

ADAM CONTZEN

TEN BOOKS OF POLITICS

BOOK NINE

On the Internal Evils of the State

CONTENTS

Chapter I. That the Losses of States Are Many and Grave, and Which of Them Especially Pertain to the Statesman	5
Chapter II. That Sedition Is a Most Grave Evil	6
Chapter III. That Seditions Are Most Frequent	10
Chapter IV. Seditions and Conspiracies in the Time of the Monarchy	23
Chapter V. That the Empire of Constantinople Was Agitated by Sedition and Rebellion	28
Chapter VI. The Seditions of Other States	33
Chapter VII. The Seditions of the Osmanids	38
Chapter VIII. The Causes of Seditions and Tumults on the Part of Rulers	39
Chapter IX. The Causes of Seditions Arising from Subjects	51
Chapter X. A Fuller Discussion of Seditions Arising from Religion, and the Condition of the State and of Religion in the Year 1617	58
Chapter XI. The Condition of the European Religions, If One Considers Their Doctrine and Doctors	85
Chapter XII. The Unexpected Origin of Seditions, and Their Origin from Small Things	92
Chapter XIII. Chance Events Sometimes Furnish a Cause of Sedition	94
Chapter XIV. The Order and Method of Stirring Up Seditions	97
Chapter XV. Remedies against Seditions and Civil Wars	104
Chapter XVI. Various Methods of Restraining Seditions Employed by Different Men	110
Chapter XVII. Public Peace Has Been Disturbed Not by Catholics, but by the Seditions of Sectarians	114
Chapter XVIII. Civil Peace Can Scarcely Be Obtained in the Roman Empire So Long as the Preachers Disturb Ecclesiastical Peace	121
Chapter XIX. Experience Teaches That Religious Dissensions Disturb the Peace of the State	127
Chapter XX. Concord of Religions Commended to the Prince	129
Chapter XXI. The Sectarians Themselves Feel the Disadvantages of Their Discords	134

Chapter XXII. That Religious Peace Can Be Established in Germany	140
Chapter XXIII. That Peace Cannot Exist in a Mixture of Religion and a Certain Political Moderation	143
Chapter XXIV. That Seditions Arising from Religions Cannot Be Removed by Syncretism Is Taught from Its Nature and End	146
Chapter XXV. That the Primary Aim of Syncretism Is That, Once the Peace of Religion Has Been Violated, Catholics Should Be Slaughtered	153
Chapter XXVI. That the Secondary Aim of Syncretism Is Twofold: the Overthrow of the Lutherans and the Servitude of Calvinist Princes	159
Chapter XXVII. That Syncretism Is Not Proved by the Examples of the Fathers, Catholics, and Lutherans	175
Chapter XXVIII. That the Lutherans Condemn Syncretism and That Catholics Ought to Be Prepared to Endure Evils	178
Chapter XXIX. That the Civil Alliance of Certain Princes Is Not to Be Adduced in Favor of Syncretism in Religion	181
Chapter XXX. That for Peace It Is Necessary to Restrain the Insolence of Intellectuals	185
Chapter XXXI. That Arbiters Free from Passions Must Be Chosen in a Negotiation for Peace	189
Chapter XXXII. That Meanwhile, While Peace Is Being Negotiated, the Lies and Calumnies of Preachers Must Be Restrained	195
Chapter XXXIII. That Colloquies Rightly Instituted Conduce to Peace	199
Chapter XXXIV. That Writings Undertaken Concerning Controversies, Although Eristic, Are Nevertheless Useful for Peace	202
Chapter XXXV. That a General Council Is the Most Certain and Compendious Way to Peace Is Shown from the Scriptures	204
Chapter XXXVI. That It Is the Custom of the Church to Assemble Councils against Heresies, and That the Holy Fathers Think Thus	208
Chapter XXXVII. That the Sectaries Themselves Think a Council the Most Advantageous Way to Peace	211
Chapter XXXVIII. That the Sectaries of Our Time Cannot Possess a General Council	214
Chapter XXXIX. It Is Shown Further That the Innovators Can Possess Neither a Synod nor Peace	218
Chapter XL. The Form of a Council Assembled to Make Peace Must Be Taken from the Ancient Custom of the Church	227
Chapter XLI. There Are Weighty Reasons Why Catholics, but Not the Adversaries, Approve a Council	229
Chapter XLII. The Council of Trent Must Be Received, So That Peace May Be Restored to Germany	237

Chapter XLIII. The Objections against the Authority of the Council Are Empty	244
Chapter XLIV. The Method of Entering upon Peace	253
Chapter XLV. Severe Punishments Have Been Established for Seditious Persons and Rebellions	261
Chapter XLVI. A Good Citizen Should Sometimes Join One Party, and Sometimes Neither	266

CHAPTER I

That the Losses of States Are Many and Grave, and Which of Them Especially Pertain to the Statesman

§ 1. Just as in the human body there are as many troops of diseases as there are joints and members, so also in the great system of the state and of kingdoms there are innumerable calamities and modes of perishing. Sometimes pestilence depopulates entire nations, as did that one in the time of Gallienus which traversed the whole world. Famine is accustomed to precede or follow pestilence, and it itself sometimes devours the remnants of peoples. The very earth is provoked by the sins of men and is shaken: in the year of Christ 366 almost the whole world was violated by an earthquake. Add to these floods and fires, and whatever evil has befallen anyone which may rightly be feared by all. Some cities have been overthrown by feeble creatures. Pliny, Book VIII, chapter 29: “Nor are there less famous examples of destruction even from contemptible animals. Marcus Varro is an authority that a town in Spain was undermined by rabbits, one in Thessaly by moles; that a city in Gaul was driven out by frogs, one in Africa by locusts; that the inhabitants of Gyaros, an island of the Cyclades, were put to flight by mice; that in Italy Amyclae was destroyed by serpents. On this side of the Dog-Milking Ethiopians a region lies widely deserted, its people removed by scorpions and solifuges; and Theophrastus is an authority that the Thrarienses were driven away by centipedes.” Although a wise prince may moderate and alleviate the gravity of these evils by diligence, humanity, and liberality, they nevertheless do not come under the consideration of politics, since they can be averted and governed by no means except prayers and the amendment of morals.

§ 2. But the losses of the state with which the prudence of the prince is occupied are twofold. For either they arise from the city itself and adhere in its entrails, as fever, dropsy, and pestilence do in a man; or they are brought in from elsewhere, as hail, lightning, and arrows are. The internal evils are hatreds, contempt, factions, treasons, seditions, and rebellions. The external evil is war. Although, however, the causes of discords and seditions can be forestalled and excluded by those things which I have taught, it has nevertheless seemed good to dispute in separate books about sedition and war, lest anything which pertains to the perfect government of the state appear to be lacking.

CHAPTER II

That Sedition Is a Most Grave Evil

§ 1. We call sedition, as it were, a separation or secession, when one part of the state rises against another part or against the prince; the Greeks call it *στάσις*. It is a great evil and more calamitous than war. For the members of one body, which cannot be safe unless by agreement, clash among themselves and destroy themselves by their mutual pressure. Indeed, greater crimes are committed in sedition than in war. And so, in the judgment of all wise men, nothing is more detestable than civil war. Its causes are various, but the principal one is that civil hatreds are most bitter; for they seem to be stirred by great causes, and when they have grown strong, they are little removed from madness. Indeed, we openly say that those who rage against their own members are mad. And so kindred battle lines, when brothers and parents are on opposing sides, clash more fiercely. Hence even fables have handed down that the most burning hatreds were fraternal; hence the banquets of Thyestes and the smoke of the Theban funeral pyres tending in opposite directions; hence the deaths of Turkish brothers, now as if by law. With an external enemy the contest is about liberty, glory, and resources; with a citizen, about life.

Let the antiquity of Roman history be consulted. They received conquered enemies into the city, sent them under the yoke, and sold them into slavery; and when they exercised cruelty, they struck them down with axe or sword. But in civil war the conquered man counted it a gain if he were permitted to die without tortures and insults. They very often spared the leaders and kings of enemies; they killed their own commanders after torture and abused their corpses with every kind of mockery. Civil madness has given the world no example, so far as I remember, more horrible than that concerning Andronicus. Nicetas describes the history in Book I:

“And so Andronicus, having been captured, is cast into the fortress of Anemas with two heavy chains fitted with iron clasps placed upon his proud neck, and laden with fetters, as it is customary for captives to be treated. When he is brought in that condition to Isaac, he is assailed with insulting words, slapped, struck upon the nostrils, plucked by the beard, beaten out of his teeth, and torn by the hair. Publicly exposed to the mockery of all, he is even beaten with fists by women, especially by those whose husbands he had either killed or blinded. Then, after his right hand had been cut off, he is taken back into the same fortress without food, without drink, without any service from anyone. After some days, his other eye having been put out, he is set upon a mangy camel and led through the forum in the semblance of a triumph, his smooth bald head like a dry oak and barer than an egg, clothed in a short tunic--a pitiable spectacle which could draw streams of tears from eyes not inhuman.

[Printed page 706]

“But the most foolish and wanton inhabitants of the city--especially tailors, leather-workers, artisans, and the filthy rabble hanging about the marketplace, like flies in springtime flying to milk-pails and rich cups--paid no regard to the fact that only the day before yesterday he had been emperor, adorned with the royal diadem, praised, celebrated, and adored by all, and that they had attested by the most sacred oath their fidelity and goodwill toward him. Rushing upon him with savage minds and without any reason, they omitted no evil by which they might wickedly afflict Andronicus. Some drove keys into his head; others defiled his nostrils with dung; others squeezed upon his face sponges fouled with the excrement of men and beasts; others assailed his parents with obscene words. There were also those who pricked his sides with spits, and certain more shameless men, hurling stones, called him a rabid dog. A certain shameless harlot, having snatched from the kitchen a pot full of boiling water, poured it upon his face. Finally, there was no one who did not harm Andronicus.

“Thus, after he had been led ignominiously into the theater in that ridiculous triumph and taken down from the wretched camel, they suspended him by his feet, tied with a rope, beside two little columns upon which a stone rests

above, near a bronze she-wolf and hyena which stand with necks bent as though roused to rush one against the other. Having suffered so many evils and six hundred others which we have passed over, he nevertheless still bore the evils inflicted upon him with a noble spirit; and turning, with his mind unimpaired, toward the crowd pouring in while he lay there, he said nothing other than: ‘Lord, have mercy; and why do you break a bruised reed?’ But the utterly mad crowd of people did not spare the most afflicted Andronicus even then, after he had been suspended by his feet. Having torn away his bonds, they maltreated his genitals, and a certain wicked man drove a long sword through his throat as far as his intestines. Two men of Latin stock, leaning with both hands upon their swords, drove them into his buttocks in order to try which was sharper, glorying in dexterity of stroke. After so many hardships and disasters he ended his life with difficulty, his right hand brought painfully to his mouth, so that many thought that he was sucking from it the warm blood still dripping from the recent wound.”

