SEBASTIAN CASTELLIO AND HIS 'DE HAERETICIS A CIVILI MAGISTRATU NON PUNIENDIS...LIBELLUS'

by Marius Valkhoff (University of the Witwatersrand)

‘In one page of the writings of Castellio I find more truth, more piety and more edification than in all the books of Calvin and Beza’. DIRCK COORNHERT

I

Nowadays everyone knows of the sensational discoveries of the Dead Sea scrolls and their considerable importance, probably the greatest discovery of this half-century in the field of philology. But in this same period other finds have been made which, although they are less spectacular, present a special interest, because of the new light they throw on a problem or a person, or even on several problems and several persons.

One day in 1938 Professor Bruno Becker (Amsterdam University), a distinguished specialist in the history of ideas of the 16th century and the conscientious editor of the Wellevenskunste by Dirck Coornhert, the Dutch ‘Montaigne’, was browsing in the small church library of the Remonstrant Community in Rotterdam. He was looking for the works of spiritualists and liberal thinkers of the time of the Reformation, which one might encounter in the archives of this Latitudinarian denomination. At a certain moment he picked up a double-manuscript (one text in Latin, the other in French), of which the Latin version was signed by the writer as Basilius Montfortius. It had been attributed by the authors of the printed catalogue to Celio Secondo Curione. When he started reading the Latin text, Becker at once recognized the handwriting of Sebastian Castellio and noticed that this unknown manuscript was the last word in a famous controversy between John Calvin and Theodore Beza on the one hand, and Castellio and a few friends on the other. Now Castellio, although somewhat overshadowed by the great reformers and handicapped by the fact that much of his work was considered to be heretical and hence could not be published in his life-time, was one of the outstanding personalities and most original thinkers of the 16th century. The relation of the French translation to the Latin original is not at once clear: it was written by another hand, but on the first half of the manuscript there are corrections by Castellio himself. Moreover the translation is very free and done into most colloquial French. It soon dawned upon Becker and the specialists with whom he discussed his find, that he had discovered a work of no little consequence.

In order to realize the full significance of the discovery, we have to go back to the year 1553. At that time a Spanish humanist, Michael Servetus, arrived in Geneva on his way to Italy. He had been physician in ordinary to the bishop

2. Professor B. Becker himself wrote about his discovery Quelques remarques à propos du De haereticis non puniendis de Sébastien Castellio in L’Esprit et la Vie, IV, 35 (Janvier, 1939); Een onbekend werk van Sebastiaan Castellio, de apostel der verdraagzaamheid, in De Duitse Warande en Belfort, 1949, pp. 640—645; Un manuscrit inédit de Castellio in Castellioniana, pp. 101 and foll.
of Vienne in Southern France and had dabbled in theology in his spare time. One day the Catholic Inquisition had got wind of a most heretical book of his and had taken him into custody, but after many vicissitudes he had succeeded in escaping from his prison. However, because of his heresies, of which two already — his rejection of the Holy Trinity and his condemnation of infant baptism — all over Christian Europe were punishable with death, he was as unwelcome amongst the Calvinists as he had been amongst the Catholics. Moreover Calvin had a particular antipathy against him, for Servetus had written and submitted his book to him, in a rather naive attempt to convince this great but stubborn and severe reformer. So, as soon as Calvin learnt of the presence of the arch-heretic and Anti-trinitarian in his Republic, he had him arrested, tried and burnt at the stake.

