In my first article we learnt to know Sebastian Castellio (1515—1563) as a humanist, a liberal reformer, a defender of religious freedom and a prolific Latin writer. His main characteristic is his originality, especially where he breaks new ground in the fields of humanism and reformation. To his contemporaries he was primarily the Latinist who had turned the most picturesque scenes of the Bible into elegant and sprightly dialogues (his *Dialogi Sacri* was one of the most popular schoolbooks of his century) and the Latinist who had dared to translate the Bible into Classical Latin (1551), substituting e.g. *genitrix*, *lavare* or *collegium* for *angelus*, *baptizare* or *synagoge* respectively. Then he had also been the translator of the two Testaments into popular French, introducing even a simplified spelling of his own. This *Bible en français* (1555) with its striking colloquialisms and rustic words or expressions (originating from the author's Jurassian dialect), had soon become a target for malicious jokers.

Still the idea of rendering the Scriptures in a language as simple as the original and comprehensible to 'the man in the street' is tenable, and Castellio's method of critically handling the books and the text of the Bible is now common practice. Finally, to his contemporaries he was likewise the thinker who had risked his life to oppose John Calvin, the powerful orthodox reformer and statesman. We, men of the middle of the 20th Century, see Castellio above all as a great forerunner and a revolutionary in spiritual matters. His plea for religious tolerance — and political for that matter — has been won and even staunch Calvinists will in our day accept Castellio's views on this subject. We are also impressed by his biblical criticism, to which I have just referred; here too he was much ahead of his time. Castellio's idea of free will, as opposed to Calvin's conception of predestination, has been adopted by the liberal Protestant sects, which nowadays consider him more and more as their spiritual father. In the same way other religious views of his have been appropriated by them, such
as his perfectionism, his antidogmatism, his preferring good morals to good doctrine, his latitudinarianism, and his suggestion that to each of us the Bible ought to be a source of personal inspiration. The modern reader will still read for his own benefit Castellio's posthumous treatise De arte dubitandi et confidendi, ignorandi et scienti and he will undoubtedly read with interest his unknown book De haereticis non puniendis, about whose discovery by Professor B. Becker I wrote in my first article.

It is now time we turned back to the two newly discovered manuscripts, examined some of the problems they set and said a few words about the contents. As we have seen before, the Latin text L was written by Castellio himself. It is in the same handwriting as that of De arte dubitandi (see plates 1 and 2), which in its turn corresponds to that of the author's handwritten and signed testament. The French text F on the other hand shows a different handwriting, but its first half bears corrections made by Castellio in the italicised handwriting which he also used on the frontispiece of L and for the motto on the first page of F (see plate 3). F itself seems to be partly translated by a friend or disciple and partly dictated by Castellio himself (or copied out fair by the unknown writer from a rough copy of the author).

It is most interesting to study some of the philological problems which arise from these two manuscripts. Of course I cannot deal with them in detail in an article, but I shall endeavour to give the reader a notion of their importance. Above all, the question of translation from Latin into the mother tongues occupied the minds of humanists and reformers much in the time of the Renaissance.

There were two audiences, first the aristocracy and the clergy, who read Latin and often Greek without difficulty, and even corresponded in these languages; next the bourgeoisie and the uneducated masses, who only knew French (or German in Strasbourg or Basle for instance). It had been Calvin's great merit to have translated his Institutio Christianae religionis into French (in 1541), in order to impress the second audience; the first audience had been reached by his Latin edition of 1536. This masterpiece is written in a clear and beautiful French and is considered to belong to French literature by all handbooks on the subject. By this daring act he had not only brought the summum of the orthodox Reformation under the eyes of the general public, but also forced his opponents to answer him in the same language in order to reach the same audience. In this way he established French as the language of theological controversy, which meant a linguistic revolution in 16th century France. Whereas the original version was destined for the students ('gens d'estude'), the translation into common speech was intended, as the reformer himself observes, 'to assist the simple people ... as if it were to give them a hand, to lead them and to help them to find the essentials ('somme') of what God wanted to reach

---

4 I am aware that mine is a very subjective and a very incomplete summary of Castellio's theology!
5 See about re-editions notes 21 and 22 of my first article.
6 This is the book of which the Latin and French versions are being published jointly by Professor B. Becker and myself.
Plate 1
De Arte Dubitandi, beginning of Chapter II, in Castellio's handwriting and with his marginal scribble in French about the efficacy of prayer (see article I, note 30).
De Haereticis a Civili Magistratu non punitis, folium a 30, in Castellio's handwriting.
Plate 3
De l'Impunité des Héritiques, folium A2, in the handwriting of Castellio's collaborator with some corrections made by Castellio himself (e.g. the last 3 lines).
us by His word’. In this way, even though its topic was a difficult one, the book had become a popular work; words which were too technical were eliminated, explanatory notes were added, while the language used is colloquial whenever the subject allows. In later editions Calvin even showed a tendency to become more familiar and more circumstantial; that of 1560, the last, is more prolix, more adorned and more flowery than any other. Castellio, too, indulges in this desire to embroider and embellish his French texts. It is piquant to note how Castellio and Calvin, the two great opponents, probably used the same methods of work and the same kinds of language and style.

Let us now study the attitude of the humanist or reformer towards translations and translators into the ‘sermo vulgaris’, with the aid of our Latin and French Castellio-manuscripts.

1. It is a fact that the language of F is the most colloquial French which I have ever come across in the 16th century, except perhaps for Castellio’s French Bible. Part of it could have been dictated by Castellio (e.g. the Requête au Lecteur, which is missing in L), but most of the text is probably the French of his collaborator. Now this friend or disciple may very well have translated also Castellio’s other French works of which Castellionists doubt whether the French is his (Traité des Hérétiques and Théologie Germanique) 8. Just like Castellio, Calvin too used to dictate parts of his works to a secretary and give him notes to elaborate or insert. Dealing with the mistakes in Calvin’s last edition of the Institution, Professor J. Plattard remarks: ‘They are due to the carelessness of the secretaries to whom Calvin dictated and to the negligence of the printers. If these mistakes are more numerous in the edition of 1560, the reason is, as we know through one of his friends, that he did not write but dictated all the additions to the new text, and left to one of his secretaries the task of preparing the manuscript for the printers’ 7. Most probably Castellio could not have afforded more than one secretary, but we should be glad to know who this man was and which of the works he translated; in this respect his language could be a key to solving these problems. F also provides us for the first time with the handwriting of one of Castellio’s collaborators and here too we have a possibility of identification (see plate 3).

Now the language of F is typical enough to serve as a guide for future investigators. It is extremely colloquial and we encounter vulgarisms which are still condemned in correct 20th century French 9. The negative particle ne

---


8 As for the other three works in French, I should think that the Dialogues sacrés (1543), where the French translation only covers the first book, was done by Castellio himself. He was still too young and too poor to afford a secretary and he may have translated it with his pupils in the classroom. About his Bible en français (1555) he himself tells several times in his correspondence how he is working on it. His Conseil à la France désolée only exists in French and has several linguistic traits in common with his Bible.

9 This example shows how far the spoken language is ahead of the written one! The language of F would deserve an extensive study, which would be quite rewarding. As our edition is not yet out, I indicate the examples by the letter of the quire and the page; v means verso.
already begins to be omitted and F has Esse point (D 5) for n’est-ce-point; sa esté (M 1v) for ça (ou cela) a été is another popular trait. Moreover, the translator writes and perhaps pronounces prope (B 6v) for propre, and fonde (A 3v) for forte, and as a hypercorrectism (super-correction) he uses contre (D 8v) for conter (= compre). His French is neither (a) correct nor (b) consistent.

(a) He uses a subjunctive vivissent (K 4) for vecussent (or older vesqttissent), eussé (E 1v) for eusses, faudra-il que vous jugez de tous (E 3v) without subjunctive: jugiez.

(b) When he has doubles at his disposal, he employs now the popular form (ostine, doctrine, monester), now the learned form obstine, doctrine, admonester, with a slight preference for the former. Frequently he takes up again a noun by means of a personal pronoun, which is nowadays a vulgarism: Toutefois saint Paul, Bâze, craignant de nuire à quelque infirme, il ne parloit sapience qu’entre les parfaits (H 15), or he shows that he already pronounces il and ils as i, just as the present-day Parisian: le bien qui veulent (A 16v), corrected by Castellio into quilz.

Still the writer of F does not make the impression of being a foreigner writing French, for he demonstrates a great facility and his ‘mistakes’ make sense. All the same, his language has certain peculiarities and sometimes a dialectic trait drops from his goose-quill. These traits seem to belong to the North-East of the French territory, or perhaps to the East (there the Bugey is the region where Castellio was born and brought up). Such are pleume (19v) for plume, meillieu (E 4) for milieu, Suisse (E 5) for Suisse, colly (D 14) for colly, les ceux (B 15v) for ceux, complignans (C 8) for complaignans, le troisième partie (G 7) for la troisième partie, souffsa (I 6v) for souffir, à ceste heure (G 7) (Walloon asteure) translating Latin nunc and perhaps -êt for -eurt: doucer (G 4v), of which there is at least one other example in F. Note that Castellio accepts most of these colloquial or dialectical features (he corrects celluy), even esse point (D 5), and would therefore seem to approve of them or at least to find them not shocking enough to eliminate them at the beginning of his revision.

It is noteworthy that this colloquial French, tinged with Walloonisms or Bugeysisms — or perhaps even with both 10 — also contains an impressive number of Latinisms. The text abounds in ‘accusatives and infinitives’ (ils confessent Christ estre Seignur et juge du monde) (F 1) and other Latin forms. Absolute ablatives (Zébèdeu ayant seulement parlé de la permission de Dieu) (I 5), participial constructions and turns with quel are equally numerous. There are Latin words that have been borrowed almost unaltered, although good translations existed for them, e.g. illation, incréible for accusation, incroyable. Every now and then the version of F follows L so closely, although elsewhere developing or paraphrasing it, that it remains unintelligible without the original L. There is no denying it, with its simple and unadorned Latin, L is much easier to understand than F with its strange and exuberant French, the fruit of a humanist’s attempt to put on to paper his spoken French; this difficulty remains, even when we take into account the difference between a 16th century treatise and a modern novel for instance. Nevertheless, owing to its embellishments and embroideries, F presents a text which in my opinion is more attractive to a

10 In case we should be in the presence of specimens of Castellio’s language as well as that of his collaborator.
present-day reader than the Latin version. Hence future translators who intend to popularize this remarkable work among English, German or Italian readers, would do well to reckon both with L and with F.

2. I have already treated the nearly 450 corrections made by Castellio in the text of F in the Preface to my critical edition (De l’Impunité des Hérétiques), so that I will present here only the gist of it. Naturally these corrections can assist us in learning some of the author’s linguistic habits, and conceptions about language and style. In themselves they do not raise great problems, but the original text is sometimes difficult to decipher under Castellio’s erasures. First of all the author corrects his own name and we now know that Sébastien Chasteillon (or: Sebastian) Casteillon (D 4) was the form he preferred at the end of his life, when he worked on this French manuscript 11. He improves the style where he can, easing a sentence by putting qui for lesquelz (A 9v), replacing the too colloquial pour faire ce que tu veux by pour faire ce qu’on veut (A 16), or when at the beginning of a rather heavy sentence: c’est là sans doute, Bèze, votre art, he writes: Vêlà, vêlà, Bêze votre art (B 14), with a vêlà for voilà, which is typical of Castellio and which also occurs in his Bible en français and his Conseil à la France désolée. Sometimes he archaizes, isolated as he was in the German-speaking town of Basle, and falls back into the dialectal French of his youth, for since 1545 he had had no opportunity of brushing it up in one of the cultural centres of France or French Switzerland. Thus he makes soupefon (C 9) feminine and affaire (F 14v) masculine, contrary to the usage of his time, and he changes chassez (= chassés) into forelôs (B 2), a real archaism, and balles (de vos livres) into folloiz (A 13), which seems to be a dialect word. However, in the majority of cases our author modernises as we would expect him to do. Ne veoys-tu point becomes ne voys-tu point (B 5), il faalloit — il folloit (B 15), ainsoyz — mais aussi (C 5), à sçavoir — à savoir (F 20v). The complete list is impressive and it shows us how much Castellio was in advance of his time 12. A spelling sçavoir, which he rejects for savoir, was still currently used in the 18th century, and through many other linguistic innovations he is ahead of the 17th century. Often he attenuates the bearing or the effect of a passage, for instance where he himself while dictating, or his collaborator while translating, had been too affirmative. Probably instructed by the author, the translator had mostly rendered ego or nos in L by Bellie et les siens, as a measure of precaution. Castellio goes further and where F had left comme(ni) si nous étions cause he modifies: comme(ens) si ceux qui les allègent estoient cause (B 12v), and on the following line et non par ce que nous citons leurs témoignages becomes et non par ce qu’on cite leurs témoignages (ibidem). Somewhere else, speaking about a passage which Calvin is supposed to have cancelled in a new edition of his Institution, he cautiously adds: pour le moins je ne l’ai encor sceu trouver ès dernières (i.e. in the Institution) (B 16), and in the same way he adds que je sache at the end of the sentence à cause que les Escriptures ne parlent en aucun lieu en telle sorte (D 17v), which shows his scholarly conscientiousness, and in general a feeling of responsibility towards his reader. It does not seem

11 On the 4th December 1560 our author signed his testament as Sebastian Chateillon.
12 The reader will find a more complete study in the 2nd half of my Preface to the edition of F.
impossible that Castellio applied certain stylistic principles when correcting the translation of L. He surely prefers the learned form (obstine, B 8) to the popular one. He restores the etymological spelling in reprendre (B 5), rendant (C 4), rendez (D 17), by correcting reprandre, randent, randez. In the same way he latinizes Roman or erudite names such as Crasse, Alasgue, Arrie, which become under his pen: Crassus (C 2), Alasco (D 3v), Arrius (E 11). Finally there are of course a great number of ordinary misinterpretations and lapsus calami which have also been rectified by the author.

As we have seen in the first article, both Castellio and his collaborator give the impression of having been in a hurry, and neither the text of F nor the corrections by Castellio can be said to be final. I would surmise that the two friends did their utmost to produce a passable text in the last two months of Castellio's life when he was prosecuted for heresy, and we may now conclude that they fairly well succeeded in this almost superhuman task.

The most important question which our manuscripts raise is the one of the translator's technique: how do the Latin and French texts compare? Several reformers translated their works from Latin into the vulgar tongue or had them translated under their own supervision, and often we have two versions of the same book which may sensibly differ from each other. We would like to have more studies like J. W. Marmelstein's thorough comparison of Calvin's Latin and French editions of his Institution, a pioneering work of which much applies to Castellio's translations as well. In our case these differences are striking: first of all the translator must have been working on an initial version of L, for many passages that were crossed out (about one quarter of the manuscript!) had been translated in F beforehand. Moreover the writer of F takes such great liberties with Castellio's Latin text that he must have been a man of mature age and an original thinker and also probably a confidant or friend of Castellio's. He knows Latin well and also writes a few Greek words without hesitation, so that if he did not copy all the Greek of L this can only mean that in certain cases he was still looking for a translation. Nevertheless, in translating from Latin he makes a number of mistakes which I should ascribe to negligence or haste. Several translations which at first sight look like errors, upon close examination prove to be very free interpretations. We should not forget, however, that F is likely to have been no more than a first draft.

A complete comparative study of L and F would easily fill a whole book and it would be a suitable subject for a doctoral thesis. I shall therefore confine myself to giving here an outline of the results of a collating I did myself of the two manuscripts. The most salient feature which dominates throughout the 500 pages of F is what I should like to call a stylistic hendiadys.

Here is an example right from the beginning: F translates clementes and in—

---

13 I cannot imagine that Castellio would have entrusted anyone but a close friend with the task of translating and elaborating one of his main works.

14 For the difficult circumstances under which Castellio had to work in the year of his death (1563), I refer the reader to my first article.

15 Étude comparative des textes latins et français de l'Institution de la Religion Chrétienne par Jean Calvin, Groningue La Haye, 1921.

16 This is also the impression made by his handwriting. (See plate 3). Compare likewise n. 13.
clementes (a 4) by doux et bêins and rudes et inhumains respectively (A 3). Sometimes both words are synonyms, as is more or less the case here, sometimes a new shade of meaning is added, e.g. consulricem insanam (a 5v) becomes une mauvaise et enragée conseillère (A 5); in the latter case I have more often than not mentioned the hendiadys in a foot-note of my edition of F. Occasionally we encounter a double hendiadys. For instance when F translates dicendi copiam (c 4) by le pouvoir et liberté de ceste eloquence et beau parlor (C 3). The translator also uses this figure of style to explain a difficult term, e.g. fallacia (e 15) > ta falace et finesse. (F 15v), or zizania (g 1) > les zizamzies ou mauvaises herbes (H 3). In the same way proper names are elucidated: Elymas: (f 2v) > Elymas l'enchanteur (F 21v), or Gallio (h 13) > le proconsul d'Achaïe, Gallio (K 1v). The great majority of hendiadyses are of this twofold type, but we also have examples of threefold ones: O artes parum liberates, f 5v > O ars bien peu libérales! O rues outrageuses! O faitz vilains et desbonnestes! (G 3), and fourfold ones scurrilitasibus (e 2v) > Choses de plaisanterie, gaudisseries, mots de gâuleille et propos pour rire (E 8v), which are veritable rhetorical developments, inspired by the writer's indignation. The opposite of the hendiadys is extremely rare: oracula ... plana et perspictta (d 6v) > ... manifestes (D 6v), and Sanat enim deletque Christm omne peccatum (f 15v) > Car Christ guarit tout peche (G 20v), which is about all I have found, whereas the ordinary hendiadyses are plentiful. Professor Ch. Bruneau observes that this stylistic hendiadys was developed by translators at the end of the Middle Ages and became a rhetorical figure among Renaissance authors (Montaigne cut it down in the later editions of his Essais, which seems to prove that by then it was going out of fashion) . But it remains a fact that our translator was excessively fond of this stylistic figure and that it is his principal means of paraphrase. As a matter of fact the omissions of F with regard to L are much fewer than the additions, and they do not appear to have much significance; the additions on the other hand are almost always explicable. The language of L is very simple and its style rather arid: Castellio will begin a sentence with a terse Qttidcum, Atenim, Item qttod or Et qttod; his translator was in the habit of embellishing and thus the first may become in F: Plus que direz-vous que, the second Voire mais, je diras-tu, the third Plus vous dites que nous blasfémions à nostre escient, pourcq que, the fourth Tu ne sais que, among several other translations. In other cases the translator introduces a learned word and explains it in this way: collyrium (c 12v) > du collyre ou remède pour les yeux (C 14v), or atheus (d 1) > athéiste, c'est-à-dire sans Dieu (D 1). Or he improves the text of L, when it is too concise: populum (d 4) > le simple peuple (D 6), or diligere Deum (d 6) > aymer Dieu de tout son cœur (D 8v). Or he develops Castellio's thoughts, with which he seems to have been familiar: in Dania et alibi (suppl. 51) > de Dannemarc et autres lieux de la basse Almaine (D 18), or qua debiliorum sumus (i 6v) > qui n'avoys aucune puissance et ne sommes plus de l'église (k 18v). And often Castellio endorses such developments, for instance when his collaborator had translated et imbéciles ab obedientiae conatu detertere (suppl. 52) by Né détournez-vous par espouvamment les infirmes de

17 Castellio changed evidentes into manifestes.
19 In this special case we have a correction by Castellio himself.
mettre peine et travailler après l'obéissance des commandements de Dieu (E 13v),
he simply substitutes pas en descourageant for par espoventement. At times the
writer of F even adds a whole passage or sentence which is missing in L. Sed
vosis banc mentem dísplícere minus mírum est cum persecutíones tantiim abstíat
(g 10v) extingvere velitís, ut ad eas excitandas libros nominatímus (quod namquam
post homines nótes quod sciam factum fuerat) publicítes is rendered like this:
Mais il ne se faut émerveiller si une telle intention vous déplait, veu que tant s'en
fait que vouliez estendre les persécutions que pour les émouvoir, nomméem
publiez livres, ce que je pense n'avoir esté fait depuy que le monde est monde
(H 19), which is a personal and lucid way of translating. But then he subjoins
the following feeling sentence of his own: Mais quoy, vous estes en lieu hors de
ces dangers, en domination, en prospérité, ayans le vent en poupe, pour ce n'est
de merveilles si sans considération ainsy jasez, car vous estes à vostre aise et
avez les pieds chaux. I for one cannot imagine that Castellio's collaborator would
have made such important additions to his master's or friend's work without
his consent or his knowing it. How then do we account for the too free
translations (why e.g. la costume platonique for per Pythagoricmn modum?), the
clumsy ones (timore perculsos cogebant in suum obsequimn > estoient con-
trains par contrainte à leur obéir) or the wrong ones (obscurius aigue obstusius
by plus obscur et dur)? I venture the answer that neither he nor Castellio
brought this captivating book to a conclusion and were still working on it
when death snatched our author away at the peak of his activities on the 29th
December 1563.

Last but not least, it should be stressed that the importance of the two
unknown Castellio manuscripts lies to a great extent in the contents of this
remarkable work. Both L and F were written in such a way that they spoke for
themselves and could be read without any special knowledge of the previous
publications in the famous controversy between Calvin and Beza on the one
side and Castellio and his friends on the other. Nevertheless in the introductory
pages the author advises his readers to keep Martinus Bellius' De Haereticis an
sint persequendi (the so-called Traité des Hérétiques)20 and Beza's Anti-
Bellius21 at hand, so that it would be easier for them to follow the argumen-
tation (c 6v). But a bit further on he summarizes the Preface of his Traité for
those who do not possess it (c 6v ss.). As his new treatise is meant as a refutation
of his main opponents he says: 'Suppeditabit certe ipse mihi in suo libro artem
qua refellatur, sequarque in disputatione ordinem, et rationem eius quo mihi
sit minus in ea quaerendo negotii' (a 4v).

Now, as contrasted with De Haereticis an sint persequendi, a rather loosely
composed anthology of advocates of toleration, the Anti-Bellius is a well-built
and stringent demonstration. As such it rightly aroused the admiration of contemporaries and even Castellio confesses that he thought Beza's eloquence
extraordinary ( = singulares). Between a Prologus and Conclusio the book
contains 5 main chapters, each carefully divided into sections (argumenta).
Many of the arguments are drawn from the Bible, as it was customary in

20 See my first article, especially note 5.
21 The origin of this name and the original title have been discussed in my first
article.
religious controversies. Here is the division with the first argument of I in extenso:

I. Miscellanea. Primum argumentum, quo probare nituntur adversarii non esse puniendos haereticos. Quia scilicet ea omnia de quibus quaeri solet, sunt non usque adeo cognitu necessaria, neque sciri possunt nisi ab iis qui sunt mundo corde; et si sciantur, hominem non reddant meliorem.

II. Haereticorum punitionem ad civilem Magistratum non pertinere quibtts argumentis doceant adversarii.

III. An Magistratui non licet capitali supplicio in haereticos animadvertere.

IV. Confirmatio propositae quaestionis puniendos esse haereticos.

V. Haereticos interdum capitali supplicio esse coercendos.

This was the argumentation Castellio had to reflect upon in order to write his refutation, but his book acquired a character of its own and did not become an 'Anti-Beza'. Naturally we find in the margin of the manuscripts references to Beza's arguments, besides sub-titles and other notes, and all the 20 authors quoted in De haereticis an sint persequendi re-appear on the scene. In this way, in reply to the above-mentioned Primum argumentum in I, we are soon presented with a first exposition of Castellio's conception of essentials and non-essentials in matters of Christian religion. As a reflection on an attack made by Beza upon the Anabaptists Castellio gives a courageous defence of this unpopular sect. The definition of 'heresy' and 'heretic' takes up much room here, for this was also the first question the author raised in De haereticis an sint persequendi, the second being how to treat the heretic, and the third (especially in the present book) what the duties are of the magistrate. We get an eyewitness' account of Servetus' execution and are shown documents about dissensions in the heart of the Republic of Geneva and among the Calvinists in general. Then there is Castellio's famous prediction that Beza's arguments in favour of persecution of heretics would be used against the orthodox Protestants themselves, a prediction which came true after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. We also discover the limits of Castellio's tolerance, when he deals with the blasphemous and the atheists; these he wants to be punished, as distinct from the heretics, although not with the death penalty. Numerous pages are devoted to the Parable of the Tares, which was popular among advocates of religious freedom, for to them it was clear that just as the tares had to be left to ripen with the weeds, one should not prematurely try to hunt out the heretics lest one destroy, by accident, a good Christian. There is an interesting passage about the Catholics, whether they should be considered as belonging to the Christian Church, or not; Castellio answers affirmatively and generally shows himself much less anti-papist than Calvin. We come across a moving description of an heretic being burn at the stake in the presence of his wife and children, and proclaiming his Christian faith in the pangs of death; I would not be astonished if Castellio had witnessed some of the first executions in Lyons when he was student there in the middle of the 1530's. There is also a curious passage where Castellio attacks the death sentence for petty theft, an idea which

22 This is a sub-title I gave for convenience sake.

shows him to have been far ahead of his century. He defends his Bible translations and carefully discusses: ‘Utrum in doctrina an in vita periculosius peccetur’ (k 12, in margin). After a conclusion, Castellio ends up with a long Epilogue and a sort of Postscript. In the former he enumerates the various sophisms and rhetorical tricks Beza had used in his *Anti-Bellius* in order to impress his audience; this constitutes an interesting reaction by Castellio on his opponent’s superiority in the art of polemic (Castellio himself never indulged in abuse as so many of his enemies did). The Postscript contains a letter by Calvin about the opposition he had encountered in the Council of Geneva and the difficulties he had experienced with it. For in this book Castellio is almost as much pre-occupied with Calvin as with Beza.

The preceding paragraph is no more than a brief sketch and does not pretend to be an analysis of Castellio’s last book. Professor B. Becker, the discoverer of the two manuscripts, is publishing a detailed study of it, in which he devotes special attention to the author’s sources and the manner in which he coped with Beza’s arguments\(^{23}\). The modest task which I set myself in these two articles was to retrace the discovery of L and F, to evoke their historical background and to show the interest they still present for us\(^{24}\).

\(^{23}\) In his *Introduction* to and *Commentary* of his edition of L.

\(^{24}\) I wish to thank my colleague Professor S. Davis, a Classical scholar, for having read and improved the manuscript of my two articles.
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