§ 2. This also shows the cruelty of civil wars in many ways: all the consolations of the victor are removed by his fear and hatred. In external wars the usefulness of slavery blunts the edge of cruelty; for men prefer to have from their enemies slaves, cultivators of fields, and superintendents subject to works rather than to tread upon corpses. And so avarice, by preserving men as slaves, makes those live to whom mercy does not grant life. Civil wars know no slavery. They station Persians and Getae at the wine-cups, make Ethiopians hall-servants, and Alemannic horsemen walk before the carriage; but no service of a captured citizen is valued: death alone renders the victor secure. He is not even sold abroad to enemies, because so long as he lives he is not believed likely to remain quiet. Hence Marius stained with civil blood; hence the Sullan vengeance, which was more ruinous than if the crimes had been left unpunished. Lucan, Book II:

The remedy exceeded measure and followed too far
those hands which led men to death: the guilty perished;
but when now only the guilty could survive,
then liberty was given to hatreds, and wrath, released
from the reins of the laws, raged.

§ 3. Enemies are often accustomed to spare nobility and virtue. The cause is twofold. For either they pity the common lot of human affairs and judge that those whom they understand to have fallen back from the highest fortune to the lowest should be treated more gently. Nebuchadnezzar indeed admitted conquered kings to his table, and advanced Daniel and his companions, the sons of captive nobles, to honors. Alexander ordered the conquered Porus to reign; after consoling the daughters and mother of Darius, he ordered them to hope for a marriage not beneath their dignity. The Romans afterwards found those same nations to be their most faithful allies which they had had as their most hostile enemies.

Seneca, Book II *On Anger*, chapter 34, exhorts one by this consideration to conquer anger; but it is accustomed to avail in the case of an enemy, not in the case of a citizen: “Whom does the Roman people have as more faithful allies than those whom it had as its most obstinate enemies? What would the empire be today if a salutary providence had not mingled the conquered with the conquerors? Someone will be angry; do you, on the contrary, challenge him with benefits. The quarrel falls away at once when deserted by the other side. Unless there is an equal opponent, there is no fight. If the contest is maintained on both sides, the better man is he who first withdraws his foot; he who conquered is conquered. He struck you: withdraw. For by striking back you will give him both occasion and excuse for striking more often; you will not be able to tear yourself away when you wish. Would anyone wish to strike an enemy so heavily that he left his hand in the wound and could not draw himself back from the blow? Yet anger is such a weapon: it is scarcely drawn back.”

The other cause is that many, revering the virtue of enemies, have granted life to those from whom they received the greatest disasters. The madness of civil wars is inflamed by these good qualities. No one is judged more hostile to

nobles and the rich than a conquered citizen; proscription is especially aimed at them, and riches are an incitement to the slaughter of citizens. In sedition they persecute virtue as though it were sorcery. Sedition persecutes the Catuli, Ciceros, Antonii, and Catos; the Clodii and Curiones enjoy security. The cause is that, where enmities and hatreds have occupied the mind, where spirits have been embittered by mutual injuries, nothing is easily believed or said except what is effective for increasing enmities. For those citizens whom men think their enemies they also judge to be injurious, and therefore unjust and impious. With this opinion another is joined: namely, that no pest is more effective for doing harm than a familiar enemy. And so whatever good appears in a citizen they suspect to be an instrument for harming themselves.

§ 4. Military discipline is utterly destroyed, since in both battle lines there are acquaintances and blood-relations, rewards for corruption, and fraud unpunished on both sides. The faith of citizens and country-dwellers is unstable in every kind of contract: for if a man does not wish to pay a debt or wishes to deny a deposit, he will migrate to the opposing camp, where he will be secure. The cause of so great an evil is that the generals can neither govern the soldier nor moderate victory, being beholden to every most loathsome man. Thus the Caesarian soldiers sing:

Caesar was my leader in the waters of the Rhine;

here he is my comrade: the crime which stains them makes them equal.

The soldier Gaius Antonius did not obey Augustus after Augustus had despised the Senate. Obedience must be given to those through whom he conquered. "Caesar demands money from me? Why rather than I from him? Did he conquer without me? Indeed, he was not even able to do so. I brought to him the cause of civil war; I proposed ruinous laws; I bore arms against the consuls and commanders of the Roman people, against the Senate and Roman people, against our ancestral gods, altars and hearths, against the fatherland. Did he conquer for himself alone? Since the crime is common, why should the booty not be common?" You demanded justice. Augustus was compelled to give Cicero to Antony, and Antony to give his maternal uncle to Augustus, because neither conquered without the other. Lepidus also, the last of the triumvirs, gave his brother Lucius to his enemies. In the civil war of his sons Suleiman purchased for a price the death of the one who had fled, although it would scarcely have befitted so great an emperor to purchase only his life with money.

[Printed page 707]

Nor is it wonderful that they give up their own people. Sedition is strong against every affection--of parents, sons, and brothers. To this pertains that famous fable about two enemies, one of whom was sitting in the prow and the other in the stern. When the ship was being torn apart by a storm and he learned from the shipmaster that the prow would sink first, the one who was sitting in the stern rejoiced because he would behold the destruction of his enemy.

§ 5. Finally, the end of wars and seditions is destruction through tyranny or an external enemy. There is scarcely any nation so small that it is conquered by an enemy unless it wears itself down by tumult and factions. There is no need of examples: the whole world is an example, so much so that crafty warriors especially desire discord among their enemies. Nor do men escape from sedition as warriors--a fact which has generally deceived the authors of tumults. For he who is keenest at stirring up sedition is useless in war. Few can fight; anyone can conspire. In contention the most cowardly prevails; in battle, the brave. And this is the reason why sedition, when a beginning has been made, grows most swiftly: because quarrels are intensified by the vilest and most worthless men, but when the true enemy is present, all flee away.

But if their strength is not worn away and consumed by an external enemy, nevertheless civil victory, after the war is already ended, rages more cruelly while enmities live on. When the Marian party despaired not only of victory but even of safety, they filled all things with slaughter of their own men and of others. Then Sulla entered the city as victor--Augustine says in Book III, chapter 28 of *The City of God*--who, while no longer war but peace itself was raging, had laid low in the public way seven thousand infantrymen gathered from every quarter and unarmed, not by

fighting but by ordering it. In the whole city, moreover, every Sullan partisan struck whomever he wished. Hence the deaths could not be numbered at all, until it was suggested to Sulla that some men ought to be allowed to live, so that there might be persons over whom those who had conquered could exercise command.

Then at last, when the license of cutting throats which was being sown madly here and there had been restrained, that tablet was posted with great rejoicing which contained up to two thousand men of both distinguished orders--the equestrian, namely, and the senatorial--who were to be killed and proscribed. The number saddened; the limit consoled. Nor was there so much grief because so many were being slain as there was joy because the rest did not fear. But in the case of certain of those who had been ordered to die, even that cruel security of the rest groaned at the exquisite forms of death. For the hands of men tearing at one man rent him apart without iron; men tore a living man more savagely than beasts are accustomed to do, and the corpse was cast away. Another, with his eyes put out and his limbs amputated piece by piece, was compelled amid such tortures to live for a long time--or rather, to die for a long time. Certain noble cities also were put up for auction as if they were country estates. One entire city, as though a single defendant were ordered to be led away, was ordered to be slaughtered.

These things were done in peace after war, not that the victory to be obtained might be hastened, but lest the victory obtained be despised. Peace contended with war in cruelty, and conquered. For war laid low armed men; peace, disarmed men. War existed so that the man who was struck might strike if he could; peace, not so that the man who had escaped might live, but so that in dying he might not resist. Sedition, therefore, is a great evil and--what must be lamented--also frequent and customary.

CHAPTER III

That Seditions Are Most Frequent

§ 1. So grave an evil is also frequent. The cause is that the human race is querulous, and because it is easy for every most wicked man to murmur. God led the people of Israel out of Egypt, out of the iron furnace, out of the house of bondage, through so many and such great miracles that Pharaoh himself was stupefied; and yet within the space of fifteen months it stirred up sedition against God ten times. Numbers 14:22: “Nevertheless, all the men who have seen my majesty and the signs which I did in Egypt and in the wilderness, and have tempted me now ten times, and have not obeyed my voice.” It might seem wonderful that even one sedition could have been possible. There was no injustice of the magistrate. “You know,” says Moses, “that I have not taken even anyone’s ass.” There was no want: their garments were not worn away; the miracle of manna was daily; the Red Sea had withdrawn and swallowed the enemies; waters had been turned to sweetness, and new waters brought forth. Amid these wonders they murmur against God and persecute Moses the leader and Aaron, neither mollified by benefits nor terrified by plagues.

By the testimony of God that sedition lasted forty years: “Today, if you shall hear the voice of the Lord, harden not your hearts as in the provocation, according to the day of temptation in the wilderness, where your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works. For forty years I was near to this generation, and I said: They always err in heart; but they have not known my ways.” That state, therefore, beloved and chosen by God--that people whom the Lord blessed in its very liberation, in its departure from Egypt and from a barbarous people, in the very procession and triumphal passage while God was present--stirred up sedition ten times within fifteen months, and more frequently throughout forty years. What shall we judge concerning the peoples of the nations? They too had their tumults and destructions.

And, lest I withdraw far from Palestine, at the very time when the children of Israel wandered in the wilderness the neighboring kings waged wars among themselves. Sihon the Amorite obtained the kingdom of the Moabites from the Arnon as far as the Jabbok. The kings of the Canaanites, whose possession had been assigned to the Israelites, clashed among themselves so that, their strength now broken, they might be cast before the chosen people. For if Adonibezek had subdued seventy kings who gathered crumbs beneath his table with the extremities of their hands and feet cut off, who can doubt that very many of those kings were his kinsmen, since he dwelt in the midst of the Canaanites? Who also can doubt that those kings were conquered through war and sedition, with the destruction of many? Since, however, that calamity befell the most cruel tyrant after the death of Joshua, it is altogether certain that at the time when the Israelites were under Moses and Joshua there were already such great wars in Palestine, which was soon to perish. See the Book of Judges, chapter 1, verse 6. Now also, while I write these things, Christians are fighting before the gates of the Turks--lest they should ever be able to deny that they wish to perish.

§ 2 (part 1 of 3). Moreover, if from one and the same most powerful and best-known Roman state I collect the more notable seditions, I shall display the clearest example of human malice, which can bear neither empire nor liberty, and shall give all kings an outstanding lesson, so that they may be exceptionally cautious and well equipped to settle discords and remove tumults. Let us therefore weigh the contentions and conflicts of one city divided against itself; and, that we may summon all the graver ones from the beginning:

The first walls were drenched with a brother’s blood.

With this disposition the city grew up, which the characters of those brothers imparted to it. Nor was the end of Romulus happier: the plebs believed that, because of his rather harsh character, he had been torn apart by the hands of the Fathers, they say, and was hostile to the Fathers.

[Printed page 708]

Then there was contention between the ancient Romans and Sabines as to from which faction the kings should be chosen, and it lasted for the year during which there was an interregnum, until the indignant plebs murmured: "Their servitude had been multiplied; a hundred masters had been made in place of one." The words are Livy's. Nor did they seem likely to endure thereafter any king unless created by themselves. When the Fathers perceived that these things were being set in motion, judging that what they were about to lose should be offered voluntarily, they thus entered into favor, and so forth. Sedition, therefore, was then begun, but it was dispersed by the prudence of the Fathers.

Under the rule of Numa no sedition is recorded. During the reign of Tullus the Roman colony of Fidenae revolted. Mettius Fufetius attempted treason. Thereafter most things were neither quiet nor turbulent down to Tarquin, who, after suborning the Senate, expelled his father-in-law Servius from the kingdom and killed him. For the sons of Ancus also arranged for Tarquinius Priscus to be killed, although they did not obtain the fruit of the crime, that is, the kingdom. The cause why the people stirred nothing was monstrous slavery; and when I weigh the matter, the condition of the Roman plebs at that time seems no happier than that of the children of Israel in Egypt under Pharaoh, and nevertheless he is numbered among the good kings by Livy, Florus, and the rest.

Livy says concerning him: "Works of peace were begun with a spirit greater than the mass with which he had waged war, so that the people might not be quieter at home than they had been in the field. For he prepares to encircle with a stone wall the city which he had not yet fortified--the beginning of which work had been interrupted by the Sabine war. And because the lowest parts of the city around the forum and the other valleys lying between the hills did not easily carry off the water from the level places, he dries them by sewers conducted down the slope into the Tiber. And, with his mind already foreseeing its future extent, he occupies with foundations the site for the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol which he had vowed in the Sabine war." Thus Livy, serving the praise of his fatherland. But under what tyranny this was repeatedly done Pliny teaches in Book XXXVI, chapter 15: "An example not to be omitted from memory, all the more because it was omitted by the most celebrated founders of histories: when Tarquinius Priscus was causing that work to be done by the hands of the plebs, and the labor was uncertain whether longer or more dangerous, the Roman citizens everywhere escaping weariness by self-inflicted death, that king discovered a remedy new and unimagined before or afterwards: that he should fasten upon crosses the bodies of all who had thus died, to be viewed by the citizens and at the same time to be torn by wild beasts and birds."

And this is the reason why the plebs remained quiet, oppressed by royal fear. Tarquin the Proud follows, whom they drove out after the city had been aroused to rebellion, having risen in tumult because of his adulterous son, whom perhaps it would not have been difficult to punish by the laws. But the occasion, the anger of those injured, and estrangement from the proud king set the sedition in motion by one impulse, pressed it forward, and completed what they had dared.

After the kings had been expelled, although great fear from them and diverse enemies threatened, the age was nevertheless not passed without sedition. The offspring of Brutus conspired against the fatherland with the noble youths and attempted to restore the Tarquins. Valerius came under suspicion of aiming at kingship, and was not safe until the house which he had begun was pulled down and the fasces lowered before the people. And indeed there was a fearful quiet at home from the year of the City 244 to the year 257; afterwards there were continual seditions or plans for seditions.

In the sixteenth year after the kings were driven out, the second after the death of Tarquin, an immense discord arose at Rome. Livy, Book II: "But the Volscian war was also impending, and the city, at variance with itself, was burning with internal hatred between the Fathers and the plebs, especially because of those bound for debt. They murmured that while fighting abroad for liberty and empire, at home they were captured and oppressed by citizens; and that the liberty of the plebs was safer in war than in peace, among enemies than among citizens. And a signal calamity of one man kindled that odium, which was growing of its own accord.

“A certain man threw himself into the forum with a great commotion, bearing the marks of all his evils. His garment was covered with filth; the condition of his body, consumed by pallor and emaciation, was fouler. In addition to this, his long beard and hair had made the appearance of his face savage. He was nevertheless recognized amid such disfigurement; they said that he had led companies, and the people, pitying him, recounted other distinctions of his military service. He himself displayed upon his breast the scars, witnesses of honorable battles in several places. When they asked whence that condition, whence that disfigurement, and a crowd had poured around him almost in the manner of an assembly, he said that while serving in the Sabine war, because, owing to the ravaging of his field, he had not only been deprived of its produce but his farmhouse had been burned, everything plundered, and his cattle driven off, and because a tax had been imposed at a time ruinous to him, he had incurred debt. That debt, swollen by interest, had first stripped him of his paternal and ancestral field, then of his other fortunes; at last, like a wasting disease, it had been drawn to his body, and he had been cast by his creditor not into slavery but into a workhouse and torture chamber. Then he displayed his back, foul with the recent marks of lashes.

“At the sight and hearing of these things an immense clamor arises. The tumult no longer confines itself to the forum but spreads everywhere through the whole city. Those bound and unbound for debt rush from every side into public and implore the good faith of the Roman citizens. Nowhere is a voluntary companion of sedition absent; in many columns everywhere, men run with shouting through all the streets into the forum. Those of the Fathers who happened to be in the forum fell into that crowd at great danger to themselves; nor would hands have been restrained had the consuls Publius Servilius and Appius Claudius not hastily intervened to suppress the sedition. But the multitude, turning upon them, displayed their chains and other disfigurement, each reproachfully declaring that this was what they had deserved, one here and another elsewhere, by his military service. Much more menacingly than as suppliants they demanded that they summon the Senate; and they themselves surround the senate-house as future arbiters and moderators of the public counsel.

“Very few of the Fathers, whom chance had presented, were gathered to the consuls; fear kept the rest not only from the senate-house but even from the forum. Nor could the Senate transact anything because of its sparse attendance. Then indeed the multitude began to think that it was being mocked and put off, and that those Fathers who were absent were absent not by chance or fear but for the sake of obstructing the business; that the consuls themselves were temporizing; and that their miseries were without doubt being made a mockery. Matters were now near the point where not even the majesty of the consuls could restrain the anger of the men, when at last, uncertain whether they would incur more danger by delaying or by coming, they came into the Senate; and even with the house at last well attended, there was not sufficient agreement, not merely among the Fathers, but not even between the consuls themselves.”

There were in fact so many bound for debt that a good part of the army was composed from them. The discords increased to such a degree that the Sabines took up arms, not from confidence in their strength but from contempt for the citizens who were quarreling. For the plebs held nightly meetings on the Esquiline and assembled on the Aventine. At last they resisted openly and seceded to the Sacred Mount. This was done in the year 260, when they created the tribunes of the plebs, a perpetual seed-bed of discords, until they were oppressed first by citizens and then by barbarians.

Then, in the year 262, they expelled Coriolanus, who after two years brought war upon his fatherland. Nor was there a long interval between. In the year 267, after the Volsci had been conquered, Spurius Cassius, aiming at kingship by an agrarian law and by the repayment of money for Sicilian grain, was put to death when accused of high treason.

[Printed page 709]

Nevertheless, the sedition of the plebs did not cease; it aroused an external war in the following year and was ended by it. But soon after victory it grew raw again, as Livy warns. The sedition in the year 271 was most bitter. The army came to such a degree of madness that, when the cavalry had routed the approaching enemy, the infantry refused to

follow; and, without the consul's order, gloomy and cursing the cavalry's renewed exertion, they returned to camp. Nor, however, did the tumult cease in the year 273. Levies were obstructed, until by the counsel of Appius they set the tribunes against one another.

The Italian peoples describe most truly the condition of the city at that time. Livy, Book II: "The Roman resources were eternal unless they should rage against one another in seditions. That one poison, that plague, had been discovered for wealthy states, so that great empires might be mortal. That evil, long sustained partly by the counsels of the Fathers, partly by the patience of the plebs, had now reached extremes. Two states had been made out of one; each party had its own magistrates, its own laws. At first they had been accustomed to rage in the levies; nevertheless, the same men had obeyed their leaders in war. Whatever the condition of the city, so long as military discipline remained, it had been possible to withstand it. Now the custom of disobeying magistrates was following the Roman soldier even into camp. In the most recent war, in the very battle line, in the very contest, by the agreement of the army victory was voluntarily handed over to the conquered Aequi: the standards were deserted; the commander was left in the battle line; they returned to camp without orders. Certainly, if the matter were pressed, Rome could be conquered by her own soldier. Nothing else was needed than that war be declared and displayed; the fates and gods would accomplish the rest of their own accord." Who could say that Rome had been without sedition for any hour when in such a condition it raged against itself, when it preferred to be conquered and to lose everything rather than to conquer under a patrician leader?

Nor was it brought about by any means except deceit that they wished to fight, because they believed the commanders did not wish it. That estrangement and those contests between the orders persisted until, in the year 280, a tribune was killed at home and struck the others with fear. Yet it aroused greater hatred; they undertook the design of abolishing the consuls. Livy, Book II: "They said that it was all over." Then for the first time the tribunes were created in the tribal assemblies; Piso is an authority that three were also added, just as though there had been two before. He also names the tribunes Gnaeus Siccius, Lucius Numitorius, Marcus Duellius, Spurius Icilius, and Lucius Mecilius. The Volsci and Aequi, amid the Roman sedition, when war had arisen, had ravaged the fields, so that if any secession of the plebs should occur, it might have a refuge with them. Then, when matters were settled, they moved their camps back.

Appius Claudius was sent against the Volsci; the province of the Aequi fell to Quinctius. The same savagery of Appius was present in military service as at home, all the freer because he was without the bonds of the tribunician power. He hated the plebs more than with his father's hatred, because he saw himself conquered by it: and that with him alone chosen as consul a law had been carried against the tribunician power which earlier consuls, with less effort and by no means so great a hope of the Fathers, had prevented. This anger and indignation spurred his fierce mind to harry the army with a cruel command. Nor could it be tamed by any force, so deeply had they imbibed the contest in their spirits. They did everything sluggishly, idly, negligently, and contumaciously; neither shame nor fear restrained them. If he wished the column to be driven more swiftly, they deliberately walked more slowly. If he was present as an exhorter at a work, all of their own accord relaxed the industry they had set in motion. In his presence they cast down their faces; as he passed they silently cursed him--so that that spirit, unconquered by plebeian hatred, was sometimes moved. After every severity had been employed in vain, he no longer had any dealing with the soldiers; he said the army had been corrupted by the centurions, whom in mockery he sometimes called "tribunes of the plebs" and "Voleros."

The Volsci were ignorant of none of these things, and pressed on all the more, hoping that the Roman army would have the same contest of spirit against Appius that it had had against the consul Fabius. But it was much more violent under Appius than under Fabius. For it did not merely refuse to conquer, as the Fabian army had done, but wished to be conquered. Led out into the battle line, it sought the camp in shameful flight, and did not stand until it saw the Volscian bringing the standards against the fortifications and the foul slaughter of the rear of the column. Then force was wrung from it to fight, so that the enemy, already victorious, might be driven from the rampart. It appeared

sufficiently, however, that the Roman soldier had been unwilling only for the camp to be taken; some rejoiced in their own disaster and ignominy.

The fierce spirit of Appius was in no way broken by these things. When he wished to rage further and summoned an assembly, the lieutenants ran to him and the tribunes warned him not to wish at any cost to make trial of command, whose whole force lay in the agreement of those who obeyed. They said that the soldiers everywhere refused to go to the assembly, and voices demanding that the camp be moved from Volscian territory were heard on all sides: the victorious enemy had shortly before been almost at the gates and rampart, and not merely suspicion but the manifest appearance of immense evil was before their eyes. At last he yielded--since in any event they would gain nothing except time for punishment--and, dismissing the assembly, after he had ordered the march to be proclaimed for the following day, at first light he gave the signal for departure by trumpet. Just as the column was in the very act of deploying from the camp, the Volsci, as if roused by the same signal, attacked the rearmost. The tumult, carried from them to the foremost with such panic, disordered standards and ranks so that neither commands could be heard nor the battle line arrayed. No one remembered anything except flight. Thus they escaped in a scattered column through a devastation of bodies and spirits, so that the enemy ceased pursuing before the Roman ceased fleeing. This occurred in the year of the City 282.

While discord remained, in 284 the utmost violence was feared. Then the plebs refused to take part in the consular elections, always restless, always hostile.

In the year 286 there were renewed contests over the agrarian law, and Volscian land was granted for founding a colony at Antium, but most disdained it. Immense dangers brought some quiet; but after they had been discharged from them in the year 291, all domestic evils grew raw again, so that the consul had to be recalled. For in the absence of the consuls the tribunes sought time for their actions. The struggle became more bitter in the following year. The consuls held a levy; if they seized anyone, the tribunes ordered him to be released. Caeso, driven out by fear of trial, was soon followed by a thousand Caesos in place of one, but they eluded the tribunes by art throughout the entire year.

Thus far there had been dissensions; but in the year 293, when a servile band under the leadership of Herdonius had occupied the Capitol and affairs were placed in the utmost crisis, the tribunes called the people away from arms. It was evident that the utmost violence would follow and that the Roman sedition would be a spectacle to the enemies; nevertheless neither could the law be carried nor the consul go to the Capitol. Night suppressed the contests begun; the tribunes yielded to night, fearing the arms of the consuls. When the authors of the sedition had been removed from there, the Fathers went around among the plebs, thrust themselves into their circles, and sowed speeches suited to the time. They admonished them to see into what crisis they were bringing the state: the contest was not between the Fathers and plebs; rather the Fathers and plebs together were surrendering to enemies the citadel of the city, the temples of the gods, and the public and private household gods.

How astonishing that Roman citizens had been blinded by such obstinate discord that, although Manlius, dictator of the Tusculans, was coming to their aid, they were nevertheless not moved by their own danger and had to be entreated to be willing to defend themselves against their own slaves. But the fact that the tribunes even then protested surpasses all madness. Rightly, therefore, did the consul Lucius Quinctius Cincinnatus affirm in the following year that the tribunes were enemies worse than Herdonius. But nevertheless they attempt to obstruct the levy--

[Printed page 710]

§ 2 (continued; part 2 of 3). --and the plebs reelects the same tribunes.

In the year 295 Quinctius Cincinnatus, as dictator, dispersed the external dangers after the enemies had increased; the plebs reelected the same tribunes for a fifth time. And so in the year 296 they would have come to the most extreme contentions had not the Aequi and Sabines brought greater destructions. The garrison at Corbio had been lost through a nocturnal attack of the Aequi; the Sabines were ravaging the Roman fields. Nevertheless, the citizens had been

unwilling to serve unless they extorted permission to create ten tribunes. This obstinacy lasted into the year 302, when envoys were sent to Greece and decemvirs constituted, by whose labor the laws might be written. But not even thus did they have more than one halcyon year. The plebs, offended by the lust of Claudius and by a judgment given in favor of slavery against liberty, went up from the camp to the Aventine, then to the Sacred Mount; they compelled the decemvirs to abdicate and restored the consuls and tribunes. They demanded the decemvirs for the funeral pyre. There had been no greater sedition up to that time, for they were armed.

The plebs, sated by the punishment of the Fathers, became somewhat quiet, but there was nevertheless no concord; for while the plebs was quiet, the younger Fathers did not cease from injury. Livy describes it thus: "Then Geganius Macerinus and Gaius Julius were made consuls. They quieted the assemblies of the tribunes which had arisen against the noble youth without assailing their power, preserving the majesty of the Fathers. By postponing the levy decreed for the war with the Volsci and Aequi, they kept affairs free from seditions, affirming that when there was tranquility in the city all things abroad also were tranquil; concern for peace was also the cause of concord at home. But the one order was always burdensome to the moderation of the other. When the plebs was quiet, injuries began to be done by the younger Fathers. When the tribunes came to the aid of the humbler men, at first they had too little power; then not even they themselves were inviolate, especially in the last months, both because injury was done through coalitions of the more powerful and because all the force of the power was somehow more languid in the latter part of the year. And now the plebs placed some hope in the tribunate if it had tribunes like Icilius; for two years it had had only the name.

"The elders among the Fathers, on the contrary, believed that the young men were too fierce; yet if measure had to be exceeded, they preferred that courage should be excessive among their own men rather than among their adversaries. So difficult is moderation in protecting liberty: while each man, by pretending that he wishes to be made equal, raises himself so as to press down another; and by taking care lest they fear, men make themselves objects of fear in advance. And we impose upon others an injury repelled from ourselves, as if it were necessary either to do it or to suffer it. Titus Quinctius Capitolinus, for the fourth time, and Agrippa Furius were then made consuls. They inherited neither sedition at home nor war abroad, but both threatened. Discord among the citizens could now be restrained no longer, with the tribunes and plebs incited against the Fathers, when the appointment of a day for the trial of some noble always disturbed the assemblies with new contests. At the first uproar of these assemblies, as if a signal had been received, the Aequi and Volsci took up arms." These things were done in the year 306, and the discord of the orders remained, as Cincinnatus then used to say--the poison of the state--"while neither with us is there a limit to command nor with you a limit to liberty."

In the year 308 a new flame of sedition blazed forth. For Canuleius proposed a law concerning intermarriage between the Fathers and the plebs; and gradually mention was introduced that it should be permitted to make one of the consuls from the plebs, and the proposal was carried. This seemed so grave to the Fathers that they heard with joyful spirits that three wars were arising at the same time; for they hated the fortunate seditions of the plebs and the honored authors of seditions more than external wars. Most truly they said that more war was being stirred up at home than abroad.

At last, in the year 309, after bitter contests, military tribunes with consular power were created. When the state seemed more peaceful, Spurius Maelius suddenly aimed at kingship and relieved the people by a distribution of grain. He was killed by Servilius Ahala; in the year 314 Servilius was driven into exile. But when the tribunes and leaders of the plebs perceived themselves to be despised by the plebs, they set many things in motion in the following years, especially in the year 329, but with fruitless effort. For although what was done in the year 330 against Sempronius was done with an evil intention, I do not number it among seditions. Then, two years later, when the number of quaestors was to be doubled, a contest arose that some should be created from the plebs. Although they obtained this and plebeians were passed over, the tribunes, inflamed by the rejection, began to rage. In the year 334 the slaves had conspired against the city, but, having been detected, they paid the penalty.

In the year 336 matters again came to the utmost danger because of the agrarian laws. The Fathers dispersed them by drawing certain tribunes over to their own party; their colleagues accused those tribunes before the people as traitors to their interests. In all these years, therefore, either there was sedition or it was being prepared.

In the year 339 a sedition begun at Rome reached the camp, in which a military tribune was buried beneath stones by the army. The offense arose from the words of Titus Postumius: "Evil to my soldiers unless they keep quiet."

The year 341, full of sedition, was rendered moderate by pestilence.

In the year 344 the partisanship of the Fathers and plebs blazed forth because three plebeian quaestors had been created, by which the hope of the plebs was raised and fear cast into the Fathers. Livy, Book IV.

In the year 347, when the booty taken at Anxur had been divided among the army and pay had been decreed, there was greater affection between the plebs and the Senate than at any earlier time whatsoever, although in the same year the tribunes had repeatedly declared: "The greatest war of the Fathers is with the plebs. It is deliberately to be harassed by military service and cast before the enemy to be slaughtered." But when pay was decreed, Livy says in Book IV: "Nothing, it is reported, was ever received by the plebs with such joy. And so there was a gathering at the senate-house, and the hands of those departing were grasped; they were called Fathers in truth, the plebeians confessing that it had been brought about that no one, so long as any strength remained, would spare either his body or his blood for so munificent a fatherland; since it pleased them that their household property at least should rest during the time in which their body was bound and devoted to the state." The tribunes nevertheless grumbled against it, but were despised.

But soon, when they were making huts at Veii in order to winter there, the tribunes of the plebs rose up, but in vain. For when a defeat had been received at that same Veii, through a great renewal of concord between the orders new soldiers were sent, with the cavalymen promising that they would serve upon their own horses and then the infantrymen offering their labor. But while money was being contributed by the unconquered, the tribunes, having again found an occasion, attempted to contrive discords. Livy, Book V: "One war had now been protracted into a third year and was deliberately being badly conducted so that they might conduct it longer. Then armies had been enrolled for four wars by one levy, and even boys and old men had been dragged out. There was now no distinction of summer or winter, lest the wretched plebs ever have any rest. It had now even been made tributary to the final degree, so that when they had brought back bodies exhausted by labor, wounds, and finally age, and found everything at home uncultivated because of the owners' long absence, they should pay tribute from an impaired estate and return manifold to the state their military pay as if received at interest."

Then there was a new discord because of the tribunes of the plebs,

[Printed page 711]

and a greater one because of the military tribunes. For in the year 353, when the tribunes of the plebs forbade the payment of tribute and pressed that military tribunes be created from the plebs, they filled the city and almost the camp with seditions. One tribune was created from the plebs and then one patrician; by this it came about that in the year 355 the Fathers, as if about to lose the supreme command, all exerted themselves and obtained their object. At last, in the following year, agreement was reached that the greater part should be created from the plebs.

After Veii had been captured in the year 358, there was again an immense sedition, men continually saying that a colony ought to be led to Veii and demanding fields. This sedition was fouler than the rest. In the year 360 consuls were created and all things were conducted with the greatest bitterness; there was a greater war at home than abroad. And at last in the year 362 Camillus went into exile. Then followed the defeat at the Allia, the burning of the city, and the siege of the citadel. Not even by the very destruction of the city did they change their disposition, for it was urged with all their strength that they should migrate to Veii.

Then, in the year 368, when matters had come to extremes and the Senate stood as though in battle line against the plebs, Manlius was cast into prison, though nevertheless released; but when he was said to have aimed at kingship, he was cast down from the rock.

In the year 373 there was again sedition because of those bound for debt, which only the enemy near the walls suppressed. The plebeians now seemed oppressed and unable to oppose the Fathers in any way.

In the year 376 an immense contest arose from a small matter. For five years no curule magistrate was made, the elections being obstructed by the intervention of the tribunes. That sedition, therefore, lasted five years. At last, with Camillus as dictator and with Manlius and others resisting in vain, Lucius Sextius was made the first consul from the plebs. Livy, Book VI: "A triumph was decreed to the dictator Camillus by the agreement of the Fathers and plebs. When he had scarcely discharged the war, a more dreadful sedition at home received him; and through immense contests the dictator and Senate were conquered, so that the tribunician proposals were accepted, and the consular elections were held against the will of the nobility, in which Lucius Sextius was made the first consul from the plebs. Nor was even that the end of the contests, because the patricians declared that they would not furnish their authorization. The matter almost came to a secession of the plebs and other terrible threats of civil contests. Nevertheless, the discords were settled by the dictator upon conditions: the plebeian consul was conceded by the nobility to the plebs, and by the plebs to the nobility one praetor, who should administer justice in the city, to be created from the Fathers."

Then there was quiet for some time, until in the year 397 Gaius Marcius Rutilus, dictator from the plebs, named a master of horse from the plebs.

In the year 399 the contention was so great that Livy says: "They went down into the Campus several times in vain, and many electoral days were consumed by seditions. At last the grief of the plebs, conquered by the perseverance of the consuls, burst forth to such a degree that, while the tribunes shouted that liberty was at an end and that not only the Campus but even the city, captured and oppressed by the dominion of the patricians, must now be abandoned, the sorrowful plebs followed them."

In the year 401, however, spirits inclined toward concord, nor was there any great movement in the city until the year 411, when the soldiers who had been at Capua infected almost the entire army with their conspiracy.

But lest I pursue every individual thing, I shall send them all into a compendium. From the year 412 to 432 the Latins and Campanians rebelled and ordered that one of the consuls be chosen from their own body. The Privernates also rebelled; nor will you easily find so many years without sedition, but the causes were immense and the wars most bitter, and therefore they created very many dictators in those years. Nevertheless, because those wars were waged by subjects who were revolting, they can rightly be called seditions and rebellions.

In the year 439 an immense terror of factions and coalitions burst forth, not only at Rome but also at Capua and in other places, so much so that Gaius Maenius was designated dictator to conduct investigations. The result, however, was that the investigation was suppressed by the power of the faction against which it had been prepared. A rather long peace was then followed by a greater sedition. Few things are reported about it because its history has perished. It occurred in the year 467. Sigonius writes thus about it in the *Fasti*: "Zonaras adds that at this time a sedition was excited by a law concerning new account books promulgated by the tribunes of the plebs and obstructed by the creditors, and that it was not settled until the enemies invaded the city." Augustine, moreover, writes thus about the same affair in Book III of *The City of God*: "After grave and long seditions of the Romans, at last the plebs seceded to the Janiculum with hostile devastation. So dire was the calamity of this evil that for this affair the dictator Hortensius was created, who, after the plebs had been recalled, expired in that same magistracy, something which had happened to no dictator before." It must be noted that he says "after grave and long seditions," lest we suppose it a movement of only one year.

Down to the year 512 the wars of the Tarentines, Pyrrhus, Carthage, the Ligurians, and Sardinians diminished domestic seditions--although I think that writers were lacking for the seditions more than seditions for the Romans. There are certainly many and evident signs. What of the fact that not even when Hannibal was devastating Italy was there genuine peace at Rome? Livy, Book XXII: "In his interregnum elections were held amid a great contest of the Fathers and plebs. The populace was striving to draw even Gaius Terentius Varro to the consulship--a man of his own class, commended to the plebs by attacks upon the leading men and by popular arts, and shining through another's unpopularity after the resources and dictatorial command of Quintus Fabius had been shaken. The Fathers resisted with their utmost effort, lest men accustomed to attacking them should be made their equals. Bibulus Herennius, a tribune of the plebs and kinsman of Gaius Terentius, by accusing not only the Senate but even the augurs because they had prevented the dictator from completing the elections, won favor for his candidate through hatred of them. Hannibal had been brought into Italy by noble men who for many years had sought war; when he could be utterly conquered, that war was being protracted by deceit by those same men."

Nor were contests afterwards lacking, when the tribunes obstructed the elections lest Fulvius, the dictator designated, be made consul. In the eighth year after the battle of Cannae, twelve colonies refused auxiliaries, soldiers, and money, by which such great fear was cast into men's spirits that most said that the empire was finished.

A tribune accused Marcellus and the whole nobility. Livy, Book XXVII: "By their deceit and delay it came about that Hannibal now had Italy as his province for a tenth year and had lived there longer than at Carthage. The Roman people possessed the fruit of command prolonged for Marcellus: his army had been cut down twice and was passing the summer under roofs at Venusia." These things occurred in the tenth year of the Punic War, so that it may appear how entirely there was no concord in the state, unless the fear of the most cruel enemy effected some.

Hence it is that about the same time Livy introduces Marcus Livius full of anger against Hasdrubal. It has been handed down to memory, Livy says in Book XXVII, that when Quintus Fabius warned Marcus Livius, as he was departing for war still full of anger against the citizens, not to join battle rashly before he had learned the character of the enemy, he answered that he would fight when first he saw the enemy's column. When it was asked what cause there was for haste, he said: "Either from the enemy I shall obtain outstanding glory, or from my conquered citizens joy--certainly deserved, even if not honorable." What disorders would not such a spirit--

[Printed page 712]

§ 2 (continued; part 3 of 3). --would that spirit not produce, for which citizens and soldiers stood in the same place as enemies? Indeed, in a worse place: from enemies he was going to obtain outstanding glory; from slaughtered citizens, joy. For although Hannibal suppressed seditions, he nevertheless did not bind the citizens together by mutual affection. Certainly, in the year 549, when the Carthaginian had now been driven from Italy, the notable enmities of Marcus Livius and Gaius Claudius appeared in their censorship.

But that you may see that the tribunes had changed in no respect, read in Livy, Book XXXI, the things which they declaimed under a law against the Macedonian War in the year 552. Baebius, tribune of the plebs, entering upon the ancient road of accusing the Fathers, had charged that wars were sown from wars lest the plebs ever be able to enjoy peace. A sign of this also is that Scipio Africanus avoided tribunician harassments by exile; his brother Asiaticus was condemned in so great a sum that it was not found among his goods, when the praetor had sent quaestors to take public possession of them. Then followed the customary contests and the conspiracies and corruptions of the Bacchanalia, concerning which Livy, Book XXXIX.

It is also agreed that the same difficulties existed in levies, because the tribunes cast Aulus Postumius and Albinus into prison when they conducted the levy severely, because they were not able to obtain exemption for their kinsmen. And this is that age concerning which Florus writes in Book III, chapter 12: "The first hundred years of this age were holy, pious, and, as we have said, golden, without disgrace and without crime, while the integrity of that pastoral way of life was still sincere and harmless, and while the threatening fear of the Carthaginian enemies contained the ancient

discipline. But the last hundred years, from the destruction of Carthage to Caesar, were wretched and worthy of shame because of domestic calamities.”

What I said concerning the preceding years, however, must be understood thus: revolts of allies, treasons, and dissensions were not lacking; but because greater care held their spirits, discord in the senate-house and city languished. For in Spain the matter was conducted against subjects for twenty years, and likewise against the Ligurians, the Alpine peoples, and the Illyrians. Indeed, Andriscus wrested away subject Macedonia, and Alexander then occupied another part of it. Then, in the year 606, there was discord because of the consulship of Scipio, who set out for Africa and destroyed Carthage, and afterwards Numantia--wars which certainly arose from the rebellions of subjects.

In the year 618 Eunus and Cleon waged a servile war in Sicily, and not without immense loss to the state; for they captured the camps of four praetors: Manlius, Lentulus, Piso, and Hypsaeus. What sedition, moreover, is greater and more hostile than when slaves rise against their masters?

In the year 620 the sedition began which furnished the causes of the evils that followed, by which the state at last utterly perished. Epitome, Book LVIII: “Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, tribune of the plebs, when he proposed an agrarian law against the will of the Senate and equestrian order, that no one should possess more than ten *iugera* of public land, blazed forth into such madness that, after passing a law, he deprived his colleague Marcus Octavius, who defended the cause of the opposing party, of his power; and he created himself, his brother Gaius, and his father-in-law Appius Claudius triumvirs for dividing the land. He also promulgated another agrarian law by which, if anyone possessed land more widely, the same triumvirs should judge which was public land and which private. Then, when there was less land than could be divided without offense even to the plebs--since he had incited them to an ample desire by the limit of their hope--he showed that he would promulgate a law that the money which had belonged to King Attalus should be divided among those who ought to receive land by the Sempronian law. Attalus, king of Pergamum, son of Eumenes, had left the Roman people his heir.

“The Senate was gravely moved by so many indignities, and before all others the consul Titus Annius. When he had delivered a speech against Gracchus in the Senate, he was seized by him, brought before the people, and again addressed him before the rostra. When Gracchus wished to be created tribune of the plebs again, he was killed on the Capitol by the optimates upon the urging of Publius Cornelius Nasica, struck first with fragments of benches; and among the others who had been killed in the same sedition, he was cast unburied into the river.”

After this calamity had been received, the following years were deadly. At Rome all things were dreadful because of investigations against the followers of Gracchus; in Sicily, because of the cruelty of the slaves. Then followed the Aristonicus war when a great part of Asia revolted, so that the state was harassed by an external and internal evil.

In the year 623, when Carbo proposed a bill that the people might reelect the same man as tribune as often as it wished, defeated by Scipio he was unable to carry it through. But in the following year all seditions blazed forth more sharply as the triumvirs for dividing the land stirred them up. Scipio, who spoke against it, was found dead on the following day; no one investigated the parricide. While the Gracchan sedition continued, Marcus Fulvius proposed other ruinous laws and incited the Italians to seek citizenship. Hence Fregellae was destroyed in the year 628; in the year 632 Gaius Sempronius Gracchus was killed, and the head of the slain man was purchased for gold.

In the year 642 Jugurtha prepared war; Nearer Spain rebelled. Amid these things the hatreds of the people and Senate remained, and a little later they poured themselves out upon Caepio, who had been defeated in the Cimbrian War. Cicero teaches in Book II *On the Orator* that it was a sedition, that in it there were violence, flight, stoning, and tribunician cruelty, in which Marcus Aemilius, leading man of the state and Senate, was struck with a stone.

In the year 650, amid the utmost fear of the Cimbrian War, Marius was designated consul for a fourth time through sedition. He had no other beginning of his rise than his persecution of the nobility; and so, as his consulships

proceeded, contests lasted throughout them. Marius had scarcely triumphed over the Cimbri when an immense sedition burst forth. It is narrated thus by Livy's epitomator, Book LXIX: "Gnaeus Apuleius, with the aid of Gaius Marius and after killing Aulus Nonius, his competitor, through the soldiers, was created tribune of the plebs by force and administered the tribunate no less violently than he had sought it. And when he had carried an agrarian law by force, he appointed a day for the trial of Metellus Numidicus because he had not sworn to it. Since Metellus was defended by good citizens, lest he should be a cause of evil contests, he set out into voluntary exile at Rhodes, and there was free from great cares by reading and hearing."

Assuredly Gaius Marius, author of the sedition, who had purchased his sixth consulship with money scattered through the tribes, forbade him fire and water. The same Apuleius Saturninus, tribune of the plebs, killed Gaius Memmius, candidate for the consulship, whom he especially feared as an adversary to his actions. The Senate having been aroused by these events against him, and Gaius Marius--a changeable man of shifting counsel and disposition, who had always passed over to prosperous fortune--being utterly unable to protect him, he was overwhelmed by arms and killed with the praetor Glaucia and other companions of the same madness by a certain Rabirius. Quintus Caecilius Metellus was recalled from exile with the immense favor of the whole state. Marcus Aquilius the proconsul brought to an end the servile war stirred up in Sicily. At the same time Athenion the fugitive waged war in Sicily. Amid these things there was contention at Rome, until the Italian War began in the year 658.

There was indeed immense discord because the equestrians administered judgments and condemned innocent men. "Publius Rutilius," says Epitome LXX, "a man of the greatest innocence, because as legate of Gaius Mucius,

[Printed page 713]

the proconsul, he had defended Asia from the injuries of the publicans, was hated by the equestrian order, in whose possession the courts were; condemned for extortion, he was sent into exile. Gaius Geminius fought unsuccessfully against the Thracians. Since the Senate was unwilling to bear the impotence of the equestrian order in administering judgments, it began to strive with all its force that the courts be transferred to itself, Marcus Livius Drusus, tribune of the plebs, sustaining its cause. In order to acquire strength for himself he aroused the plebs with the ruinous hope of largesse." These things at Rome were done against Mucius; the Asians instituted feast days for him which they called the Mucian days.

In the year 662 the Drusan sedition, which drew after it the Social War, was excited. Epitome LXXI: "Marcus Livius Drusus, tribune of the plebs, in order that the Senate might defend with greater strength the cause it had undertaken, solicited the allies and Italian peoples with the hope of Roman citizenship. With their help, after the agrarian and grain laws had been carried by force, he also carried the judiciary law, so that the courts should be in equal part in the possession of the Senate and the equestrian order. When the citizenship promised to the allies could not then be furnished, the angry Italians began to agitate for revolt." Epitome LXXII writes concerning it: "The Italian peoples revolted--the Picentes, Vestini, Marsi, Paeligni, Marrucini, Samnites, and Lucani--the beginning of the war having been made by the Picentes. Quintus Servilius the proconsul was killed in the town of Asculum with all the Roman citizens who were in that town. The people assumed military cloaks. Servius Galba, captured by the Lucani, was freed from captivity by the labor of one woman with whom he lodged. The colonies Aesernia and Alba were besieged by the Italians."

That war was most dangerous and most grave, with great defeats received and inflicted on both sides. When it was ended, a crueler civil war followed, than which nothing is better known in Roman history.

Nor were those parricides only among allies. Fimbria killed his commander Valerius Flaccus; meanwhile Asia was exposed to be devastated by Mithridates.

In the year 669 Sulla oppressed the Marian party; many perished. In the following year he entered Italy. In the year 671 there was that bloody dictatorship in which:

The guilty perished,

but when now only the guilty could survive.

Then there was the kingship of Sulla. He recovered Nola and Volaterrae, overthrew Mytilene, and distributed forty-seven legions among the captured lands.

In the year 673 the Sertorian War was waged in Spain. It arose from the remnants of the Sullan proscription, and in it Roman commanders were defeated.

Nor was there an end of factions when Sulla abdicated the dictatorship. Lepidus, his enemy and consul after his death, attempted to rescind his acts and recall the exiles, but was defeated. Even after Sulla died, sedition grew raw again. Sallust introduces a tribune complaining thus: "For you have understood that hope was vain. When Sulla, who had imposed a wicked slavery, was dead, you believed it the end of evil; there arose Catulus, far more savage. Tumult intervened in the consulships of Brutus and Aemilius; then Gaius Curio domineered to the point of destroying an innocent tribune. You have seen with how great a spirit Lucullus went against Lucius Quinctius in the preceding year."

In the year 676 Lepidus came with an army hostile to his fatherland, but was driven from Italy by Catulus and Pompey; and yet the Roman people hated Catulus more than Lepidus. In the year 678 this was the condition which Sallust describes. "You have made us consuls, Roman citizens," Cotta says, "when the state is most entangled at home and in war. For the commanders in Spain ask for pay, soldiers, arms, and grain, and necessity compels it, since through the revolt of the allies and Sertorius's flight through the mountains they can neither join battle nor prepare useful things. Armies are maintained in Asia and Cilicia because of the immense resources of Mithridates. Macedonia is full of enemies, and no less the seacoasts of Italy and of the provinces, while meanwhile the revenues, small and uncertain because of wars, scarcely sustain a part of the expenses. Thus we sail with a smaller fleet than before to convey provisions. If these things have been accumulated by our deceit or sloth, act as you please and exact punishment thus; but if our common fortune is rather harsh, why do you undertake things unworthy of you and us?"

In the year 680 the war of Spartacus began. In that same year Sertorius was killed and left Marcus as heir of the war. When these wars had been finished, in the year 683 Pompey the Great and Crassus the Rich as consuls restored the tribunician power entire and stabilized their own power. The matter came to such a point that in the year 687, through dissensions and ambition, certain men conspired--Piso, Catiline, and Antonius Paetus. At that time there was a great dissension among the army of the Mithridatic War between Lucullus and Pompey.

But the conspiracy of Catiline was detected in the year 690, when Cicero was consul. In the following year the conspirators were defeated. Nevertheless, seeds of war remained among the optimates.

In the year 693 a coalition was made among the three leading men Pompey, Crassus, and Caesar. For although they were enemies among themselves and powerful, and the people hated Pompey, the Senate Caesar, and most men Crassus, they equally mocked friends and enemies. Suetonius writes these things in his *Julius*: "Caesar courted Pompey with every service when he was offended by the Fathers because, after King Mithridates had been conquered, his acts were confirmed rather tardily; and he reconciled Marcus Crassus to Pompey, his ancient enemy from the consulship which they had administered together in the greatest discord. He entered into an alliance with both, lest anything be done in the state which displeased any of the three. In his consulship he gave Julia to Pompey and himself married Calpurnia, daughter of Piso, the future consul."

Caesar as consul carried agrarian laws, transferred Clodius to the plebs, and compelled his colleague Bibulus to keep himself at home. Clodius, now a plebeian and made tribune of the plebs, expelled Cicero; after Cicero's return Milo killed Clodius. The Roman people proscribed Ptolemy without cause. In the year 701 armed and contentious candidates for the consulship obstructed the elections. Then Pompey, having been made consul, scarcely suppressed the sedition.

He then carried a law that account should be taken of Caesar in his absence, which Marcellus attempted to break in the following year. These contentions afterwards became stronger in the years that followed, when on the occasion of the Parthian War two legions were led away from Caesar, until the civil war began in the year 704. In that war Pompey was driven from Italy; his lieutenants were defeated in Spain; Pompey was defeated at Pharsalus and killed by the Egyptian; the Pompeians were defeated in Africa; and at last:

The final battles meet at deadly Munda.

But Caesar was killed in the year 710 and left behind the wars of Mutina, Philippi, Perusia, and Sicily, and the killings of the triumvirs, until, after Antony was conquered at Actium, Augustus alone obtained the Roman state. And such was the condition of the Roman state for more than seven hundred years: agitated by continual dissensions, it kept Senate and plebs exercised, and produced more evils at home than abroad. If princes consider these things and weigh the causes of seditions, they will procure great aids for settling or preventing them.

CHAPTER IV

Seditions and Conspiracies in the Time of the Monarchy

[Printed page 714]

§ 1. I have shown that seditions are the gravest and most frequent evil of the state, something that appeared in both the Roman aristocracy and the Roman democracy. But that I may more strongly arouse the prince to the protection of himself and his empire and to the avoidance of seditions, I have resolved to show this also in the Roman monarchy; for when these things have been read, a prudent prince who loves his fatherland will more easily attend to the cause, remedies, and outcomes of such great evils.

For among a thousand seditions there is none which does not make the prince more cautious, prudent, and moderate by some singular lesson. For the causes of each easily appear. Let us therefore look upon Augustus the prince, who passed the first twelve years in perpetual civil war or fear, and after the victory at Actium and in Egypt endured many seditions and conspiracies. Suetonius, chapter 19: “After this he suppressed tumults and even beginnings of revolutions, and several conspiracies detected by information before they grew strong--different ones at different times: that of the younger Lepidus, then that of Varro Murena and Fannius Caepio, soon that of Marcus Egnatius, then that of Plautius Rufus and Lucius Paulus, husband of his granddaughter. Besides these were Lucius Audasius, accused of forging records and impaired both by age and body; Asinius Epicadus, a half-breed of Parthian stock; and at last Telephus, a woman’s slave employed as a nomenclator. For he was not free from conspiracy and danger even from men of the lowest lot. Audasius and Epicadus had intended to carry off his daughter Julia and grandson Agrippa from the islands on which they were confined; and Telephus, as though dominion were owed to him by fate, had determined to attack both him and the Senate. Indeed, once at night beside his bedchamber a certain sutler from the Illyrian army was caught, after deceiving the doorkeepers, girded with a hunting knife. Whether he was not of sound mind or feigned madness is uncertain; for nothing could be wrung from him by examination.” Behold, besides foreign and civil wars, by how many enemies was the life of the reigning man sought?

Nor did he sustain few rebellions. The same author, chapter 21: “He never punished those who rebelled more frequently or perfidiously with a heavier penalty than that he sold the captives under the condition that they should neither serve in a neighboring region nor be freed within thirty years.” Dio teaches, moreover, in how great fear he lived, for when coming into the Senate he wore a breastplate beneath his clothing. The same Dio, chapter 17: “Many men made plots against Caesar, and especially Gnaeus Cornelius, the son of a daughter of Pompey the Great. Since he was unwilling to kill them, because he understood that he would not be more secure through their death, nor to release them, lest for that reason he incite the rest against himself, he came into so great a state of doubt that he was tormented by cares day and night.”

Since, moreover, we are dealing with a good prince, at least in the judgment of writers, I shall add what Pliny reports concerning him in Book VII, chapter 45: “In the deified Augustus also, whom the whole of mortality names in this assessment, if all things are carefully weighed, great volumes of human fortune are found: rejection in seeking office at the hands of his maternal uncle, and Lepidus preferred contrary to his request; the odium of the proscription; companionship in the triumvirate with the worst citizens, and not even in an equal portion, but with Antony having the weightier share; in the battle of Philippi, illness, flight, and concealment for three days while sick in a marsh--and, as Agrippa and Maecenas acknowledge, water flowing beneath him and his sides swollen; shipwrecks in Sicily, and there too another concealment in a cave; then, in naval flight with the enemy’s hand pressing, prayers to Proculus that death be brought upon him; anxiety over the Perusine contest; solicitude over the battle at Actium; ruin and terror in the Pannonian war; so many seditions of soldiers; so many doubtful bodily illnesses; the suspected wishes of Marcellus; the shameful sending away of Agrippa; his life sought so many times by plots; the deaths of his children

laid to his charge, and griefs sad not merely through bereavement; the adultery of his daughter and counsels of parricide openly disclosed; the insulting secession of his stepson Nero; another adultery, that of his granddaughter. Then so many evils joined together: lack of military pay, the rebellion of Illyricum, a levy of slaves, a scarcity of youth, pestilence in the city, famine and thirst in Italy, a determination to expire and, through fasting for four days, the greater part of death received into his body. Close upon these were the Varian disaster and the foul bruising of his majesty; the repudiation of Postumus Agrippa after his adoption, regret for him after his relegation, then suspicion concerning Fabius and the betrayal of secrets; thereafter the designs of his wife and Tiberius, the final care of his life. In sum, that god--I do not know whether he more attained or merited heaven--departed with the son of his enemy as his heir." Seneca recounts similar things in *On the Brevity of Life*, chapter 5, where he indicates that those terrors remained into old age: "He had not yet escaped the plots of these men: his daughter and so many noble youths, bound as if by an oath in adultery, were terrifying his now broken age; and once more a woman was to be feared together with an Antony."

No small storms shook Tiberius in a marvelous manner. First, the Gallic legions disturbed his accession when they called Germanicus emperor and detained his son Caligula. While Germanicus lived, Tiberius restrained his vices, Dio says. At last Germanicus and Drusus were removed, when the seditions in Pannonia and Germany had been settled. Meanwhile Libo Drusus, in part convicted of revolution, was killed; Clemens, a slave of Agrippa, stirred up sedition. There was war and revolt in Africa. Piso and Sentius, governor of Syria, disagreed and fought a civil war. The whole life of Tiberius thereafter was a slaughterhouse, until, when sick, he was suffocated by Macro. Caligula, ruling for a brief time, removed tumults.

More seditions and treasons harassed Claudius. Suetonius, chapter 13: "Nor, however, did he remain altogether exempt from plots; rather, he was assailed both by individuals, by a faction, and finally by civil war. A man of the plebs was found at midnight beside his bedchamber with a dagger. Two men of the equestrian order were found awaiting him in public, one with a sword-cane and the other with a hunting knife: the one had conspired to attack him as he departed from the theater, the other while he sacrificed at the temple of Mars. Asinius Gallus and Statilius Corvinus, grandsons of the orators Pollio and Messala, had conspired to effect a revolution, having taken to themselves his own freedmen and slaves. Furius Camillus Scribonianus, legate of Dalmatia, stirred up civil war; but within the fifth day he was suppressed, and the legions which had changed their oath were converted by religious scruple to repentance after, when the march to the new emperor had been announced, by a certain chance and divine act neither could the eagle be adorned nor could the standards be pulled up and moved."

And chapter 35 shows from his fear the disposition of the Romans: "But nothing was so characteristic as that he was timid and distrustful. In the first days of his reign, although--as we have said--he was a boaster of civil liberty, he did not dare enter banquets unless spearmen with lances stood around him and soldiers performed the part of servants. Nor did he visit anyone sick unless the bedroom had first been explored and the mattresses and bedclothes felt and shaken out. During the remainder of the time he always set searchers over those who came to salute him, and indeed over all, and the most severe. For only late and with difficulty did he relax the rule that women and boys and girls wearing the bordered toga should not be handled, and that pen-cases or stylus-cases should not be taken from every attendant or secretary. When Camillus, in a civil movement, not doubting that he could be terrified even without war, ordered him by an insulting, menacing, and contumacious letter to yield the empire and pass an idle life in private affairs, he deliberated, after summoning the leading men, whether he should obey." Chapter 36: "Certain plots rashly reported terrified him so greatly that he attempted to lay down the empire. When a certain man, as I related above, was caught with a weapon beside him as he sacrificed,

[Printed page 715]

he hastily summoned the Senate through heralds and lamented with tears and shouting his condition, in which nothing was safe anywhere; and for a long time he abstained from appearing in public. He cast away even his most ardent love for Messalina, not so much because of the indignity of the insults as through fear of danger, since he believed that the

empire was being acquired for her adulterer's son. At that time, trembling in a foul manner, he fled to the camp, asking along the entire road nothing except whether the empire was safe for him."

Nero also, agitated by many seditions, at last, having been judged a public enemy, destroyed himself by his own hand. The first sedition blazed forth at Puteoli. Tacitus, Book XIII. Then there was a graver one in Britain because of the plunder and avarice of the governors, and another because of Octavia, Tacitus, Book XIII. Finally, amid many conspiracies he was killed almost while awaiting vengeance. The world was then thrown into confusion while Galba, Vindex, and Nymphidius sought the empire, and while Otho, Piso, and Vitellius attempted everything against the fatherland, until Vespasian was carried up to the empire.

At his beginning tumults received Vespasian as victor: Mucianus was a rival; Sabinus an aspirant to empire; Alienus and Marcellus, after forming a conspiracy, laid plots. The Batavians under the leadership of Civilis revolted, expelled the Roman garrisons, and overthrew fortresses. Piso was killed in Africa, and a tumult arose from it. In Gaul the Treveri and Lingones revolted; all Gaul wavered; the legions inclined to revolt and swore allegiance to the Gauls. The war in Judaea also, a province long since pacified, must be judged a civil war.

Scarcely any sedition afflicted Titus, who ruled for a brief time and was dear to the people; his brother had to be guarded against, by whom he is even said to have been killed. Domitian, always fearful, was killed by conspirators. Nerva saw no peace in his one year. At the beginning he was compelled to thank the brave men who had killed Domitian, to whom he was especially favorable; but when the soldiers had killed those men contrary to the emperor's command, he was compelled to thank the killers of his friends. And so he was so cast down in spirit that he himself pursued his lot with tears; therefore he declared Trajan Caesar and added: *τίσειαν Δαναοὶ ἐμὰ δάκρυα*. "May the Danaans pay for my tears." For he accomplished nothing in his command except to lament his unhappiness, elude the conspirators, and adopt Trajan.

Trajan, numbered among the best princes, had peaceful beginnings, except that it was necessary to fight rather frequently against the revolting Dacians; but his end was altogether pitiable. For when peoples revolted and stirred up sedition in Syria, Egypt, and Cyprus, and when the Jews raged monstrously against the Greeks, the whole empire, especially in the East, being disturbed, he died of more than one disease.

As soon as Hadrian obtained the principate, he killed those who plotted against him--Celsus, Nigrinus, and Lucius--because they were said to have laid plots against him during a hunt. When about to die he was also savage from suspicion and at the very end even greedy for death, fearing plots.

In the time of the Antonines the state was quieter; nevertheless Cassius, and then others, harassed the Philosopher, until he died by poison.

But the crimes and seditions of Commodus made compensation for this peace, whatever it was. Perennis attempted to remove him; Quadratus conspired; Maternus stripped him; at last he was killed by his most trusted men. Pertinax followed, who, betrayed by an associate, was killed through sedition. Soon Julianus, lest a cause of discords be lacking, bought the empire with money; Niger was chosen emperor; Severus removed them both. Although he was victor in the civil wars, he by no means administered the kingdom without disasters and seditions: Niger, Albinus, Plautianus, Britain, Saturninus, and finally his sons rendered everything turbulent and deadly, now by wars, now by deceits. He left the empire to discordant brothers, of whom one, Caracalla, soon killed the other, Geta, and was himself killed by Macrinus, in accordance with his deserts but with great loss to the state. Macrinus was killed by Elagabalus; the latter by a seditious army. Alexander, after treating the revolt of Ovinus lightly, was betrayed to Maximinus and indeed by the army.

Maximinus suffered the gravest seditions: from the Africans, Titus, Gordian, Maximus, Balbinus, and finally his own soldiers; he was killed with torture and mockery. The soldiers also butchered Maximus and Balbinus. Soon the Senate substituted Marcianus and Severus Hostilianus for Gordian; Philip killed Gordian, and Decius Philip. Thus at that time

there were more seditions, continuous and bloody. When Valens had harassed Decius, Gallus betrayed him to the barbarians. The soldiers slaughtered Gallus and Volusianus, and after three months of rule killed Aemilianus, whom they had chosen.

The state was no better or quieter under Valerian, and most wretched under Gallienus, under whom one body, divided into thirty battle lines, fought against itself. The tyrants were, on the authority of Trebellius: Cyriades; the elder and younger Postumus; Lollianus; the elder and younger Victorinus; Marius; Ingenius; Regillianus; Aureolus; both Mariani; Quietus; Odaenathus; Herodes; Maeonius; Ballista; the two Valentes; Piso; Aemilianus; Saturninus; the two Tetrici; Trebellianus; Herennianus; Timolaus; Celsus; Zenobia; Victoria or Victorina; Titus; and Censorinus. The empire was publicly agitated by so many movements; for I omit the seditions of certain cities as private evils.

Claudius received these affairs, and through the revolt of the Egyptians came into danger of losing everything. He killed the tyrant Quintillus; Victorinus, and finally Aurelius as victor, were among the factions. Aurelian seemed more moderate, but because he was savage against the senators he was harassed by the greatest discords. The Palmyrenes revolted from him and were torn out by the roots, to the great grief of all because they had had grave causes for rebelling. Under the same emperor Firmus, Quintillus the brother of Claudius, and other traitors were butchered through the entrails of the state. The Alexandrians rebelled; and lest any evil be lacking, the war of the mint-workers arose, of whom about seven thousand were slain. It has sometimes come into my mind to marvel how men were able to live amid continual evils.

After Aurelian was killed by his intimates, Tacitus was made emperor and not long afterwards was slain; then came Probus and Florianus, of whom the latter was quickly killed. The former, harassed by the revolt of his familiar Saturninus, the sedition of the Britains, the madness of the Lydian robber, the tumult of Ptolemais in the Thebaid, the tyranny of the Franks in Sicily and the capture of Syracuse, the audacity of the Roman gladiators, and the treason of Proculus and Bonosus at Agrippina, was butchered by the army. Hence Carus for a short time, and then Numerian, seized the empire. Diocletian fought against these men; Carinus stood on another side, who had slaughtered the emperor Julianus and fell only after many battles. Diocletian, anxious at the multitude of seditions and rebellions, associated Maximian with himself. Meanwhile there were various tumults, but three principal ones: those of Carausius in Britain, Julianus in Africa, and Achilleus in Egypt. But what had been established for pacifying and protecting

[Printed page 716]

the state--that several men should be called Caesars--was almost its destruction. Never was the state torn more foully than by the wars among the three Galerii, Constantius, Maxentius, Licinius, Alexander, and Constantine; and unless the torn members of the empire had fallen back into the hands of a moderate and religious emperor, by whom they might be cherished, there would without doubt have been an end of so great a mass, so gravely shaken.

§ 2. Thus the empire was restless, turbulent, divided, and raging against itself down to Constantine and Christian times. Nor was it altogether pacified thereafter. Constantine, victor over all seditions and civil wars, by his authority and piety restrained the wicked somewhat, so that all could breathe again. But in the time of his sons it returned to its customs. Constans killed his brother Constantine; Dalmatius Caesar was put to death, and other famous and well-deserving men. Magnentius was declared emperor as a jest; Constans was killed. Nor was there one sedition or a simple evil: Vetricius seized tyranny in Illyricum; Silvanus in Gaul, which was wholly in tumult; Nepotianus at Rome put on the Augustan insignia. Julian carried off the palm among these, who, after Constantius died, striving to extend the empire which he had seized, almost betrayed it.