This is a well-known story and I have summarized it as briefly as possible. But the reaction to this event and its consequences are not common knowledge and they bear directly on our subject. The trial and execution of Servetus was received with mixed feelings in Protestant circles. Here was a co-religionist, who differed from the principal sects on a few tenets merely; but this sincere Christian and honest man had gone to the stake in Geneva as surely as he would have done in Catholic France. Such a thing had not yet happened in a Protestant country, for if the Lutherans killed the Anabaptists, they did so regarding them primarily as revolutionaryists nor as heretics. Some leaders defended Calvin, mostly for reasons of State, others frankly disapproved. Among the latter was a French humanist living in Basle, whom we are presently going to know better: Sebastian Castellio. Calvin was much moved by this criticism and decided to defend himself; already at the beginning of 1554 — hardly four months after Servetus' execution — he felt compelled to publish, both in Latin and French, an apology for his action in particular and for the killing of heretics in general, entitled: Defensio orthodoxae fidei de Sacra Trinitate contra prodigiosos errores Michaelis Serveti Hispani; ubi ostendit haereticos jure gladii coercendos esse et nominatim de homine hoc tam impio et merito suppliciumuisse. A few days later, as if to refute immediately his arguments, appeared another book, of which the front-page bore the following title, which also constitutes a kind of succinct programme: De haereticis, an sint persecendi, et omnino quomodo sit cum eis agendum, doctorum virorum cum vterum tum recentiorum sententiae. Liber hoc tam turbulentio tempore necassarius, et cum omnibus tum possissentum prindcipis et magistratibus utilisimus, ad descendam, quodnam sit eorum in re tam controversa, tamque periculosa, officium. Magdeburgi, per Georgium Rausch, Anno Domini MDLIV, Mense Martio.

Beza, who was already Calvin's right hand and who was to succeed him in 1564, rightly presumed that this Magdeburg was situated on the Rhine and that
Castellio had had a hand in this publication. In point of fact the new professor of Greek in Basle had made history in publishing for the first time in the annals of mankind a reasoned anthology of supporters of religious toleration and had thus started the first stage of what would become a fascinating controversy about liberty of conscience, a controversy which is still topical in our own day.

Professor R. Bainton (Yale University), the eminent American church-historian, quite truly remarks in this connection: 'If today we do honour to Castellio it is not simply that we may build the tombs of the prophets but that we may again heed their message. Liberty in our time in many quarters is in eclipse. We need once more to reexamine the presuppositions of freedom and we can do so no better than by renewing the struggle of a former time. And yet this very effort on our part is fraught with the possibility of renewed intolerance, for Castellio’s championing of liberty was itself a spirited attack upon intolerance, particularly as manifested by John Calvin and his associate, Theodore Beza. If we recount the story in a manner sympathetic toward Castellio we shall hardly escape from portraying Calvin and Beza in an unfavourable light and we may appear to be indulging in covert attack upon Calvinism itself.'

I too would like to get round the difficulty Bainton refers to and I therefore intend here first to present Castellio as an original thinker and a Latin author — after having sketched elsewhere his French works — and then to point out the importance of the newly discovered work in the history of ideas during the Reformation period as well as for our time. In a second article I hope to deal with the book itself and especially with a certain number of curious differences — due to the translator — that exist between the Latin version (L) and the French one (F), as well as the problems they raise.

Let us now outline the background of this little drama in order to understand better the main characters. Calvin was born in 1509 and Castellio in 1515, both were Frenchmen and therefore grew up under the reign of François I, the frivolous and art-loving Renaissance king. This was the age of a 're-birth' of Roman and Greek letters, arts and sciences. Authors, artists and intellectuals sought new inspiration in the rediscovered world of Ancient Rome and Greece. One has only to skim through the works of a Bude or a Rabelais to realize the abundant and catching enthusiasm with which thinking France threw itself upon the treasures then brought to light again: the great classics — and even the minor ones — were published in beautiful editions. Dictionaries and commentaries came out and it became fashionable to correspond in Latin and even more in Greek! Not that the Middle Ages had ignored Roman literature —

---


8 Professor B. Becker and I myself have prepared a joint edition of L and F, which will probably come out in 1961.
Greek had then been unknown in Western Europe —, but everything had been read and interpreted ad majorem Dei gloriorem, whereas the Renaissance studied the masterworks for themselves and also dared to criticize where necessary. During the first third of the 16th century the three renovating currents: Renaissance proper (Letters and Arts), Humanism (all sciences) and Reformation (religion) were not yet separated in France. When in their youth Calvin and Castellio studied in Paris and Lyons respectively, they might still have had illusions about a reform within the Catholic church (as Erasmus had had); they wrote letters and poems in Greek and Latin — while studying also the third classical language: Hebrew — and they changed their names of Chauvin and Chasteillon⁹ into Calvinus and Castalio — after a nymph! —, later replaced by Castellio. But soon this idyll would end, when in the night of 17 October 1534 placards insulting the mass were put up everywhere in France, right up to the door of the king's bedroom. Until then François I had been hesitant and lenient under the influence of his sister Marguerite de Navarre, but now he took fright at the magnitude of this new movement and sided with the catholics. Soon the flames of the stake flared up in France and the first Protestants suffered martyrdom. From that moment all humanists had to make up their minds about where they stood. Calvin and Castellio chose the difficult way of Protestant Renewal, whilst Budé and Rabelais quietly stayed in the mother church, probably without believing much.

It is time we turned back to our main subject and met Castellio at work in Basle. In the year of grace 1553 he had just been appointed to the chair of Greek at the university of the town, after a life full of bitter hardship as well as great productivity.¹⁰ When we now look back on the impressive list of his works as it is given by his biographer Ferdinand Buisson,¹¹ we are astounded to see the volume of the work he produced in the span of a quarter of a century (ended by his death in 1563), ranging from his early Latin and Greek poems — his 'péchés de jeuness' — to the newly discovered manuscripts. What also strikes us is the versatility of this classical scholar: he was a philologist bringing out careful editions of Greek authors — of which in my opinion the most interesting is his Sybilla oracula de graeco in latinum conversa et in eadem annotationes. He was also an educationist whose Dialogi sacri latino-gallici — later extended with 3 other volumes, in Latin only, and prefaced and commented upon — became a 'best seller' after his death (133 editions until the end of the 18th century); it is a textbook based on the Bible and written to provide Christian reading matter for his young pupils at the Geneva Athenaeum, instead of the

⁹ This is the form (Sebastian Chasteillon) which Castellio himself preferred while correcting F.
¹¹ op. cit., II, pp. 341 and foll.
¹² As we shall see further on, F can most probably be placed at the end of Castellio's life.
¹³ This is an abridged title, the whole book is usually spoken of as Dialogi sacri. The first volume was re-edited under the title Dialogues Sacrés by the Librairie Fischbacher (Paris, 1932).
'dangerous' classics. As a theologian and a liberal reformer, he translated the Bible, both into Ciceronian Latin — as contrasted with the Vulgate! — and into colloquial French, he translated from German into Latin and French the *Theologia Deutsch*, a mystical treatise; he adapted for Protestant readers another mystical booklet, the famous *De Imitatione Christi*, and he produced several theological works of his own of which the most original is his unfinished and posthumous *De arte dubitandi et confidendi, ignorandi et scienti*. As a defender of toleration he conceived three works in which he made not only his point about the issue itself, but also gave a good exposition of his liberal faith; to them belong the above-mentioned anthology (*De haereticis an sint perse­quendi*) and the manuscripts contained in the title of the present article and discovered by Becker. Finally, as a pacifist he published — only in French and under a pseudonym — a courageous and eloquent appeal to both parties in the first war of Religion to lay down their arms, his *Conseil à la France désolée* (1562). We must not think, however, that Castellio is in the first place a French author. Nearly all his writings are in Latin (in spite of the French titles which are sometimes used to designate them) and if we have French versions of four of them, we do not even know whether they are originals or translations done by some friend or disciple. Only his *Bible nouvellement translée* and his *Conseil à la France désolée* can be attributed to him without any doubt. Add to this that Latin was certainly the language he handled best, and that it was in this language that he conducted his correspondence with his friend Nicholas Zerchintes — published by Buisson, and not in French or German. Far away from the French cultural centres such as Paris, Lyons, Geneva or Lausanne, his mother tongue had become a bit rusty and in the German town of Basle he did not have much occasion to improve his slightly dialectal French (he was born at St Martin-de-Fresne in the French Jura). His French is often picturesque but his Latin is clear and correct — without being very elegant —; he himself must have noticed this divergence and certainly felt more at ease when writing Latin.

If in our century Castellio is coming more and more to the fore, it is not because of his editions of Xenophon, Herodotus or Diodorus Siculus, his school-books or his translations — although those of the Bible are remarkable and would deserve special monographs —: it is of course his original work that has been least touched by the finger of time. Many of his theological writings were

14 See about this part of Castellio’s activities the English article: *Castellio Paedagogus* by Professor Helena W. F. Stellwag in *Auteur de Michel Servet et de Sébastien Castellion*, pp. 181 and foll.

15 It was especially the Rev. E. Giran who stressed the idea of *two* Reformations: an orthodox one started by Luther and Calvin, and a liberal one inspired by Castellio (*op. cit.*).  

16 Published by Mrs. Elizabeth Hirsch, née Feist, in *Reale Accademia d’Italia. Studi e documenti*, Vol. VII (1937). *Per la Storia degli eretici Italiani del secolo XVI in Europa* by D. Cantimori, t. 2, pp. 307—430; the 23 chapters of the *Tractatus de Justificatione* have been omitted. The book was translated into Dutch and into French (see further on) and it is high time an English translation was brought out.

17 It is regrettable that this little book has not yet been re-edited.

18 *Traité des Hérétiques, Théologie Germanique, De l’Impunité des Hérétiques, Dialogues sacrés*; I think that the French of the last-mentioned book is Castellio’s own.

19 This is the abridged title; the book is often called Castellio’s *Bible en français*.

20 *op. cit.*, II, pp. 381—408.
already translated into Dutch during the War of Independence of the Dutch Republic, especially when at the beginning of the 17th century the struggle of the Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants opposed once more the orthodox believers and the Latitudinarians, the intolerant and the forbearing. Likewise in our own day there is a growing interest for Castellio among the liberal protestant sects, which consider him more and more as their spiritual father; the 1953 congress of the International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom (I.A.R.F.) was devoted to him and Servetus. It was not accidental either that subsequently his most typical work *De arte dubitandi* was published in French and Dutch and a new edition of *De haereticis an sint perseguendi* saw the light.

Nevertheless the historian of the Renaissance is more interested in his fight for religious toleration and freedom of thought. When in 1553 Castellio witnessed from a safe distance the trial and execution of Servetus, he must have undoubtedly waged an inward battle: now that he had been appointed a professor, after so many years of misery, was he going to stake his all by thwarting the powerful and venerated reformer in Geneva? How much easier would it be to devote himself to his work and his studies, to continue to publish his philological editions and to bring out every now and then some cautious treatise with his theological opinions... But the memories of executions he had attended as an eye-witness — there is a very vivid description of one in his last book —, his association with Calvin in Geneva which had become a failure, a warm sympathy for the courage of Servetus and a great dislike for Calvin's rigidity and his doctrine of predestination must have tipped the scales. So he wrote and published in Latin and French his above-mentioned *De haereticis an sint perseguendi*, probably assisted by a group of friends: David Joris, Lelio Sozzini, Celio Curione and others. The preface was signed by his pen-name Martinus Bellius, and thus he started what would become a *cause célèbre*, so much that in the 16th and 17th century the supporters of toleration were called *Bellians*, their doctrine *Bellianism* and Beza's refutation, which I am going to mention, the *Anti-Bellius*.

However, Castellio was greatly disappointed that he had not remained master of the battle-field and that Calvin had also conceived the idea of writing a book. In this way his action had been more or less neutralized, although the impression made by his own work had been much greater than that made by Calvin's. Castellio therefore closely examined the *Defensio orthodoxae fidei de Sacra Trinitate* and wrote a careful refutation of it discussing all the arguments one after the other. But times were already changing to his disadvantage: Geneva brought pressure to bear upon the magistrate of Basle, the municipal and academic authorities began to keep an eye on Castellio and friends dissuaded him from directly attacking the greatest living reformer and most considerable Protestant statesman. He consequently kept his manuscript in his portfolio and it was not until 1612 that Dutch Remonstrants published *Contra libellum*

---


23 See note 5.
Calvini in quo ostendere conatur haereticos jure gladii coercendos esse. Meanwhile Beza had begun to write an equally conscientious refutation of the Traité des Hérétiques and a year later appeared a De haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis libellus, adversus Martini Bellii farraginem et novorum Academicorum sectam; Theodoro Beza Vezelio auctore, soon translated into French by his friend Nicolas Colladon; this is the so-called Anti-Bellius, which concluded the 2nd stage of the ideological controversy.

Now it looked as if this 'bloodthirsty book of coercion against heretics' as Dutch Remonstrants called it, would remain un-refuted. Not because it was irrefutable, as the Calvinists pretended, but because the opponents had been reduced to silence. Much later (1590) in the Netherlands Coornhert published a refutation in Dutch and then Castellio's other two books were also translated and brought out. Already in the 17th century allusions had been made to a last masterpiece of Castellio refuting the irrefutable and it had been rumoured that J. J. Wetstein, a renowned 18th century theologian (Amsterdam University), possessed some un-published manuscripts by Castellio. But that was all and we could scarcely have spoken of a third stage in the sensational controversy, if Becker had not discovered the two manuscripts, of which the Latin one (L) is entitled: De haereticis a civili magistratu non puniendis, pro Martini Bellii farragine adversus libellum Theodori Bezae libellus. Authore Basilio Montfortio; the French version (F) had no title.

About the handwriting of L there was not a single doubt in Becker's mind; it was the same as that of De arte dubitandi and this latter treatise had been attributed to Castellio on the ground of French documents unquestionably written by him and also present in Rotterdam, such as Castellio's autographic testament and a certain number of letters (see photos in the next article). Another problem was how such valuable and important manuscripts had ended up in this forgotten library. Here Becker had luck. Turning over the pages of L he discovered two strips of yellowed paper which had served as bookmarks. On the back of one of them was printed: Amsterdam, Anno MDCCXLVIII. Den Eersten Sondag Seevende ..., so that it had apparently been a notice torn from an old church gazette or timetable. Now the place (Amsterdam), the time (middle of the 18th century) and the subject (Castellio) brought him at once to Wetstein. Of course, once he went into the question, everything became clear and everything fitted as perfectly as in a jigsaw puzzle. This minister of religion had been compelled to flee from Switzerland, 'because since the Reformation never had such dangerous ideas been preached as those by Wetstein' (as a contemporary said). He had been a Castellionist and had most likely brought to Holland the manuscripts and other 'Castellioniana', which he was to donate to the Amsterdam Remonstrant Community at his death; the latter had conveyed them as a gift to the sister community in Rotterdam. In this way the manuscripts had been identified and accounted for by their discoverer.

Both L and F consist of quires, the former counting 363 written pages in all and the latter 500; there are 58 Latin supplements, which form a special quire.

25 For convenience sake I named it De l'Impunité des Hérétiques.
26 One can find the story of this other discovery in Becker's article: Een onbekend werk van Castellio (see note 2).
while the 16 French ones have not yet been found. In L at least a quarter of the text was crossed out, but most of it had been translated in F before. According to Becker this probably means that after Castellio’s death friends or disciples of his started preparing the manuscript for publication and deleted passages which would have been censured by the authorities or would have shocked the public. There are also corrections and notes in the margin by Castellio himself and two different hands; here are some interesting ones collected by the editor: argutia fuganda (folium b 5v), argumentum elumbe et alienum (h 5), dicatur obscurius (b 10), hoc tibi certe constare debet (suppl. 30). It is clear that the same group of friends which assisted him in compiling and writing De haereticis an sint persecuendi, also advised him about this far more dangerous book. But they did not succeed in bringing it out after his death; in 1578, Fausto Sozzini, the founder of Socianism, was luckier with his edition of Sebastiani Castellionis Dialogi IV (De Praestitutione, De Electione, De Libero Arbitrio, De Fide). The first page of F bears the motto Nonum p r ematur in annum, taken from Horace and written by Castellio in his special italicised handwriting (in which are also written his corrections in F). Castellio had enough common sense to appreciate the situation at the end of his life and to realize that his book would not be published forthwith. But little could he foresee that four centuries would elapse before it would see the light in Holland in the early 1960’s.

L bears the date of 11 March 1555 (also translated in F), so that it really constitutes Castellio’s last word against Beza and Calvin. When one compares the full titles of the Anti-Bellius and L, one notices at once that Castellio copied Beza’s title almost word for word, of course introducing non before puniendis and changing the names; he even kept the unfavourable term farrago ’hotch-potch, pack of lies or nonsense’. This happened in the heat of the battle, but to my way of thinking F must have been one of the last manuscripts on which Castellio worked. It was translated under his supervision and some parts must have been dictated (e.g. the Requête au lecteur, which is missing in L and is too important to have been invented by a collaborator in Castellio’s presence). But the whole gives the impression of having been left unfinished. Castellio’s corrections only cover the first half of the manuscript and his italicised handwriting shows signs of illness or old age, according to the graphologist F. W. W. Simon. Moreover everything suggests haste: certain corrections were made in such a hurry that Castellio had to re-correct them and after having made a rectification he often forgot to correct the same mistake a few lines farther; some corrections were wrongly made (e.g. comme si changed into comment si, because of antiquated comme for comment) and the number of corrections decreases considerably in the last two quires he revised. Furthermore the second half of F is not a final text either, for words are repeated, mistakes are overlooked and sometimes the writer has left a choice between two synonyms or translations. Consequently, however incredible it may seem, we have to assume that in the fatal year of 1563, when Castellio wrote De arte dubitandi, adapted De imitatione Christi, translated from Italian into Latin Ochino’s daring Dialogi XXX and — last but not least — defended himself against A. Bodenstein’s treacherous accusation of heresy, he must also have had these two favourite manuscripts under his eyes. Then, on

---

the 29th December the curtain falls: Castellio was neither to go to the stake nor to be exiled, he departed on his last journey to a better land.

Hence, when at one occasion I called De l'impunité des hérétiques (ms. F) Castellio's swan-song, this was not done because it was the last 'Castellionia-num' to be found. Psychologically too, it is not unlikely that in the months of November and December 1563, when he was in peril of his life because of the impending persecution, he turned back to these manuscripts. In them he had pictured in advance his own case and there he had given the best defence against heretic-hunting one might ever encounter. But there is still something more curious: both to L and F and to De arte dubitandi, Castellio added supplements; these supplements are usually marked by a + sign and a number in the margin and a reference-sign in the text. Instead of being inserted in an increasing order: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc., they seem to be placed quite arbitrarily; in F, for instance, this is the order of the (lost) supplements: 2, 1, 3, 7, 8, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15; the last one on folium D 2, still followed by more than 100 folia corrected by Castellio. I for one see only one explanation for this strange procedure, and that is that Castellio must have taken up these manuscripts every now and then for a few spare hours to read them over and to improve them. He must have done this in a rather haphazard manner perusing now this chapter now another. Why only these three manuscripts? I venture the answer: because they are his favourites. De arte dubitandi no less than the other two, for this book was a kind of theological and philosophical testament — a summa of his doctrine — and he began it in a year when he could more or less foresee his own fate (after the posthumous burning for heresy of the exhumed body of his friend David Joris).

