BASIL MONTFORT\(^1\)
Refutation of the Reasons Commonly Alleged in Favor of Persecution

Some wish to see all heretics put to death, that is, all those who disagree with them, of whatever condition or nation they may be, provided this can be done. Others think that foreigners should be exempt, since the Israelites were not commanded to persecute foreigners, but to punish only those of their own sect. This is the subterfuge of the wolf, who does not attack the lion, but rather the lamb because there is less danger. In order to persuade princes and rulers, the persecutors collect all the passages of Sacred Scripture which may enflame princes to bloodshed. Although not a few authors have refuted these opinions, nevertheless, the persecutors

\[226\] persevere and listen to no one unless he is also a persecutor. Such conduct is not actuated by Christ, as it seems to me, for He did not defend Himself by arms, though He might readily have done so, since He had at His disposal ten legions of angels. The oppressors are actuated rather by the desire to defend their power and worldly kingdom by the arms of the world. This appears from the fact that when they were poor and powerless they detested persecutors, but now, having become strong, imitate them. Abandoning the arms of Christ they take the arms of the Pharisees, without which they would not be able to defend or retain their power. When I see how much blood has been shed since the creation of the world under color of religion and how the just have always been slain before they were recognized, I fear lest the same thing happen in our day, that we kill as unjust those whom our descendants will revere as just. For this reason I have here endeavored to answer the arguments of the persecutors. I have done so with good and ardent intent to open their eyes, if may be, that if they err in ignorance they may err no longer-better to repent late than never-and also that others may not be deceived by their authority. Wherefore I beg them to take my labor in good part, as true Christians ought, and not to resent opposition in the interests of the truth. If they so act, the time will come when they will thank God. I would gladly have listened to them in turn and conferred with them in an amicable and Christian manner, but inasmuch as they dispute with steel, flames, and water, and we are not so armed, for Christ has forbidden steel in this war, we shall therefore debate the question with them from afar and by words as did Jotham, the son of Jerubbaal. [Judges 9] This is the battle of Christ; we must use the arms of Christ. Let Him be judge and defend the persecuted, as He was persecuted. Let Him open the eyes of the oppressors to see that their sacrifices are not pleasing to God. May they turn again and be healed and saved.

Now let us come to the point. They cite the law in Exodus, "He that sacrificeth unto any god save unto the Lord only, he shall be utterly destroyed." [Exod. 22: 20] I ask you whether this destruction is cor-

\[227\] poral or spiritual. If it is corporal, then must they first revive the whole law of Moses and inflict corporal punishment upon those who sacrifice. But to do this is to seek to be justified by works of the law, [Gal. 2:16; 5:3] and to be cut off from Christ, in whom the former things are passed away and all things are made new. [Rev. 21:4, 5]

Furthermore no one should be punished for this law, because no one sacrifices physically to strange gods, not even the Turks sacrifice to Jupiter or Mercury, to the Sun or the Moon, but

\(^1\) Another of Castellio’s pseudonyms. (emc)
rather to the God of Moses. If, on the other hand, the passage is interpreted spiritually, as Paul intended when he spoke of the "reasonable sacrifice," [Rom. 12:1] then those who sacrifice to their god Maussim\(^2\) are the first to be killed, that is, those who sacrifice to violence and cruelty. For this sacrifice they will certainly be killed if they do not amend, but this death shall be spiritual through the word and fire of Christ, so also the avaricious whose avarice is idolatry, and the gluttons whose god is their belly,\(^3\) who, according to Paul, shall not inherit the kingdom of God.\(^4\) Again, those who sacrifice to their belly, living in contention and debate, do not serve Christ but rather their bellies, as Paul says.\(^5\) This is the true idolatry of the New Testament, of which that of the Old Testament is but a shadow and a figure. Hence it follows that the punishment of the Old Testament is a figure of that punishment which is not temporal but eternal.

The persecutors appeal also to Deuteronomy 13 where it is commanded that the false prophet be put to death. I ask, to begin with, who is a false prophet? Moses teaches in this passage that the false prophet is one who predicts something that does not come to pass, and also one who teaches the people to serve strange gods. But today false prophets or heretics are not judged by these tests, but by their opinions. Now it is extremely difficult to pass judgment in view of the diversity of opinions and the animosity engendered even against one who errs on some minor matter of religion, though he retains the fundamentals. For, if every error of faith and every misinterpretation of Scripture obstinately defended makes a man a heretic or a false prophet, who ought to be put to death, none would be more subject to this law than those who teach others. Scarcely will you find in one city two who entirely agree, though they may conceal the disagreement in the interests of the common peace, and to avoid scandal and envy.

But let us suppose that it is possible to judge of the false prophet, nevertheless the heretic is not to be put to death according to this law, unless, like the false prophet, he predicts events which do not come to pass, for the false prophet and the heretic are not identical, and unless he exhorts to the worship of strange gods, who are no longer found among Christians. The persecutors say that those who falsely interpret the Scriptures lead others from the worship of the true God and thus exhort to the worship of strange gods; but this is a false and a diabolical device for the shedding of blood, for if any man build upon the foundation of Christ, even though he build hay and stubble, he shall nevertheless be saved himself, though his work perish.\(^6\) Paul says that Christ died for him who thinks it wrong to eat meat,\(^7\) even though he wrongly understands the Scriptures. God forgives his ignorance. I say nothing of the fact that in view of the innumerable sects, not one of which agrees with the other as to the interpretation of Scripture, all would have to be killed except one, and that the smallest, for the flock of Christ is always small. Who does not see that this is absurd and impossible? Nevertheless, should we grant it, this slaughter would have to be with the sword of the

---

\(^2\) Dan. 11:38. The Vulgate makes a proper noun of the Hebrew word which the King James version translates "God of forces." The Latin Bible of Castellio reads: \textit{Ceterum Maozim deum vice eius colet.} Luther repeatedly called Maozim the god of the Mass. See the note in \textit{Works of Martin Luther} published by the A. J. Holman Company and the Castle Press, III, 369, n. 1.
Spirit, as we have shown above.

An the persecutors adduce the case of the blasphemer from 1° 1 Cor. 3: 12-15.

"Rom. 4: 15.

[229] Leviticus 12 Yet we have whole cities full of drunkards, and it is hard to tell whether they are more addicted to drink or to blasphemy. Certainly there is no doubt that they are genuine blasphemers, but we do not put them to death. Yet the persecutors wish to execute the so-called heretics, who are convicted of blasphemy neither by the voice of conscience, which is a primary witness, nor out of the mouths of two or three witnesses, unless we wish to accept the testimony of the accusers, that is, of our masters. But Christ said to leave them until the harvest." Before that time uncertainty cannot be entirely removed. I say nothing of the fact that the greatest blasphemers, who should be punished according to this law, are those who confess God with their lips and deny him with their lives. This is why the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles." Read the second chapter of Romans and you will see that these are the true blasphemers, all of whom, however, neither can, nor should, be put to death.

Then the persecutors introduce the case of the man who violated the Sabbath 16 But if this is applied to the Jewish Sabbath, then ought all to be killed except the Jews. If, on the other hand, this is the Sabbath which the Epistle to the Hebrews mentions, then it does not apply here, because in this passage the corporal sin is transferred to the spiritual. Hence the punishment also must be spiritual, not corporal.

Appeal is then made to the Levites who killed the makers of the golden calf." To arguments of this sort I have sufficiently 12 Lev. 24: 16. "He that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, he shall surely be put to death and all the congregation shall certainly stone him."


1° Num. 15: 32-36. "And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the sabbath day. And they that found him gathering sticks brought him unto Moses and Aaron, and unto all the congregation. And they put him in ward, because it was not declared what should be done to him. And the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall be surely put to death: all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died; as the Lord commanded Moses."

14 Exod. 32:28.

[230] replied. The corporal calf received corporal punishment. A spiritual offense is to receive a spiritual penalty.

One might quite as well adduce the case of Achan, who for his sacrilege was stoned with his family and his cattle." If we wish to imitate this example let us kill the entire families of the heretics, or rather let us return to Moses and be circumcised. Let us reject Christ and with the Jews await another under the shadow of the law. For as Moses did not pass over Jordan nor enter into the promised land," so those who live under the law of Moses shall not enter into the blessedness of Christ. If only the persecutors would select the finer portions of Moses, those
which better accord with the mercy of Christ. If only they would imitate Moses, who even though the children of Israel wished to stone him, nevertheless appeased the anger of the Lord against them and desired to be blotted out of the book of life rather than that they should perish. But the persecutors select the harsher portions of the law and by every means seek blood. This is utterly contrary to the mercy of Christ. To please the mighty they adduce also the case of the prophet Elijah, who slew the priests of Baal. This is highly relevant. Our adversaries disclose their bad faith because they omit another instance of this same Elijah, who brought down fire from heaven and destroyed the officers of the king. Our opponents would certainly not have passed over this passage if Christ had not reproved his disciples when they wished to follow the example of Elijah, "Ye know not what spirit ye are of," said Christ, "for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives but to save them." The persecutors think that we ought to do what Christ forbade to the apostles. We are given to understand that they were come not to save, but to destroy. Our adversaries wish to put to death the priests of Baal, although it is not yet apparent who they are. In the days of Elijah there was no un-

17 Josh. 7: 24-25. 18 Deut. 3: 25-26; 34. 19 Num. 14: 10.
20 Exod. 32: 31-32; Deut. 9: 12-22, combined with Rev. 3: 5.
21 In the Latin version only. 22 I Kings 18.
23 In the French version only. 24 II Kings 1.

[231] certainty. The priests themselves made profession of Baal. Today, on the contrary, none of the heretics professes to believe in strange gods. Moreover Elijah brought down fire from heaven to consume the sacrifice which had been wet with water three days. The priests of Baal were unable to do this. Elijah, having achieved the victory, enjoyed the triumph and slew them. But our persecutors wish to triumph without victory. What fire have they ever brought down from heaven? "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart," "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God," a people obedient unto God, who "worship him in spirit and in truth." If the oppressors have such a people, and if they have brought down from heaven the fire of love and the Holy Spirit to burn the sacrifice, then they have a perfect right to triumph over the priests of Baal, and to kill them, not with the physical sword, but with the two-edged sword of the Spirit, which is the living word of God. But if they have a people who are rebellious and obstinate, who spend their nights in gluttony-our opponents themselves proclaim this from the pulpits-if they have cried until evening without being able to bring down any fire of love, if, on the contrary things have gone from bad to worse and have come to such a pass that the pastors have often been exiled by their own flocks, then let them cease to imitate the triumph of Elijah, whose victory they have been unable to reproduce. As for the references to Jehu, Jehoiada, and Nebuchadnezzar, these allusions reveal an insufficient consideration of the reasons marshaled by Brenz, who has replied to this sort of thing once and for all. Our opponents make the kingdom of Christ worldly, although He said, "My kingdom is not of this world." They are debtors to do the whole law because they wish to remain under the law. It is surprising that they do not appeal to the case of Phineas, who with his own hands slew those who were not condemned. This is not permissible, they say, for we are not authorized to kill anyone. Yet Phineas and Samuel did.

26 Ps. 51: 17. 27 Rom. 12: I. 28 John 4: 23. 29 Eph. 6: 17,
If we really wish to imitate the ancients let us do the same as they. Let us abandon the New Testament and return to the Old Testament. Let us kill all those whom God has commanded to be killed, namely, the adulterers," children who curse their parents," the uncircumcised," those who do not keep the Passover," and the like.

The persecutors adduce also some passages from the New Testament. Which do they cite? Is it this? "I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves." "No. Is it this? "Blessed are ye when men shall persecute you." Is it this? "The world shall rejoice: ye shall be sorrowful." No. They introduce nothing of the sort, but rather this that Peter killed Ananias and Sapphira for their hypocrisy and lying or for their false religion, “that Paul blinded Elymas the sorcerer," as if he had dug the eyes out of his head. O these blind men! They do not see that they cut their throats with their own sword, for Peter killed him who had lied against the Holy Spirit, if indeed Peter did it, and not the Lord. They, on the contrary, put to death only those who will not lie, for if anyone gives a verbal and outward conformity to their religion he is not killed even though he dissent in his heart. Whereby we perceive that a lie is more esteemed among them than the truth, seeing that if anyone says what he feels, he is put to death. But if they retort that they are unable to judge of the heart and look rather to a man's words, then the example of Peter does not apply. He was instructed by none other than the Holy Spirit, and he did judge the heart of Ananias, which they cannot do because they do not have the Holy Spirit. Moreover Ananias was not punished for heresy, but because he made a division with the Lord, instead of giving everything or nothing. Peter makes this plain when he says: "Whiles [the land] remained, did it not remain thine own? And after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?" Which is as if "he had said, "Nobody compelled you to sell it or bring the money, and we do not constrain those who bring nothing." But


[233] the persecutors wish to punish those who are not of their religion.

Why do they not say with Peter, "We compel no one to sell his goods and offer them to Christ"? That is to say, we compel no one to renounce himself, but if anyone makes a renunciation then he must do so utterly, presenting himself to God a complete sacrifice without blemish, for our Savior will have the whole man, as the husband his wife.

If anyone does not give his whole heart to God, but makes reservations, this man truly follows Ananias. Besides, to attribute to the sword what Peter accomplished with the word is highly absurd, and they seem to realize the absurdity when they endeavor to escape by the subterfuge that there is no great difference in killing with the sword, poison, or words. To kill is to kill, no matter what the method, and what God did then through the apostles, he does now through the magistrate, since vengeance is of the Lord, who has empowered magistrates and sovereigns to exercise authority and punish malefactors. This is what the persecutors say. Is there, then, no difference in killing by the sword, poison, or words? Why in that case, does Christ not destroy Antichrist with the sword instead of with the spirit of His mouth? Why were the weapons of Paul not carnal? Why did Peter not use the sword as he would like to have done in the case of Malchus, and as Moses and Phineas formerly did? Is it not because the sword of the Old Testament is but a figure of the sword of the Spirit of God, which.

Montfort (Castellio)
used in the New Testament? That is why Christ told Peter to put up his sword, that is, the carnal sword, and to use the spiritual, as he did in the case of Ananias. What shall we say? Are these statements true? Or can they be refuted? Shall we confuse the symbol with the thing symbolized and treat the sword, poison, and words as the same things? What did Jesus mean by these words, "When thou wast young thou girded thyself, and walkest whither thou wouldst: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth they hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldst not." Did he not mean that Peter should not kill by the sword, but should himself be killed? But to kill is to kill, you say, no matter what the method. Very well. Then to cure is to cure, no matter what the method. Will you say that it is all the same whether Peter's wife's mother was cured by the words of Christ, or by the medicine of Galen? If you wish to kill Ananias, raise Dorcas. If the magistrate kills by the sword in the same way as Peter by words, why cannot the magistrate raise the dead with the sword as Peter did with a word? To kill with the sword—a brigand can do that, but he cannot with words. Show that you can do more than brigands, more than the Scribes and Pharisees, who killed Jesus by the sword. Kill with a word, use the sword of Saint Peter. Then we shall confess that you are the disciples of Saint Peter. Otherwise, who will not believe that your word has turned into a dagger, that you have beaten your ploughshares into swords and your pruning hooks into spears? You say that the magistrate is authorized to punish malefactors. Right you are. But what malefactors? Was Ananias a malefactor? If you had been the magistrate, would you have punished Ananias as a malefactor? What malefactor? Was he not against the Holy Spirit, when they repeat after you these words, "Our Father who art in heaven? How many times must be shed the blood of God's children? Is His name be hallowed, that His kingdom come, that His desire be done? Who is there who does not wish that his own will be done instead of God's; that his own kingdom come? Do not all spend, night and day to acquire riches and power; that the magistrate put them all to death? And do you not But would you wish the office of the magistrate and the minister are absolutely different? Come now, if you were the magistrate, would you have killed the children who mocked Elisha? as You would have no


[234] shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldst not." 49 Did he not mean that Peter should not kill by the sword, but should himself be killed? But to kill is to kill, you say, no matter what the method. Very well. Then to cure is to cure, no matter what the method. Will you say that it is all the same whether Peter's wife's mother was cured by the words of Christ, or by the medicine of Galen? If you wish to kill Ananias, raise Dorcas. If the magistrate kills by the sword in the same way as Peter by words, why cannot the magistrate raise the dead with the sword as Peter did with a word? To kill with the sword—a brigand can do that, but he cannot with words. Show that you can do more than brigands, more than the Scribes and Pharisees, who killed Jesus by the sword. Kill with a word, use the sword of Saint Peter. Then we shall confess that you are the disciples of Saint Peter. Otherwise, who will not believe that your word has turned into a dagger, that you have beaten your ploughshares into swords and your pruning hooks into spears? You say that the magistrate is authorized to punish malefactors. Right you are. But what malefactors? Was Ananias a malefactor? If you had been the magistrate, would you have punished Ananias as a malefactor? What malefactor? Was he not against the Holy Spirit, when they repeat after you these words, "Our Father who art in heaven? How many times must be shed the blood of God's children? Is His name be hallowed, that His kingdom come, that His desire be done? Who is there who does not wish that his own will be done instead of God's; that his own kingdom come? Do not all spend, night and day to acquire riches and power; that the magistrate put them all to death? And do you not But would you wish the office of the magistrate and the minister are absolutely different? Come now, if you were the magistrate, would you have killed the children who mocked Elisha? as You would have no

49 John 21: 18, ao Mark 1: 2
" II Kings 2: 23, 2e. Joel 3: to, reversing Isa. 2: 4 and Mic. 4: 3.

[235] right to, for you have no law which commands that mockers be killed, and the magistrate can execute only in accord with the

Montfort (Castellio)
I say the same thing of the officers upon whom Elijah brought down fire from heaven and consumed them.\textsuperscript{64} They had committed no crime save that they had obeyed the magistrate himself, that is, the king, who told them to go and call Elijah. Here we observe that the office of the minister is vastly different from that of the magistrate, as an author, with whom you are well acquainted, has written in these words, "The Church does not assume the office of the magistrate, nor does the magistrate meddle with the affairs of the Church." \textsuperscript{55} If you confess these words, then the magistrate would have no right to kill Ananias, nor any heretics, nor those who ought to be punished by the word. Otherwise the magistrate would take from the apostles their sword, for if the magistrate may kill by the sword those whom the minister ought to kill by the word, then the minister in turn may kill by the word those whom the magistrate ought to kill by the sword. The magistrate has no more right to perform the office of the minister than has the minister to assume that of the magistrate. Why do we confuse everything? If you have the word, be content with it and punish with the word heretics, hypocrites, the avaricious, etc., and let the magistrate punish criminals with the sword, let him take an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a life for a life, and money for money. If your word is weak then let them live whom you cannot overcome with this weapon, that you may not be like children at school, who when they cannot worst their companions by arguments, begin to pull their hair.

God wished to show in the case of Ananias what happens to those who do not dedicate themselves completely to the divine service and who lie against the Holy Spirit when they say that they cannot do more than they are doing. This was said in a figure

\textsuperscript{54} II Kings I: 10-12.  
\textsuperscript{55} Calvini opera, I, 648, Instit. VIII (IV), 170 (the passage first appears in the edition of 1543 and thereafter in this form through the edition of 1554); II, 894, Instit. IV, XI, 3 (edition of 1559).

[236] as was also the crucifixion of Christ when Paul said, "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts thereof." \textsuperscript{65}

Paul did not know Christ after the flesh, but after the Spirit, and shall we know Peter and Paul after the flesh? Why do we not follow them, then, in curing the sick and raising the dead? Or if we are unable to do so, let us not take life away from those to whom we cannot give it, especially in view of the prohibition of Christ, before whom we stand or fall.

Paul did not desire that we despise the Jews, even though they deny and utterly detest Christ,\textsuperscript{66} and shall we kill those who confess Christ and interpret certain passages of Scripture differently than we do? Just as if we were perfectly agreed among ourselves, when sometimes we cite ten opinions on a single passage. What sort of reasoning is this: adulterers, homicides, impostors, and blasphemers are rightly punished; therefore with equal right false prophets and heretics are to be put to death? This is as if you should say, "He who hates his brother is a murderer and should be put to death." Indeed he should, but with the sword of the Spirit, because he has committed a spiritual offense. I say the same thing of heretics. Otherwise, if you wish to kill all who hate another, who covet a neighbor's wife," who call a brother fool or Raca,\textsuperscript{80} beware if your cities be depopulated.

The persecutors adduce also the examples and decrees of the emperors for the punishment of heretics. The oppressors do not observe that in so doing they place the sword in the hands of the tyrants against themselves, for they are considered heretics by the emperors, and Christ scarcely has had martyrs who were not killed by emperors or their successors. As soon as the
gentiles ceased to persecute the Christians, they began to do the like, that we might never lack tyrants. But we shall be told that there were formerly emperors who were more just. True, if they acted more justly. If they granted freedom of religion, their examples and decrees may be cited

$\text{Gal. 5: 24.}$ $\text{Cor. 5: 6.}$ $\text{Rom. 9.}$ $\text{Exod. 20: 17.}$ $\text{Matt. 5: 22.}$

against the cruelty of those who do the contrary. We may easily show that often they did grant religious liberty. Gratian, after his recall from exile, passed a universal decree in conjunction with the younger Valentinian, that each religion might celebrate its own rights. The Church was closed only to the Eunomians, Photinians, and Manicheans.

Sozomen,

Tripartite History,

Book Seven, Chapter Twelve

Valentinian, although he took the position of the Nicene fathers and favored those who upheld the same sentiments, nevertheless did not molest those who held other opinions.

The Same, Book Eight, Chapter One

Valentinian framed a law and caused it to be published through-out all the cities, by which any man was permitted to have two lawful wives.

The Same, Book Eight, Chapter Twelve

Themistius, the philosopher, recalled Valens from the slaughter of the orthodox by the following reasons: a prince ought not to exercise cruelty on account of discord in ecclesiastical dogma. Inasmuch as among the pagans there appear more than three hundred sects, each should be allowed to maintain his diverse opinion with regard to the dogma of Christ. Perhaps God is the better pleased not to be easily known and to be glorified in different ways, so that each may fear the more in proportion as his knowledge falls short of the perfection of God and of an understanding of what nature

$\text{Socrates, HE V, 2:}$ Migne, PG LXVII, 568; PNF 2 II, 118-19.

$\text{Cassiodorus, "Hist. Trip." VII, 12:}$ Migne, PL LXIX, 1078. Taken from Sozomen, HE VI, 6: Migne, PG LXVII, 1309; PNF 2 II, 350.

$\text{The reference should be to Book 8, Chapter 11 of Cassiodorus, "Hist. Trip.";}$

Migne, PL LXIX, 1118 (from Socrates, HE IV, 31: Migne, PG LXVII, 549; PNF 2 II, 114). A footnote in the last named work gives cogent reasons for regarding the statement as false. Why Castellio should have introduced the passage at all is a matter for conjecture. Perhaps he was pleading for a more tolerant attitude toward Anabaptists of the Munster type. Perhaps he wished merely to point out to his opponents that an appeal to the imperial law would involve them in more than they relished.

Sozomen

The Emperor promulgated a law that the heretics should neither hold churches, nor teach concerning the faith, nor ordain bishops or others. Some were expelled from the cities; others
were allowed
  to remain, but were deprived of honor. He permitted them to enjoy civil rights and although in
the law he prescribed cruel penalties against them these were not executed. He hoped in this
way to promote concord, and did not actually inflict penalties.

The Same in Book Nine, Chapter Thirty-six

The Church was divided into the Consubstantials, the Arians, the Novatians, the Macedonians, and the Eunomians. Be it observed that Emperor Theodosius persecuted none of them except

64 Cassiodorus, "Hist. Trip." VIII, 12: Migne, PL LXIX, n18 (from Socrates, HE IV, 32: Migne, PG LXVII, 552; PNF 2 II, 115). Castellio in the Latin version (p. 155.20) reads scientia instead of scientiae as in Migne. The French translation shows that this is not a misprint. On Themistius consult p. 18, above.

6 Cassiodorus, "Hist. Trip." IX, 19: Migne, PL LXIX, 1136-38 (from Socrates, HE V, 10: Migne, PG LXVII, 583-9,4; PNF 2 II, 122-23). Castellio's summary is not accurate. Socrates says that the leaders withdrew discomfited from a conference with the Emperor.

67 Cassiodorus, "Hist. Trip." IX, 19: Migne, PL LXIX, 1138 (from Sozomen, HE VII, 2: Migne, PG LXVII, 1445; PNF 2 II, 383). Castellio in the Latin version (p. 154, line 7) reads atque instead of neque. The original says that Theodosius did not permit them to enjoy civil rights. The Latin of Cassiodorus is itself a condensation which does not give the full sense of the Greek.

[239]

Eunomius, who, by reading his own books in private assemblies, corrupted many with his doctrines. On this account he was exiled, but no one else was molested and the Emperor compelled none to communicate with him, but permitted all to meet in their several conventicles, and to observe the Christian faith as each saw fit. Some were allowed to construct churches outside of the city. The Novatians, who agreed with him in the faith, were permitted to meet within the city. Agelius was bishop of the Novatians for forty years, from the reign of Constantine to the sixth year of Theodosius.

The Novatians held a synod in Sangatium of Bythinia in which they passed a canon that each should be permitted to observe Easter as he chose, and that the Church should not be divided because of a difference in the celebration, since the ancients who lived nearest to the days of the apostles communicated with one another in spite of a difference on this point. 88

Sozomen, Book Ten, Chapter Twenty-two

In order to enforce conformity with Arsacius [of Constantinople], and Porphyry [of Antioch], as well as with Theophilus of Alexandria, the leading men at court secured a law that all the people must worship in church and that those who did not communicate should be banished, but since many opposed the party of John Chrysostom there was again great division, so that many took communion apart and great scandal arose. 60

88 Cassiodorus, "Hist. Trip." IX, 36 and 37: Migne, PL LXIX, 1152-53. These passages are taken from Socrates, HE V, 20 and 21: Migne, PG LXVII, 619-25; PNF 2 II, 128-29. Castellio has condensed Cassiodorus and has changed Sangarium into Sangatium. Socrates has Angarum, which the editors of the PNF identify with Angora.

60 Cassiodorus, "Hist. Trip." X, 23: Migne, PL LXIX, 1181 (from Sozomen, HE VIII, 24: Migne PG LXVII, 1580; PNF 2 II, 415). Cassiodorus has misunderstood Sozomen and has placed the commission at Constantinople instead of at Antioch. Castellio has inverted the order
of both Cassiodorus and Sozomen, who record first the division and then the order of conformity. The citation does not occur in the French version of Castellio.

[240]

The Same, Book Eleven, Chapter Two

In the year 411 during the reign of Honorius, Anna 70 was the bishop of Constantinople, a man distinguished and learned, venerable and prudent, during whose episcopate the churches prospered greatly. He was gracious not only to those of his own faith, but displayed the marvel of his wisdom even to the heretics, whom he was unwilling to molest. Although he had attempted to intimidate them, yet again he showed his magnanimity. 71

And Chapter Three 72

A certain Theodosius was the bishop in Synada of Phrygia Pacata. He violently persecuted the Macedonians of whom there were many, and with undue severity expelled them, not only from the cities, but even from the country, although the orthodox Church was not accustomed to inflict persecution. He even armed the clergy and the provincial judges against the heretics and in particular molested their bishop, Agapetus. Since the provincial judges were not invested with sufficient authority to inflict the torments which he desired, he made off to Constantinople to enlist the assistance of the prefects. While he was gone Agapetus adopted the dogma of the consubstantial and was received as bishop by the constitutive expelency of Theodosius himself, who, on his return, was rejected and led. 78

[This seems to end an extended series of quotations from Sozomen by Basil Montfort]

These are the ancient examples of justice and clemency which we should imitate.

And if sometimes the men of old acted as men do now, in that case they were no better. But if you appeal to their violence toward the weak in justification of your own, suffer the element to appeal also to their clemency. If you reject clemency, permit us to reject violence, which is not to be found in the camp of Christ, but rather in that of Antichrist.

70 Both Cassiodorus and Socrates call him Atticus.

71 Cassiodorus, "Hist. Trip." XI, 2: Migne, PL LXIX, 1188 (from Socrates, HE VII, 2: Migne, PG LXVII, 741; PNF 2 1154)

72 This heading is in Castellio's Latin version only.
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I grow weary of refuting all of the inane arguments which are brought forward to stir up persecutions. The oppressors sedulously collect all that has been said or done from the foundation of the world in favor of shedding blood, which ought by every consideration to be assuaged. They reject the advice of Paul to Titus that a heretic after a first and second admonition should be avoided." Paul was writing to an apostle, we are told. Had he been addressing Sergius Paulus or some magistrate, undoubtedly he would have explained his duties. I think so too. He would have told Sergius to hang all the Jews, heretics, and enemies of Christ.

Dost thou hear this, 0 Paul? And what dost thou reply? "I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ" 76 for the Jews. Dost thou then desire that they be slain for whose salvation thou went content to lose salvation?

Montfort (Castellio) 51
Let us cease to imagine such absurdities about Paul and to make him like ourselves. He struck Elymas with physical blindness in order to illustrate for Sergius the duties of the magistrate. Yes, he did: if the principle which we formulated above be true that the magistrate is not to do that which pertains to the Church. Paul wished to show that the false prophet is not to be punished by the magistrate but by the apostle. We do not object if all the false prophets be killed in this way, for thereby the will of God will clearly appear.

But we are told that the heretics blaspheme. To this I reply, in the first place, that everybody blasphemes. All confess God in words and deny him in deeds and in the heart. '"The fool hath said in his heart, `There is no God.' " 76 What blasphemy could be greater? But this is secret, you say. On the contrary, it is quite manifest. The fools, like the Sodomites, clearly display their folly and publicly boast of their misdeeds, as their own masters testify. Moreover, as we pointed out above, we do not perfectly know who are the true heretics. Christ and his disciples were esteemed heretics according to the judgment of the Scribes and Pharisees, and if our churches have no Scribes and Pharisees, I marvel that

75 Titus 3: 10.  75 Rom. 9: 3.

76 Ps. 1.
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The tares have been eradicated before the harvest." But if the churches do have Scribes and Pharisees, then let Christ come when He will and they will say again as of yore, "He has blasphemed." 78 They will always have power and be approved of the people as they formerly were. Thus the truth will be repudiated until the light of the Lord discloses them. If we pass a law to put false prophets to death, certainly Christ Himself will be killed with His followers. They will be done to death before they are recognized. But they ought to be known before they are killed.

But heretics hurt others. I know it, and I should be glad to see all real heretics and enemies of the truth dead, if they do not amend. But what shall we do? The tares hurt the wheat, but to pull them up before the harvest is to pull also the harvest. The avaricious also and other bad folk hurt and corrupt people not only by example, but by words, but there is no law which commands that the avaricious, flatterers, or the envious be put to death, even if they are recognized.

