation."