

## **Historical Difficulties in the Great Controversy.**

### **Some remarks by pastor J. Voerman.**

### **Part I**

It is asserted by some that Ellen White did not present a truthful picture as to her historical description of the Bohemian Reformer John Hus. On four points Ellen White's description is supposed to be in error:

1. That the Pope was the one who issued the order placing Prague under interdict.
2. That during this interdict, all the churches in Prague were closed, and all religious services were suspended.
3. That as a result of the tumult, Hus left Prague at this time.
4. That Hus wrote the letter quoted on page 101, paragraph 2, at this time to explain why he had left Prague.

Let us first read the passage that concerns the first point:

*“Tidings of the work at Prague were carried to Rome, and Huss was soon summoned to appear before the pope. To obey would be to expose himself to certain death. The king and queen of Bohemia, the university, members of the nobility, and officers of the government united in an appeal to the pontiff that Huss be permitted to remain at Prague and to answer at Rome by deputy. Instead of granting this request, the pope proceeded to the trial and condemnation of Huss, and then declared the city of Prague to be under interdict.”* *Great Controversy* p. 100.

This paragraph is in harmony with many sources and unless the word “then” (“...and then declared...”) is allowed for a lapse of several months, which however is not warrantable, it is clear that the interdict of the year 1411 is indicated here. A German source informs us: *“In February 1411 Colonna pronounced over Hus the Excommunication in absence, and threatened the Place, where he would reside, with the Interdict.”*<sup>1</sup>

Because Hus did not appear before the pope, cardinal Colonna pronounced the ban on Hus in February 1411, while, after this incident, the Bohemian king Wenceslas pleaded the cause of Hus with the pope, however, without success. The pope appointed a new commission to examine the procedure but shortly afterwards Cardinal Brancas was appointed as papal judge to handle this case. The ban was not lifted and Zbynek (Sbinko), the archbishop, ordered it to be proclaimed in all churches and this was done, except in two churches. The solicitors of Hus were taken captive or returned to Prague without result - the Church did not want to listen but to rule, and at last Brancas issued even more severe measures against Hus and placed his residence under the interdict. Soon a great conflict emerged. The angry king Wenceslas persecuted the priests who obeyed the interdict and before long the whole country was stirred.

“At last cardinal Brancas proceeded to take more severe measures against the reformer. He publicly announced a declaration in which he called him a heretic, yea, announced the interdict on his residence, and immediately this was carried out by the archbishop and Prague was punished with the interdict.”<sup>2</sup>

Note: This was clearly the interdict of 1411 and not the interdict of the year 1412 for that last interdict was not issued by the papal judge cardinal Brancas but by cardinal de St. Angelo (Peter degli Stephaneschi de St. Angelo) and at that time there was also another Archbishop, Albik (of Unicov), since Zbynek had died in September, 1411.

For the sake of clarity it should be stated that Zbynek had also placed Prague under an interdict in 1409. This interdict, however, was pronounced in the name of a deposed pope. King Wenceslas sided Alexander V as the newly elected pope on the Council of Pisa (there were then three popes), while the archbishop Zbynek remained loyal to pope Gregory XII. He sent his delegation to his Council at Cividale and placed Prague under an interdict, which was not observed. Zbynek was the appointed papal legate for his archdiocese. But when pope Alexander’s papal auditor Krumhart started legal proceedings against Zbynek, he also sided this new pope who changed his attitude at once and issued in December a bull approving Zbynek’s position completely and he authorized him to take measures against heresy. Pope Alexander died in May 1410 and John XXIII was elected in his place.<sup>3</sup>

If the three interdicts on Prague are not carefully dated, they can be mixed up easily sometimes.

Zbynek was the archbishop who carried out this interdict in 1411. Was this a papal interdict and a papal bull? Colonna and Brancas were cardinals. Would it be possible that a cardinal, all by his own, could pronounce such far reaching measures without any form of papal consent? The influence of Hus was very impressive and widespread. The king and many of the nobility were on his side and these measures created a great stir. But Colonna and Brancas did not act on their own. They were appointed cardinals; authorized by the pope, to take care of this matter. Pope John XXIII was their principal who carried, as head of the church, final responsibility and so we can speak of a papal bull and a papal interdict. No wonder that the clergy, as to this interdict, appealed to the pope: *“the clergy reported to the Pope that the secular power prevented the interdict from being carried out,”* while we also note that an interdict is pronounced in the name of the pope. (Roubiczek and Kalmer, *Warrior of God*, pp.112, 94) In fact, without papal approval it was not possible to impose such a far reaching interdict as that of 1411, imposed on the whole city of Prague. *“A common Interdict on a land or people or a diocese can only be issued by the pope.”*<sup>4</sup>

If some critics still have doubts, let a Catholic source convince them:

*“Since he [Hus] neglected the summons of the papal judicial investigator Cardinal Otto Colonna, the excommunication by the Pope followed in February 1411, which was read in nearly all churches in Prague on March 15.”*<sup>5</sup>

The bull of excommunication, pronounced on Hus by cardinal Colonna, is clearly presented in this source as the excommunication by the Pope.

No wonder then that this 1411 Interdict is also presented to us as such: *“The consequence was that Hus was excommunicated, and Prague laid under a Papal interdict - measures which failed, however, to achieve their object.”*<sup>6</sup>

*“Popular riots followed in the city, and Huss, backed by the people, still maintained; nor did he yield one jot even after the entire city was laid under a papal interdict in 1411.”*<sup>7</sup>

Ellen White is not out of harmony on this point. If we find fault with her description that the pope placed Prague under interdict, then we are obliged to find fault with many other sources as well.

## **2. During this interdict all churches were closed and all religious services were suspended.**

But is this really what Ellen White intended to say? It is quite clear that she writes in general terms and not in a specific sense with direct reference to this particular interdict. Since Ellen White wrote her book “The Great Controversy” not as a scholarly work on Church History for academic people, but intended to convey a spiritual message for all classes of people, it is but logical that she inserted a paragraph explaining what really is involved when an interdict was pronounced because many people have no idea of the consequences of such ecclesiastical measures. In the context of making it better understandable to everyone, this paragraph is most valuable.

It is interesting to note that Bronswijk did the same what Ellen White did as to this very interdict. We read: *“On June 18, 1411 the embittered prelate placed the curse of the interdict on Prague. An interdict meant, that all church services were prohibited, that no sacraments were offered, that no children were baptized, that no marriage was blessed, that no one dying was anointed and that no one deceased was buried in consecrated earth.”*<sup>8</sup>

Let us now consider what Ellen White wrote:

*“In that age this sentence, whenever pronounced, created widespread alarm.”*

The wording “in that age” and “whenever pronounced” convey clearly a general meaning and it is not a specific reference to the particular interdict of 1411, while “widespread alarm” is mostly the usual result.

*“The ceremonies by which it was accompanied were well adapted to strike terror to a people who looked upon the pope as the representative of God Himself, holding the keys of heaven and hell, and possessing power to invoke temporal as well as spiritual judgments.”*

This sentence also does not contain any specific reference to the 1411 interdict. It is but a general description of what is aimed by Rome and what the impact usually would be on trusting orthodox people.

*“It was believed that the gates of heaven were closed against the region smitten with interdict; that until it should please the pope to remove the ban, the dead were shut out from the abodes of bliss.”*

Now was this only believed to be the case with regard to the Prague interdict declared in 1411? It is clear again that this is a general description that applies to any region smitten by the papal ban.

*“In token of this terrible calamity, all the services of religion were suspended. The churches were closed. Marriages were solemnized in the churchyard. The dead, denied burial in consecrated ground, were interred, without the rites of sepulture, in the ditches or the fields. Thus by measures which appealed to the imagination, Rome essayed to control the consciences of men.” GC p. 101.*

These regulations are not particularly applicable to the 1411 interdict of Prague; they apply for every place whenever an interdict was declared. By such measures Rome essayed not only and specifically to control the consciences of the men in Prague but she has always done this everywhere whenever she had the power to do so.

To regard this whole paragraph, as some critics do, as a specific reference to the 1411 interdict is clearly out of place. This passage is only a general explanatory description of the meaning and consequences of an interdict whenever and wherever it is inflicted.

As to the effect of the 1411 interdict, there is some evidence that it was shortly observed, for we read: *“All official rites and rituals of religion came to an abrupt halt”*<sup>9</sup> The government intervened in a dramatic way and although full observance was greatly hindered, the interdict was still, after all, an ordinance of the church and it can be readily imagined that it created a great stir among the people that were loyal to the church and believed in her authority. Also the unobserved first interdict of 1409, caused riots. We read: *“Then Zbynek resorted to his strongest weapon; he placed Prague under an interdict. But this interdict, pronounced in the name of a deposed Pope, rebounded on himself. Once again street riots broke out, notorious clergy were dragged from their beds and put in the pillory and it was only with difficulty that the palace of the Archbishop was saved. Speeches by Hus and Jerome set Prague in such an uproar that the Archbishop had to flee to Roudnice.”*<sup>10</sup>

No one can deny that even if an interdict was not, or very poorly, observed, it still was an awesome threat and a source of great concern, tension and unrest.

### **3. Did Hus leave Prague in 1411 as a result of the tumult?**

Ellen White continues: *“The city of Prague was filled with tumult. A large class denounced Huss as the cause of all their calamities and demanded that he be given up to the vengeance of Rome. To quiet the storm, the Reformer withdrew for a time to his native village.” GC p. 101.*

It is important to be certain that there was indeed tumult in Prague during the year 1411. After many Germans left Prague in May, 1409, we read: *“For years to come Prague was a storm-centre.”*<sup>11</sup>

We are also informed that after the burning of books on July 16, 1410 there was soon an increase of commotion in Prague that continued for a long time. Serious ecclesiastical disturbances emerged and the gap between Hus and his opponents became wider and wider. *“All books and valuable manuscripts of Wyclif were burned, and Huss and his adherents put under the ban. This procedure caused an indescribable commotion among the people down to the lowest classes; in some places turbulent scenes occurred. The government took the part of Huss, and the power of his adherents increased from day to day. He continued to preach in the Bethlehem chapel, and became bolder and bolder in his accusations of the Church. The churches of the city were put under the ban, and the interdict was pronounced against Prague but without result.”*<sup>12</sup>

Hus was put under the ban on March 15, 1411, and in all churches of Prague, except two, it was announced and the city was soon after laid under an interdict and Dr. Loserth writes: *“During this time the people stood at the side of Hus: it came in more places to tumultuous actions.”*<sup>13</sup>

*“When the papal bull announcing Colonna’s verdict reached Prague, it excited immense public indignation. The king’s favorite, Voksa of Valdstejn, organized a procession, parading a young man dressed as a prostitute, with a mock papal bull hanging about his neck, loudly denouncing the pope. The populace jeered when the document was burned. Charges of heresy were now aggressively urged against Hus at the curia by Michael de Causis, a notorious priest in the service of Zbynek and the antireformist party.”*<sup>14</sup>

*“King Wenceslas was extremely angry at the curia that all his efforts in behalf of Hus had been so cavalierly ignored...The king...issued an order commanding the stoppage of payments to the canons of St. Vitus and the All Saints and other priests of the cathedral, as well as to the pastors of the churches in Prague... He retaliated further by ordering a visitation of all ecclesiastical establishments in the whole country, including the monasteries. The populace also took part in the anti-ecclesiastical measures and plundered and burned parsonages, dragged the priests and their concubines naked to pillories, threw them into rivers, and expelled them from the cities.”*<sup>15</sup>

Not only in Prague, but in the whole country were serious tumults and many regarded Hus as the cause of all trouble. During the year the conflict did not subside much. The archbishop could not keep his ground because of the fierce opposition of the king, but he tried to take revenge on him and on Hus. He sent a declaration to all reigning heads saying *“that Bohemia was a nest of heretics, reigned by the heretical king Wenceslas and taught by the master of heretics, John Hus.”*<sup>16</sup> Although the archbishop had promised to write to the pope to

annul the excommunication and the interdict, he did not keep his promise and sought refuge in Hungary, but on the way he suddenly died on September 28. The conflict, however, did not end. *“The trial at the curia... continued to grind on inexorably toward its fateful end.”*<sup>17</sup>

Following the commotion of the ban and the interdict, soon another event, that caused great discord, developed. In the autumn of 1411 pope John XXIII issued his ‘Cruciata’ against king Ladislaus of Naples. The cross was preached and preachers of indulgences urged people to crowd the churches and give their offerings and before long a traffic in indulgences developed. Although this conflict reached its peak in Prague in 1412, it is a fact that during the year 1411 Hus had preached in his Bethlehem chapel at Prague in clear tones against indulgences,<sup>18</sup> and Ernst Werner informs us: *“It seems that he in 1411 wanted to keep ahead of a popular opposition against the traffic of indulgences. None the less Hussite priests mobilized already underground active resistance against him.”*<sup>19</sup> Undoubtedly, these developments in 1411 caused much tension and while more friction was added, it was clear that there lurked a great conflict. We can imagine that under all the various trying circumstances Hus would consent in leaving the scene for a while and find some rest in his birthplace Husinec in Southern Bohemia. Hus however could not remain inactive. He preached in the country to eager crowds; he shared his conviction by pen and voice; his influence increased and his absence brought only short lived relief. The conflict escalated more and more. Hus lost some of his best friends who became his fiercest enemies while he also lost the support of king Wenceslas who had been on his side for several years, including the whole year 1411.

*“The breach became wider and wider, and led to popular riots in Prague, so that at length the king, who was still on Hus’s side found it necessary to induce him, for the sake of peace, to leave Prague (1411). Hus did so; but the desired result did not ensue, for his continued activity in Southern Bohemia, where he devoted himself partly to composing polemical tractates in the castle of a patron, and partly to preaching to the people of the district, soon put him at the head of the popular movement.”*<sup>20</sup>

Note: There is no need to be in doubt as to this event of the Reformer’s absence. When Hus left Prague in 1411, the king was still on his side and he returned to Prague *publicly*, while he enjoyed much popularity, but when he left Prague after the last, more effective interdict, he was, as some indicate, *ordered* to do so while he went in *exile*; he had lost much support by this time; the king now saw him as the sure obstacle and Hus, for a few times, returned to Prague *secretly* (1413), and for short moments only, while hiding with friends.

There was indeed great commotion among the people because of the measures the church was taking, while Hus was regarded more and more as the source of all trouble. The king, at this moment being still on his side, advised Hus to leave Prague, which seems to have been during the last part of the year 1411.

Another source described, just as Ellen White did (GC p. 100), that Hus was summoned to come to Rome while the king and queen, the nobility and the university appealed to the pope that he would release Hus from coming to Rome. A deputy of three advocates, sent by Hus, was arrested, however, and cardinal Colonna's condemnation was confirmed by the papal commission. Hus was sentenced as heretic and all church services prohibited. Thereupon Hus left Prague for some time. In the margin we find the year 1411. Next the conflict over indulgences is described with the year 1412 in the margin. No one, therefore, needs to be in doubt as to this moment when Hus left Prague. We read: "...John Hus sent three advocates to Rome to excuse his absence, but these were ill treated and thrown into prison, and cardinal Colonna declared John Hus obstinate, and because of that excommunicated. The assignee's appealed from this to the Pope, who appointed four cardinals as judges, by whom not only the sentence of Colonna was confirmed, but John Hus, along with his disciples and friends, declared to be heretics, and all church services were to him interdicted. John Hus, on that, left the city of Prague for some time and went to his birth-place Hus to the lord of that village, from where he, however, returned to Prague...(1411, margin)." <sup>21</sup>

Ellen White, not being at variance with this, writes that Hus withdrew for a time to his native village and on page 104, when the city was again placed under interdict, she also informs us that Hus withdrew to his native village. This is in harmony with J. A. Wylie's description and it is, for instance, also stated by James Gardner, <sup>22</sup> and R. Husen. <sup>23</sup>

#### **4. Did Hus wrote the letter quoted by Ellen White on page 101, par. 2 at this time to explain why he had left Prague?**

The critics say that it can be clearly demonstrated that this letter is used erroneously in this context since it was written in December of 1412 and not in 1411 as the reader of the Great Controversy would be let to believe.

*"Writing to the friends whom he had left at Prague, he said: "If I have withdrawn from the midst of you, it is to follow the precept and example of Jesus Christ, in order not to give room to the ill-minded to draw on themselves eternal condemnation, and in order not to be to the pious a cause of affliction and persecution. I have retired also through an apprehension that impious priests might continue for a longer time to prohibit the preaching of the word of God amongst you; but I have not quitted you to deny the divine truth, for which, with God's assistance, I am willing to die." Bonnechose, The Reformers Before the Reformation, vol. I, p. 87. Hus did not cease his labors, but traveled through the surrounding country, preaching to eager crowds. Thus the measures to which*

*the pope resorted to suppress the gospel were causing it to be the more widely extended.” Great Controversy, p. 101.*

Now if Hus left Prague during the last part of 1411 and wrote and preached in Southern Bohemia, why could he not also have written this letter at that time?

The critics assert: *“The letter could not have been written in December of 1411, because even if we were to grant, for the sake of argument, that Huss left Prague in 1411, the interdict was a thing of the past and Hus was certainly back in the city by December. We have him writing the Pope from Prague on the “Day of St. Giles” (1 Sept., 1411). (Spinka, The letters of John Hus, pp. 54-56.) Thus we know that Mrs. White’s citation of this letter in this context is a historical error known as an anachronism.”*<sup>24</sup>

This assertion does not seem to make sense. Hus could have written the pope from Prague on 1 sept., 1411 without problem and he could have left Prague some time later that year. That the interdict was a thing of the past does not at all mean that the conflict was ended, on the contrary, it escalated more and more while “the trial at the curia... continued to grind on inexorably towards its fateful end.”

The letter contains a sentence saying: *“Dearly beloved, the day is now near when we shall commemorate the Lord’s birth.”*

The critics say: *“But if the letter was written in December, it had to have been written in December of 1412, not 1411. Hus was in exile by December, 1412, which was after the second interdict. Thus this letter fits perfectly his circumstances of that time.”*<sup>25</sup>

But if Hus left Prague during the last part of 1411 and if we find him writing and preaching in his native area in Southern Bohemia, as Hasting’s Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, for instance, indicates, why would that not fit perfectly the circumstances of that time? Hus was in exile after the last or third interdict while that was not in that sense the case during the previous interdict when he still enjoyed royal favour.

As we now reflect, for a moment, on the four different points together, that the critics have raised, it would be good to refer to John Dowling’s ‘History of Romanism,’ a source that perfectly agrees with Ellen White’s description and that remarkably underlines all four points, while there can be no doubt that this source describes the very interdict that Ellen White also describes. We read: *“Upon the accession of pope John XXXIII in 1410, that violent and vicious pontiff immediately summoned the Bohemian reformer to appear before his court at Bologne, and upon Huss refusing to comply with the summons, he was excommunicated, the city of Prague laid under an interdict, and the priests*

*forbidden to perform the rites of baptism and burial, so long as John Huss continued in the city... §27.- The persecuted reformer, though enjoying the protection of the royal family, chose to retire for the present to his native village, from whence he wrote to his spiritual children to explain to them the cause of his retirement, in the following pious and affecting strain. 'Learn, beloved,' says he, 'that if I have withdrawn from the midst of you, it is to follow the precept and example of Jesus Christ, in order not to give room to the ill-minded to draw on themselves eternal condemnation, and in order not to be to the pious a cause of affliction and persecution. I have retired also through an apprehension that impious priests might continue for a longer time to prohibit the preaching of the Word of God amongst you; but I have not quitted you to deny the divine truth, for which, with God's assistance, I am willing to die.' "*<sup>26</sup>  
On top of the page of this source we read the heading: "*The Pope lays an interdict on the city of Prague, on account of Huss. Huss's pious letters.*" And as for the letter that Hus wrote to his followers, while retired to his native village to explain to them the cause of his retirement from their midst, a French source is cited.<sup>27</sup>

We have here a clear confirmation of all four points: 1. The interdict is laid on Prague by the Pope. 2. The priests were forbidden to perform the rites of baptism or burial. 3. Hus withdrew to his native village. 4. Hus wrote at this time the letter explaining why he had left Prague.

It is however important to remember that historians do not always agree. They sometimes present or explain certain events differently and it is not always easy to figure out what is right.