You say that the father can compel his child to go to school. You do well to say the father. The father of Christians is not the magistrate, but he who teaches them as Paul taught the Galatians, whom for that reason he could constrain, but only by that instrument through which he had begotten them, namely, the Word. Are the preachers the children of the magistrate in view of the fact that they teach the magistrate? Certainly not. They are the fathers of the magistrate, who must obey them as fathers in the affairs of Christ. Just as the preachers in turn must obey the magistrate as their protector in worldly affairs. But if in religion the magistrate commands something unjust, we must obey God rather than men. 79 In Christ there is neither father, son, nor brother, but a new creature. He is a spiritual father, who has begotten another, and has spiritual authority over him.

Petilian cried, "Far be it from our conscience to compel anyone to embrace our faith." 80 Is he for that reason to be considered a


80 In Augustine's "Contra litteras Petiliani," II, 83 (183): CSEL LII, 112. 21-24; PNF 7 IV, 572.
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heretic? How many there have been of genuine insight who have been condemned as heretics by heretics. Take, for example, Vigilantius, who was condemned by St. Jerome because of his criticism of the abuse of candles and of prayers for the dead.81 Today we agree with Vigilantius and condemn Jerome. Do we suppose for a moment that Vigilantius was the only one to be unjustly condemned? Believe me, the judgment of God will be different from that of men.

The other arguments which are adduced for the coercion of faith I pass over as irrelevant. The persecutors wish to constrain by force those whom God wishes to draw by spiritual exhortation and ardent impulse. They cite Augustine, who at first thought that no one should be constrained to the unity of Christ, that men should be opposed by the Word, combated by disputation, and vanquished by reason, lest those who were known to be manifest heretics should turn into false Catholics. Augustine changed his mind, persuaded not by words, but by example. The city of Augustine, named Hippo, was converted to the Catholic faith by the imperial laws. To which I reply, first of all, "Ho, everyone that thirsteth, come ye to the waters." 82 If Hippo had no thirst she would not have come to the waters and would not have drunk. Thirst had to be created. Augustine perhaps thought they were true Christians who professed Christ with the mouth. He did not perceive that he had fallen into the very calamity which he at first feared. What good is it to be a pretended Catholic? If the sultan of Turkey gave the order, all his subjects would embrace the Evangel at once. Would they, therefore, be real Evangelicals? "This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me." 83 Augustine saw but a feigned profession which lasted as long as the coercion and the fear of punishment. He did not consider what a poor guarantee of endurance is fear. We find that shortly after-ward Augustine himself and his church and the whole of Africa were subject to that same cruelty which, by his approbation or disimulation toward others, he had brought upon his own. When

81 "Contra Vigilantium": Migne, PL. XXIII, 337-52; PNF 2 VI, 417-23.
82 Isa. 55: 1.
83 Mark 7: 6; Matt. 15 8; Isa. 29: 13.

the Vandals, steeped in the Arian faith by the Gothic bishops, broke into that part of Africa in which St. Augustine dwelt, they con-strained the Catholic bishops either to abjure that form of religion which they professed or to abandon their churches. Great cruelty was inflicted on the true Catholics, as the Vandals vented their fury under the pretext of religion. In that very night on which Hippo was besieged, Augustine died, as it is written in the history of Victor."

Socrates likewise testifies in the Tripartite History, Book x I, Chapter 9,85 that at the very time when Pope Innocent at Rome began to persecute the Novatians and other evil sects and to dissipate and destroy their churches, the Goths invaded Italy, captured Rome, and sacked all. The same Socrates testified in the same place that up to this time the Novatians at Rome had their own churches, their own bishops, deacons, councils, etc.,88 that never before this time were they molested by any of the bishops at Rome, nor were they troubled even at Constantinople, for here, he says, the Novatians were so cherished that they were allowed to hold their services within the city.87

In the time of Justinian already the bishops of Rome obtained their urgent requests to the emperors that those called heretics be expelled from Constantinople and that their churches be scattered. Justinian it was who, after many importunate exhortations, granted to Agapetus, the bishop of Rome, that the heretics be driven out - and that their churches be destroyed. Such was the lust of the Roman bishops for power
and such their zeal to banish those who did not agree with them, that Vigilius (the third from Agapetus) suffered himself to be bound and maltreated by Justinian, the emperor (otherwise held in high esteem by the bishops), rather

84 "Victoris Vitensis historia persecutionis Africae provinciae," I, I o - I 1 : CSEL VII, 6; Migne, PL LVIII, 185.


88 Castellio is combining references to the Novatians here and there in Socrates, for which see the index in PNF 2 II.

87 Cassiodorus, "Hist. Trip." XI, so: Migne, PL LXIX, 1193 (from Socrates, HE VII, x 1: Migne, PG LXVII, 757; PNF 2 II, 158).
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than consent to the restoration of certain exiled heretics. 88

The fruit of harsh persecution and of the cruelty of the Church was manifest first of all in the case of the Arians, who, having suffered from the emperors at the instigation of the Catholics, exercised a like cruelty against the Catholics so soon as the emperor took the Arian side. I refrain for the moment from recounting how Mohammed immediately leveled at the Christians the persecution exercised by the Catholics, so that the evil which our side introduced rebounded against them. Similarly in our own day we observe that the Church which was formerly flourishing is now overwhelmed with confusion, mutilation, corruption, and the murders of so many thousands of men. Likewise recently, under the boy king, Edward, England favored the Gospel and was entirely on our side. If anyone had told us then that the profession of this people was insincere we should have despised him as malicious. But the issue showed what sort of Evangelicals they were who had received the Evangel by force. Those who have but barely escaped with their lives know well, and they say that nothing could be more alien to the Evangel. Little wonder that measure is given for measure and that those who do violence suffer violence. What need is there to mention the cities which formerly seemed to be well grounded in the Gospel, but now the pioneer reformers think that only with difficulty could one or two be found in any city who really favor the Gospel, whereas there is scarcely a city among the outsiders which does not have several, for the strength of Christ

ss Castellio probably derived his information from the Historie B. Platinac de vitis pontificatam Romanormn (Lugduni, 1512, Venetiis, 1515). In the edition of Lyons Agapetus I is treated on fol. lxxviib-lxxix and Vigilius I on fol. lxxx-lxxxib. Platina says that Justinian was moved by the intrepidity of Agapetus and by the divine impulse to embrace the Catholic faith and remove Anthemius, the Eutychian, from the patriarchate at Constantinople and put in his place Menas, the Catholic, who was consecrated by Agapetus. The Empress Theodora wished to reinstate Anthemius, and removed Silverius, the next pope, because he would not consent. Vigilius was appointed as pope on the promise to comply, but when brought to Constantinople, he proved obdurate in spite of severe persecution. Castellio has exaggerated the role of the bishops in making a bigot out of Justinian. See J. B. Bury, History of the Later Roman Empire from the Death of Theodosius I to the Death of Justinian II (London, 1923), Chap. XXII.
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is made perfect in weakness. 80 Many preachers confess that after long years of instruction there
is not one among their people who would lose so much as a little money for the truth. And even those who have engaged in persecution now frankly confess that they did so unwillingly, giving place to violence, but always at heart they adhered to their first opinion.