There are many other problems to discuss in connection with L and F, of which I can here only touch upon the relation between the Latin and French versions of Castellio's works. As we have seen, one cannot be sure that all the French texts were translated by the author himself. This was certainly not the case of De l'impunité des hérétiques and recently Becker has discovered and deciphered a curious marginal scribble in French on the beginning of the 2nd chapter of De arte dubitandi, which can hardly be anything else than an instruction for a translator. This does not mean, however, that Castellio did not supervise his translations or step in every now and then to have passages altered or even to elaborate on the new text. My impression is, as I have already said above, that parts of F must have been dictated, even the handwriting indicates it: there are pages that seem to flow easily, without corrections, with words linked together and other signs of hasty writing. But then again there are parts that were conceived with difficulty, full of erasures — sometimes double or triple ones — and attempts to approach the ideal rendering of the Latin version.

I do not exclude either the possibility of our translator having at times copied outright some passages translated and written by the author. Anyhow, Castellio...
endorsed these French texts and among Castellionists his paternity was recognised likewise for the Latin and French works. Therefore we have the perfect right to use $F$ in order to elucidate obscurities in $L$, and this is exactly one of the tasks Becker has set himself for his substantial Introduction and edition of $L$, besides picturing the historical and ideological background of the work. For that matter I myself have collated $L$ and $F$ and the differences are more often than not most interesting, as I hope to show in my 2nd article.

When now we strike the balance, we clearly see the importance of Becker’s discovery. First of all he elucidated the identity of the enigmatic Basilius Montfortius, who puzzled generations of theologians and historians (he is the author of the conclusion of *De haereticis an sint persequendi*) $^{31}$: $L$ is signed by Montfortius and therefore he is identical with Castellio. Next the discovery of the route by which the manuscript arrived in Holland (Wetstein!) reveals an interesting connection and once more enlightens the close relations between Castellio and the Remonstrants, the greatest liberal Protestant denomination in the Netherlands. But what is more important, these manuscripts conclude the famous 16th century controversy on religious toleration. Becker himself remarks about them: ‘It goes without saying that we find back in our manuscripts several arguments against the persecution of heretics which we already know from other writings by Castellio, i.e. the preface to his Latin translation of the Bible (published in 1551), the *Traité des Hérétiques*, where the pieces attributed to Martin Bellie, Georges Kleinberg et Basile Montfort were written by Castellio himself, and especially his *Contra libellum Calvini*. But the arguments in favour of toleration, although they are already known, do not fail to impress the reader when they are presented in a new form’ $^{32}$. I should like to add that $L$ and $F$ — the latter is even a little more extensive — contain in addition a number of religious opinions of Castellio which all together give a pretty sound — although not quite complete — picture of his spiritualistic and anti-dogmatic faith $^{33}$; this is no doubt a remarkable aspect of the book which is worth developing, and there are many passages that will surprise the present-day reader by their freshness and their modernism. Many of his remarks ‘go home’, particularly in the more picturesque version $F$ and I am convinced that this discovery will not only change our ideas about that thrilling episode of the Reformation and its main protagonists, but will even influence modern religious thought, now that Castellio has received the attention he deserves.

Marquis d’Oria, the god-father of one of Castellio’s children, offered a copy of the *Traité des Hérétiques* to Boniface Amerbach, another influential friend of the author. On this copy, which has been preserved, one of the two wrote the great words κόσμον ἐλέφαντι ‘a fly against an elephant’ $^{34}$. This motto rightly summarizes Castellio’s material potentialities in his fight against Calvin. But fortunately it is not material power that triumphs in the long run, but spiritual values. May this be the moral of the story of the discovered manuscripts.

$^{31}$ See *Castellioniana*, p. 103 and notes 3 and 4.
$^{32}$ *Castellioniana*, p. 108.
$^{33}$ Castellio’s conception is of course much more complicated: there are also rationalist and mystical strains. See i.a. Baunt’s article in *Castellioniana*, p. 25 and foll. and J. Lindeboom: *La place de Castellion dans l’histoire de l’esprit in Autour de Castellion et de Servet*, p. 158 and foll.
$^{34}$ The anecdote is given by E. Giraud, *op. cit.*, p. 206, where he wrongly writes (note 2): κόσμον.
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