A recent article in a daily newspaper about the bombardment of the German city of Dresden, near the end of World War II, may perhaps serve as an interesting illustration. Although this happened not very long ago, historians seem to differ widely about some details of this tragic event. The newspaper informs us about a raging conflict that developed during the meetings that were held to commemorate this bombardment. One of the speakers, the historian Frederick Taylor, who wrote a book on Dresden's destruction, even needed police protection. Taylor, for instance, maintained that Dresden was a strategic centre of great military importance. His opponent, the historian Jörg Friedrich, who also wrote a book on the event, reacted: "*Nonsense, railwaylines and roads were since long destroyed, the German resistance was already broken. Dresden was filled with refugees...*"<sup>28</sup>

Now if this can happen with regard to rather recent events, could this not apply then also to the more remote historical facts? We should therefore be very careful not to be dogmatic on certain points. The birthday of Hus, for instance, is dated by some in 1369, while others say it was 1370 or 1372 and there are also some who are sure that it was July 6, 1373 although others would make us

believe it was 1374 and we also find some that state that the year and day of his birth are unknown.

Matthew Spinka, also cited by the critics, is just as well at variance on certain, quite important matters. Even on one and the same page we find in a few sentences, for instance, two discrepancies. We read: *“In spite of the fact that Colonna was no longer in charge of the case, he issued, in February 1411, a ban on Hus for non-compliance with his citation for personal appearance before him. He did not, however, decree that Hus was a heretic. Nevertheless, it was a victory for Zbynek, who promptly published the pronouncement in Prague. There, however, with the exception of two churches, the decree was not proclaimed, and Hus continued to preach at Bethlehem.”*<sup>29</sup>

Was cardinal Colonna no longer in charge of the case when he issued the ban on Hus in Februari 1411? And was it proclaimed in Prague only in two churches? Many other sources make clear that Colonna was still in charge at that moment when he issued in February 1411 the ban on Hus.

*“When he had not appeared on his summons, the Cardinal Colonna however had pronounced in his absence already the ban on Hus in February of the year 1411. But now, by intervention of the king, the Pope was persuaded to take away the matter from him and commit it to a new commission.”*<sup>30</sup>

*“The solicitors of Hus now demanded in a further judicial move the dismissal of Oddo Colonna as judge and desired that the matter should be given to another Cardinal. Before this new appeal was accepted (the Pope had entrusted the investigation of that to the auditor Johannes de Tomariis), Oddo excommunicated Hus in February 1411 because he did not appear before the Curie, not because of heresy. Shortly afterwards the pope withdrew the legal proceedings from the auditor as well as from Oddo Colonna and took it temporarily on himself.”*<sup>31</sup>

There is no doubt that these passages clearly indicate that cardinal Colonna was still in charge of the case when he issued the ban on Hus.

Many sources also make clear that it was proclaimed in all churches except two and not the other way round as Spinka would make us believe.

*“The, in February 1411, pronounced ban on Hus, because he had not appeared, had, meanwhile, come to Prague. The archbishop ordered the priests on March 15, to pronounce the ban immediately in their churches; only two refused: Christian von Prachatitz, old friend and protector of Hus, priest in St. Michael, and, amazingly, the priest of the German Knights in Prague.”*<sup>32</sup>

*“In February, the Roman Cardinal Odo di Colonna pronounced the church ban on Johannes Hus, because of continued disobedience, and the Archbishop*

Zbynek, on March 15, ordered the pronouncement in all Churches in Prague. In two churches only was the order of the Archbishop neglected.”<sup>33</sup>

It makes a great difference if cardinal Colonna was still, as papal judge, in charge or if he was not, when he pronounced the ban on Hus. If he was not, the ban would be certainly of dubious value.

It is also very different if the ban was pronounced in only two churches or if it was proclaimed in all churches except two.

If it was proclaimed in all, except two, it is understandable that the result would be far more intensive and much more liable to create a greater tumult.

Ellen White saw the controversy story in vision and was guided to select the best information available. Would it not be wise to stay with her instead of taking fallible sources as the standard to judge by what she has written?

Pastor Jan Voerman,  
Netherlands.  
([voermanjan@hotmail.com](mailto:voermanjan@hotmail.com))

#### Endnotes:

---

<sup>1</sup> “Im Febr. 1411 sprach Colonna über Hus die Excommunication in contumaciam aus, und bedrohte den Ort, wo er sich aufhalten würde, mit dem Interdikt.”  
Dr. Herzog et al., *Real-Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche. In Verbindung mit vielen protestantischen Theologen und Gelehrten*, Stuttgart und Hamburg, 1856, Band 6, s. 330.  
(Translations from the German and Dutch sources in this document, are my own.)