I have heard that there is in England one who previously preached the Gospel diligently, but now opposes it with a bitterness exceeding his former zeal. He says that before he was under constraint; now he is declaring his heart of his own accord. Augustine had good reason to fear the production of hypocritical Christians. Better one who is genuine than thousands who make a pretense. To be brief, if men could be constrained to the faith, Christ would have constrained them and would have taught us to do the like. "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not"? Christ himself could - not save an unwilling Jerusalem, and are we stronger than he?

Our opponents quote the text, "Compel them to come in!" Yes, but with the sword of the Spirit (at least if the marriage is spiritual), that is, with powerful, living, divine words. By the Word the heavens visible and invisible were made. To seek to create a new creature with anything other than the Word of God is to turn upside down the creation of the world.

Again we are told that Christ compelled Paul by corporal punishment to embrace the Gospel. Let us all be constrained in this way by Christ that we may say, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" But to assign this constraint to the magistrate is to drag heaven down to earth. The persecutors dare to assert that the apostles asked no aid of the magistrates against opponents in religion because the magistrates were not Christian. Consider well what this implies. Christ said that His kingdom was not of this world, else that He be not delivered to Pilate. The magistrate should protect the good against force

and injury, but the magistrate cannot make men good by force, nor handle religion by the sword. Otherwise Christ was not adequately armed, nor were the apostles. Nevertheless, though poor, powerless, and persecuted by all the princes in the world, the apostles accomplished more than we are able to do with the aid of all the princes, now that we have grown strong and violent. No wonder! They built the tabernacle from the free gifts of the people. But we employ forced gifts, if indeed they be gifts which are not given from the heart. We need not be surprised if we have the experience of tyrants who force their soldiers to take an oath of allegiance. In battle such commanders are deserted or betrayed by their troops, who either flee or are captured. "The weapons of our warfare," says Paul, "are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." If the sword takes captive the imaginations of men, and if St. Paul used one, we will certainly do so, but if he used none, let us be content with the weapons which Christ gave to the apostles, especially in view of our repeated assertions that the Holy Scriptures are perfect. and nothing must be added nor taken away, lest we turn the heavenly into an earthly battle and build the house of God with unworthy material and implements.

These are the arguments in favor of persecution adduced by some even after the publication of the books of Luther and Brenz, whose replies suffice in general. But
inasmuch as there are still those who prefer the authority of others, I have seen fit to examine the question in greater detail in order to serve the salvation of men as much as possible and to remedy this effusion of blood. I have done so, not with the intent of withdrawing princes and peoples from the instruction of their pastors and teachers, but since there are two kinds of pastors I. say that the better should be obeyed. Some are violent, fierce, hard, irritable, impatient, who condemn all teaching except their own and wish to put to death

95 II Cor. 10: 4, 5.
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all who disagree with them. The others are meek, humane, merciful, slow to anger, patient, who bear all things, endure all things, hope all things." They have no desire to coerce religion. I say that these should be followed as the better. The former assert that the latter, who will not constrain religion, are nourishing monsters and giving them the liberty to sow their poison. The meek reply that, on the contrary, the persecutors are rather those who nourish monsters by making religion servile and destroying men on, account of it. This violence brings it about that men are constrained to approve of whatever the violent assert. Nothing is too monstrous to teach the people when to doubt is prohibited, since if you doubt or do not believe, you are put to death. Hence the power of the Scribes and Pharisees, who exclude from their synagogue those who dare to speak of Christ. Hence the tyranny of him who in our day has been unmasked and is rightly held in detestation. He could never have attained to this tyranny if he had left religion free, nor would he have introduced so many errors had he not deprived men of the power of judgment.

Finally, to resort to force even in civil matters is a confession of guilt and of a lack of confidence in the justice of one's case. Christ says, "I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist." 94 Those who are armed with this wisdom desire no other weapons. They fear not to fight openly and to withstand all comers, provided there be a just and legitimate discussion. They know that truth is an invincible weapon and that light prevails over darkness. The others, on the contrary, fear the light and seek to hide. They employ the sword after the manner of the world, and conclude with iron the discussion which began with words, for they well know that without the sword they would be defenseless and would not be able to resist their adversaries. Thus the wolf fights with teeth, the bull with horns, the mule with hoofs: each animal uses his own mode of defense, except the sheep, which, not knowing how to fight, is entirely dependent on the shepherd.

To conclude, if you are not yet able to distinguish the true


[249]
shepherds from the false, employ this test: paint a picture of an army, of the good and of the bad. On the left portray an elder and powerful prince, named "Cain," with a red banner and a wolf as emblem. The device is, "Let us lay wait for blood." 98 The watch-word is "Crucify"; the escutcheon, unbelief; the girdle, a lie; the breastplate, injustice; the greaves, swiftness to shed blood; and the sword, violence. Let this figure be followed by his progeny with fire and sword, the giants, the Sodomites, Ishmael, Esau, the Egyptians, Saul, the false prophets, the Babylonians, Scribes, Pharisees, tyrants, and all the host of the powerful of the world. Paint then on the right side a younger and weaker prince, by name Abel, with a white banner and a sheep as emblem. The motto is, "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer
persecution;" 98 the watch-word, "patience;" the escutcheon, faith; the girdle, truth; the breastplate, justice; the greaves, swiftness to aid a neighbor; and the sword, the Word of God.

Above the two armies place a judge. Inscribe on his left in letters of fire these words, "0 Cain, where is thy brother?" l00 "Woe to thee that spoilest. Shalt thou not be spoiled?" 101 "With what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again." "'All that take the sword shall perish with the sword." 108 "He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity." 104 "Woe to the bloody city." l0a "Woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation. Woe unto you that are full! for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep. Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets." 108 "Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!"