<sup>2</sup> “Eindelijk ging de Kardinaal Brancas tot nog scherpere maatregelen tegen de hervormer over. Hij liet openlijk een verklaring bekend maken, waarin hij hem een ketterhoofd noemde, ja, het Interdict over zijn woonplaats uitsprak, en aanstonds werd daaraan door de Aartsbisschop gevolg gegeven en Praag met het Interdikt gestraft.”  
Neander, *Geschiedenis der Christelijke Godsdienst en Kerk*, Rotterdam, 1858, dl. 9, p. 346.

<sup>3</sup> Cf., Spinka, *John Hus - A Biography*, Princeton, 1968, pp. 106-108. Paul Roubiczek and Joseph Kalmer, *Warrior of God, The Life and Death of John Hus*, London, 1947, p. 94.

<sup>4</sup> “Ein allgemeines Interdikt über ein Land oder Volk oder eine Diözese kann nur vom Papst verhängt werden...”  
Heinz Brunotte und Otto Weber, *Evangelisches Kirchenlexicon*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958, Band II, s. 348.

<sup>5</sup> “Da er aber der Vorladung des päpstl. Untersuchungsrichters Kard. Otto Colonna nicht entsprach, erfolgte Febr. 1411 die Exkommunikation durch den Papst, die am 15.3 in fast allen Kirchen Prags verlesen wurde.”  
Dr. Konrad Hofmann et al., *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche*, Herder & Co, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1933, Band 5, s. 206.

<sup>6</sup> J. Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. by Edinburgh, 1913, vol. VI, p. 887.

<sup>7</sup> *Chambers's Encyclopaedia, a Dictionary of Universal Knowledge*, London & Edinburgh, 1895, vol. VI, p. 16.

<sup>8</sup> “Op 18 juni 1411 legde de verbitterde kerkvorst de vloek van het interdikt over Praag. Een interdikt betekende, dat alle kerkdiensten werden verboden, dat geen sacramenten werden bediend, dat geen kinderen werden gedoopt, dat geen huwelijk werd ingezegend, dat geen stervende werd gezalfd en dat geen afgestorvene in gewijde aarde werd gelegd.”

- 
- Alfred C. Bronswijk, *Hervormers, kettters en revolutionairen*, Kampen, 1982, p. 58.
- <sup>9</sup> Thomas A. Fudge, *The Magnificent Ride, The first Reformation in Hussite Bohemia*, Ashgate, 1998, p. 75.
- <sup>10</sup> Roubiczek and Kalmer, p. 94.
- <sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 95.
- <sup>12</sup> Samuel Macaulay Jackson ed., *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Funk and Wagnals Company, New York & London, 1909, Vol. V, p. 416. Cf., Dr. Johann Losert, *Hus und Wiclif*, Prag, Leipzig, 1884, p. 113.
- <sup>13</sup> Johann Loserth, p. 123.
- <sup>14</sup> *John Hus at the Council of Constance*, trans., Matthew Spinka, 1965, p. 38.
- <sup>15</sup> Matthew Spinka, *John Hus: A Biography*, Princeton, 1968, pp. 124, 125.
- <sup>16</sup> Alfred C. Bronswijk, p. 58.
- <sup>17</sup> Spinka, *John Hus, A Biography*, p. 129.
- <sup>18</sup> Peter Hilsch, *Johannes Hus - Prediger Gottes und Ketzer*, Regensburg, 1999, s. 162.
- <sup>19</sup> Ernst Werner, *Jan Hus - Welt und Umwelt eines Prager Frühreformators*, Weimar, 1991, s. 108.
- <sup>20</sup> *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. VI, p. 887.
- <sup>21</sup> “...Jan Hus zondt drie gevormachtigden naar Rome om zyn afwezen te verontschuldigen; maar deze wierden kwalijk gehandeld en in de gevangnisse geworpen, en de kardinaal Colonna verklaarde Jan Hus hardnekkig, en uit dien hoofde verbannen. De gemachtigden beriepen zich hier van op den Paus, die vier kardinalen tot rechters benoemde, door welke het oordeel van Colonna niet alleen wierdt bevestigd, maar Jan Hus, nevens zyne leerlingen en vrienden, tot kettters verklaard, en aan hem alle kerk-diensten verboden. Jan Hus verliet daar op voor eenigen tydt de stadt van Praag, en begaf zich naar zyne geboorte-plaats Hus by den heer van dat dorp, van waar hy echter weder in Praag kwam...marge 1411.”
- Geerlof Suikers en Isaak Verburg, *Algemene Kerkelyke en Wereldlyke Geschiedenissen*, Rudolf en Gerard Wetstein, Amsterdam, 1724, Deel II, Tyd-bestek VI, Hoofdstuk IV, p. 37.
- <sup>22</sup> James Gardner, *Godsdiensten der Wereld*, Nieuwediep, [1870], dl. 2, p. 88.
- <sup>23</sup> R. Husen, *Geschiedenis der Hervorming van John Wicliff en Johannes Huss tot op de vrede van Munster en Osnabruck in 1648*, Doesburg, 1903, p. 46.
- <sup>24</sup> Ron Graybill, *Historical Difficulties in the Great Controversy*, p. 6.
- <sup>25</sup> Graybill, p. 6.
- <sup>26</sup> John Dowling, *The History of Romanism: from the earliest corruptions of Christianity to the present time*, 14<sup>th</sup> ed., Edward Walker, New York, 1847, p. 390, §§. 26, 27.
- <sup>27</sup> ‘Hist. et Monument. J. Hus., tom. i., p. 117.’ (Cf. G.C. p. 101).
- <sup>28</sup> *Dagblad van het Noorden*, Groningen, 12 februari, 2005.
- <sup>29</sup> Matthew Spinka, *John Hus’ Concept of the Church*, Princeton, 1966, p. 103.
- <sup>30</sup> “De Kardinaal Colonna had echter over Hus, toen hij op de dagvaarding niet verschenen was, reeds in de maand Februari van het jaar 1411 bij verstek de banvloek uitgesproken. Maar door de tussenkoms van de Koning liet de Paus zich overhalen, om de behandeling van deze zaak aan Colonna te ontnemen en op te dragen aan een nieuwe Commissie.”
- Neander, *Geschiedenis der Christelijke Godsdienst en Kerk*, Rotterdam, 1858, dl. 9, p. 345.
- <sup>31</sup> “Die Prokuratoren Hussens forderten nun in einem weiteren juristischen Schritt die Abberufung des Oddo Colonna als Richter und verlangten, die Sache einem anderen Kardinal anzuvertrauen. Bevor diese neue Appellation entschieden wurde (der Papst hatte die Untersuchung darüber dem Auditor Johannes de Tomariis anvertraut), exkommunizierte Oddo Hus im Februar 1411 wegen Nichterscheinens vor der Kurie, nicht wegen Ketzerei. Kurz darauf entzog der Papst sowohl dem Auditor wie Oddo Colonna die Prozessführung und zog sie vorübergehend an sich.”
- Peter Hilsch, *Johannes Hus - Prediger Gottes und Ketzer*, Regensburg, 1999, s. 120.
- <sup>32</sup> “Die von Colonna im Februar 1411 ausgesprochene Bannung Hussens wegen Nichterscheinens war inzwischen nach Prag gelangt. Der Erzbischof wies die Pfarrer am 15. März unverzüglich an, den Bann in ihren Kirchen zu verkünden; nur zwei verweigerten sich: Hussens alter Freund und Förderer Christian von Prachatitz, Pfarrer in St. Michael, und, überraschend, der Pfarrer der Deutschordenskommende in Prag.”
- Peter Hilsch, s. 124.

<sup>33</sup> “Im Februar sprach der römische Kardinal Odo di Colonna gegen Johannes Hus wegen dauernden Ungehorsams den Kirchenbann aus, den Erzbischof Zbynek am 15. März in allen Prager Kirchen verkünden liess. Nur in zwei Kirchen beachtete man die erzbischöfliche Anordnung nicht.”  
Josef Bujnoch, trans., *Hus in Konstanz, Der Bericht des Peter von Mladoniowitz*, Graz, Wien, Köln, 1963, s. 19, 20.  
Cf., Johann Loserth, p. 123.