107 "0 thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desirest me: Shouldest not thou also have had compassion on thy fellowservant, even as I had pity on thee?" 108 "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire." loe

But on the right side let these words be written: "Blessed is he

[250]  

BASIL MONTFORT

that considereth the poor." 110 "Blessed are the poor in spirit. Blessed are they that mourn. Blessed are the meek. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness. Blessed are the pure in heart. Blessed are the peacemakers. Blessed are they which are persecuted for 'righteousness' sake. Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.) 111

"Come, blessed of my Father." 112 Let these pictures be called, "The Shepherds," "The Meek," and "The Cruel." The arms and the insignia, the mottoes and manners will readily show which designation applies. The same description cannot apply to both sides for no man can serve two masters." 118

To this picture add, if you will, the description of the warfare of Christ from Esdras. "And behold," he says, "all who were gathered together to wage war with him were seized with great far; yet they dared to fight. And lo! when he [that is, the Son of God] saw the assault of the multitude as they came, he neither lifted his hand, nor held spear nor any warlike weapon; but I saw only how

lips a he sent out of his mouth as it were a fiery stream, and out of his flaming breath, and out of his tongue he shot forth a storm of sparks. And these were all mingled—the fiery stream, the flaming breath, and . . . the storm, and fell upon the assault of the multitude which was prepared to fight, and burned them all up, so that suddenly nothing more was to be seen of the innumer-
able multitude save only dust of ashes and smell of smoke;" 114

From these passages it is sufficiently clear what are the weapons of Christ and of Antichrist, and who are the persecutors, and who those who endure persecution. If there is anyone who is not satisfied with these considerations I do not know what would satisfy Arise, 0 Lord, and
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CONCERNING THE CHILDREN OF THE FLESH AND THE CHILDREN OF THE SPIRIT

"But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless, what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman." 1

Consider these words of Paul, reader. Ishmael, born according to the flesh, was persecuting Isaac, born according to the Spirit. Even so now the carnal persecute the spiritual. It cannot be otherwise. Isaac, because he is younger and weaker, is not in a position to persecute Ishmael. Just so now the Christians, because they are born after the Antichrists, are weaker and are not able to persecute the Antichrists. And this has been signified by many examples.

Abel did not persecute Cain; nor Noah, the giants; nor Lot, Sodomites; nor David, Saul; nor the prophets, the false prophets; nor Christ or the apostles, the Scribes and Pharisees; but precisely the contrary. Even if they were able to do so, they did not, like David whom Saul persecuted as a flea or a partridge upon the mountains. Yet when David came upon Saul defenseless, he might have killed him, but would not. So today the godly are like a flea whom the ungodly persecute. And if sometimes the godly are in a position to harm the ungodly, yet are they so far from doing so that rather they seek their good. This the godly have learned from their father David, as the others have learned from Saul their father to harm those from whom they have received good. These are the marks of the godly and of the ungodly. The latter are noble, rich, learned, powerful, mockers, persecutors, cruel, proud, famous, and ambitious like Cain, the giants, the Sodomites, Saul, the E

the Scribes and Pharisees, Herod, Pilate, An magi, ha prophet, phlosophers. The godly are ignoble, proud, and the mocked, harassed, peaceable, meek, humble, submissive, obscure, vile, abject, despised, and rejected, the filth and offscouring of the world, who despise their own honor and seek the honor of God, who return good for evil, bless those that curse them, and follow Christ, the lamb of God, in crosses, tribulations, adversities, and virtues.

Now, Christian reader, place such a people before your eyes and consider for a moment whether it is possible that these poor folk, dispersed throughout the world, should persecute the ungodly, that is the giants and the powerful of the earth who have banded and conspired...
together. And if this cannot be, as indeed it most certainly cannot, then rest assured that those who persecute for the faith are the Ishmaelites, because they follow the nature of Ishmael.

"Nevertheless what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman." " 7 Now who is the bondwoman? It is the law, according to St. Paul, and the sons of the bondwoman are under the law, that is, they wish to be under the letter and persecute those who wish to be under the Spirit, as Ishmael persecuted Isaac. Thus we see that they are utterly Ishmaelites who cite the letter of the law which commands that false prophets be put to death. The false prophets are the heretics. The heretics are those with whom the persecutors disagree. Herein they are the sons of those who say, "We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God." You see that the sons of the law persecute the sons of the Spirit and cite the law in their favor. But how did Sarah act, that is, the free and spiritual Church? She did not herself cast out the son of the bondwoman, that is, the servant of the letter, nor did Isaac cast out Ishmael, for he could not, that is, the godly do not cast out the ungodly; they cannot. But Sarah asked her husband, that is, the Church asks God to cast out the law, the persecuting letter, and its persecuting sons, lest they be heirs of the kingdom of heaven. Thus the Church is not empowered to cast out the ungodly from the heavenly inheritance. She must leave this to Christ her spouse, who will cast them out

5 1 Cor. 4: 13.  6 Matt. 6:44.  7 Gal. 4: 30.  8 John z q: 7.  
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with the rod of His mouth 9 when he says, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire." 1° To pronounce this sentence belongs neither to Sarah nor to Isaac, but to Christ. Wherefore let those who condemn heretics, beware what they do. Heretics are not usually condemned in the same way as brigands. Those who hang brigands often hope and pray for them and do not believe that they are damned to hell. But those who persecute heretics regard them as utterly rejected by God and adjudged to eternal fire. To pronounce this judgment is obviously to sit on the tribunal of Christ and pass the sentence, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire." 11 This verdict is not to be passed by any save by Christ and not before the day of judgment. Precisely on this account the judgment day is so called, because then and not before, judgment shall be passed on the elect and the reprobate, as Paul teaches when he says, "Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts." 12 When I consider these words I find nothing to add save an admonition to all to consider seven times what they do when it comes to condemning anyone as a heretic to eternal pains as one forever rejected by God, for heretics are so esteemed. Again I will write in large letters this counsel that "he may run who readeth it." 18

JUDGE NOTHING BEFORE THE TIME, UNTIL THE LORD COME, WHO BOTH WILL BRING TO LIGHT THE HIDDEN THINGS OF DARKNESS, AND WILL MAKE MANIFEST THE COUNSELS OF THE HEARTS. 14

s ha. II: 4.  10 Matt. 25: 41•  11 Ibid.  12 I Cor. 4: 5.  18 Hab. 2: 2.  14 I Cor. 4: 5.