Then indeed under Jovian and in the beginnings of Valentinian there was peace from sedition through fear of the external enemy. But when Valens reigned impiously, Procopius brought the greatest disaster. Then in the times of Theodosius and Gratian followed the immense wars of Maximus and Eugenius. Under the sons of Theodosius, Arcadius and Honorius, amid the arms of the barbarians there were Stilicho, Rufinus, Eutropius, Gainas, Tribigild, Gildo, and Alaric; then, after Arcadius died, Attalus, Heraclianus, John the Notary, Castinus, Boniface, and the

seditions and revolts of Britain and Spain. Under the younger Valentinian there was Aetius and Maximus. The emperors who followed thereafter were the mockeries and chattels of their own men: Maximus, Avitus, Majorian, Severus, and Anthemius, who were the chattels of Ricimer; and they perished by sword and poison when they had scarcely tasted the sweetness of command.

And so the remnants of the Western Empire changed their emperor almost from year to year. For those who followed--Olybrius, Glycerius, Nepos, and Augustulus--were placed upon and cast down from the throne partly at the decision of Aspar and Ardaburius, partly at that of others; while meanwhile the state was worn down by the ambition of weak princes. For although they were unequal to conquering the enemy, they nevertheless stirred up the gravest seditions at home. This, therefore, was the appearance of the Roman Empire; this the constancy of discords and theater of seditions. It ought to warn all princes and counselors to take care that all seeds of tumults and hatreds be removed.

CHAPTER V

That the Empire of Constantinople Was Agitated by Sedition and Rebellion

[Printed page 716]

§ 1. I shall take my beginning from Leo the Great. For, when the empire of the West was now coming to an end or falling, he ruled the East, and in the beginnings of his reign, after suppressing a sedition, he killed Aspar and Ardaburius. Zeno thereafter, when he had thrown everything into confusion, was driven out by Basiliscus; nor did the betrayal go unpunished: Basiliscus, captured with his family, was compelled to die of hunger. Zeno, returning from exile to the empire and stained by the slaughter of illustrious men, was himself at last buried alive. Great seditions attended Anastasius. Having Longinus as his adversary, he was endangered as to his life. Evis the logothete and the prefect scarcely escaped the hands of the people, lest they be torn apart. When Justin had gained the empire by artifice, he had Amantius the eunuch, Theocritianus, and Andreas the chamberlain as plotters against him; the Constantinopolitans thereafter killed Vitalian, who commanded the emperor.

The empire of Justinian was renowned, yet it too was agitated by many civil wars. Gelimer revolted and drew Africa away. The Samaritans also stirred up hideous wars. A grave sedition arose at Constantinople. Ammianus recounts it: Hypatius, Pompeius, and Probus, cousins by birth and nephews of the emperor Anastasius, because each desired the empire for himself with unworthy ambition, on the Ides of January, together with very many of the nobles who had conspired and with the entire multitude of the seditious, enticed after arms and gifts had been supplied, attempted to invade it by treachery; and for five whole days, while they ran through the royal city with plunder, sword, and fire by means of criminal citizens, without any fixed ruler in the interval, they devastated it with hostile impiety, while in our palace they dissemblingly professed themselves faithful to the state. But on the fifth day of this impious crime, while Hypatius, wreathed with a golden necklace by the hands of the criminals accompanying him, and Pompeius the count, armored in his own garment, were ascending from the forum to invade and hold the palace, each of them was captured before the palace doors; and immediately, at the command of our most pious prince, each was put in chains and slaughtered and paid the penalty, losing the empire before he possessed it, while countless persons among the people and the associates of the tyrants were slain here and there in the Circus and immediately proscribed.

Afterwards, when barbarians occupied the East and the Franks Gaul, Artabanes conspired with Arsaces and others against Justinian, although the same Artabanes had recently killed the tyrant Guntharis in Africa. Justinian deservedly suffered these things, having changed for the worse, so far that he sought domestic and civic discords. Evagrius, Book IV: "I must also speak of another deed of Justinian. Whether it arose from a defect of nature or from apprehension and fear I am unable to say; yet it was of such a kind that it far surpassed every bestial savagery. It took its beginning from that popular sedition which they call *Nika*, that is, 'Conquer.' It pleased Justinian to incline so vehemently toward one of the factions, whose members are called the Greens, that they could slaughter their adversaries in the city at midday with impunity and not only fear no punishments but even be honored with offices; and so many murderers arose from among them. For they were permitted to break into the houses of others, plunder the treasures stored within them, and deprive men of their very safety and life; and if any magistrate attempted to restrain them, he created danger for his own head. Hence certainly a certain man who held magistracy in the East, because he wished to chastise with scourges some of those who favored us, so that they might become more restrained, was led through the middle of the city and severely beaten with scourges. Callinicus, moreover, prefect of Cilicia, when two Cilicians, Paulus and Faustinus, both murderers, made an assault upon him and intended to kill him, because he punished them with the penalty established by the laws, was driven to the cross; and he was subjected to this punishment for his upright conscience and observance of the laws. Hence it came about that those who belonged to the other faction, when they had fled from their homes and were received nowhere by anyone with hospitality, but were hunted like criminals, began to lay

ambushes for travelers, rob them, and commit murders, to such a degree that every place overflowed with premature death, plunder, and the other crimes of that kind. Sometimes, when his mind had changed to the opposite opinion, he killed men of that kind--

[Printed page 717]

--and permitted the power of the laws to extend even to those whom he had previously allowed, after the custom of barbarians, to perpetrate impious crimes in the cities. But for pursuing these matters one by one I have neither sufficient time nor ability of speech." For this reason Evagrius says that, when he had filled absolutely everything with disturbance and tumult, he was carried off to pay punishments among those below. Nicephorus says that he repented. A sedition was stirred up against him in his old age, and Belisarius is said to have been privy to it.

Justin, having first attempted to pacify the divided empire, suppressed the Alexandrian sedition at the beginning. He deprived Narses of his dignity, became angry with Marciana, and rendered everything untrustworthy toward himself; at last he was afflicted by magical enchantments. Tiberius, the colleague and successor of Justin and an excellent prince, suffered a plot on the first day of his coronation from Justinian, Justin's nephew; thereafter Sophia almost ensnared him in greater danger. Maurice followed, whom the soldiers killed. Phocas also paid the penalty of parricide: after a renewed conspiracy, Heraclius, a new emperor from Africa, killed and burned Phocas. During his reign the Persians came through Asia and Egypt as far as Africa and occupied Carthage, while meanwhile Caianus and other barbarians did not remain at rest. When the Persian had been conquered, the Saracens occupied Syria and the neighboring regions.

After him, Constantine, after four months, and Heracleonas, after a period of three months, were cast down, and Constans ruled; against him Valentinian the patrician soon attempted tyranny. But while he raged against the orthodox, he cast himself into the greatest danger: he lost Africa, Armenia revolted, and he became so hateful to his own people that, while dwelling in Sicily, he was suffocated in a bath. Constantine Pogonatus had bloody beginnings, the noses of his brothers having been cut off; he killed the rebel Mizizius and experienced everything as unsafe.

Justinian, receiving a harassed empire, was immediately agitated by the revolt of Sabbatius, praetor of Armenia. He incurred immense hatred and contempt for himself; the nobles conspired against him, and, after his nose and tongue had been cut off, he was relegated to Cherson. Leontius seized the empire; after Lazica was betrayed by Sergius, he was mutilated in the nose and handed over to Apsimar. The latter, ensnared by the plots of the exiled Justinian, was led in procession with Leontius and trodden under Justinian's feet. For Justinian raged against everyone with horrendous cruelty, as against the men of Ravenna and the nobles of Cherson and the Bosphorus. Philippicus was chosen emperor and slaughtered Justinian together with Tiberius. Conspirators blinded Philippicus and drove him from the kingdom; Artemius was then driven out by Theodosius, and he yielded to Leo.

Leo suffered a conspiracy at the very beginning, and so ruled that Italy revolted from him and he divided the Church and the empire. Hence came civil wars and Italy's freedom from the yoke of the Greeks; because of iconoclasm the East was tossed by seditions. All these things raged more grievously against the empire under Copronymus. At the beginning he was in the most immediate danger of his life, and Artabasdus was saluted as emperor; his sons were partly killed and partly thrust into monasteries, while all men of sound mind detested the foul king. Hence there was a mournful civil war, in which Copronymus as victor produced examples of cruelty. But hatred of the victor remained; hence came the seditions of the Bulgarians, and at last a most wretched death carried him off in despair.

There followed the times of Irene and Constantine, not merely seditious but also savage against their own blood. For at the beginning there was a conspiracy against Irene; she reduced Constantine to the ranks of private men; the army restored him and abolished a woman's empire. But she was soon replaced upon the throne, suppressed the seditions of the Armenian legions, and at last, after her enemies had been oppressed, blinded her son through the soldiers, and likewise her kinsmen. Stauracius thereafter, while stirring up sedition, died of disease; his accomplices were killed; Aetius attempted tyranny. But Nicephorus, having ensnared Irene's guards by treachery, punished her with exile,

although he had affirmed by oath that he would not do so. Nor did Nicephorus thereafter long enjoy the kingdom obtained through crime: for, aroused by a sedition of the Bulgarians, he was annihilated with his army. His son Stauracius was soon stripped of the empire by Michael Rhangabe. Leo drove out Michael, Michael the Stammerer drove out Leo; hence came other seditions, especially that of Euphemius, who promised to betray Sicily to the African Emir.

The empire of Theophilus was somehow pacified, but bloody, to such a degree that Theophilus, already about to die, killed Theophobus, adding this pronouncement: "Now neither shall I be Theophilus, nor shall you be Theophobus." Michael, the son of Theophilus, wicked toward his mother, was killed by Basil; Sabbatius and George plotted against Basil. Leo then followed, who implored the loyalty of the Turks against the rebellious Bulgarians; hence various slaughters ensued, even in a church. Constantine, Leo's son, succeeded him. When the deceits of Samonas had been exposed, Alexander, Constantine's guardian, was killed. Constantine the Domestic attempted to occupy the empire of the ward, but, having fallen from his horse in battle, was beheaded. Then the disagreements of the commanders afflicted the army against the Pechenegs.

But many then aspired to the empire, especially Leo Phocas, whom the emperor's tutor overthrew; then Romanus, but he reduced his son-in-law to the ranks of private men, although he was himself wearied by many machinations, such as those of Bardas and his associates, then of the Mystic, Micetas, and Pseudo-Constantine. Finally, the man who had been so faithless toward his ward was expelled by his sons. Another Romanus suppressed conspiracies, but, having died a little later, left the empire to Nicephorus Phocas, whom others compelled to undertake it. But the city was thrown into tumult for that reason, and as long as he lived he was in the greatest hatred; an occasion for vengeance was always sought, until his wife Theophano and Tzimisces accomplished it.

An eunuch removed Tzimisces by poison, after he had first scarcely suppressed the sedition of Phocas and Leo. Basil Porphyrogenitus then received the empire. Bardas revolted and became emperor; there was a battle between Sclerus and Peter the Eunuch; Contostephanus betrayed the army; Xiphias and Nicephorus, being seditious, were crushed. Constantine, the brother of Basil, followed, oppressive to the state through luxury and cruelty, without any memorable deed except that he cruelly avenged the sedition of the city of Naupactus.

Romanus Argyropulus, nearly an old man and deranged, labored under domestic evils and was agitated more by the laughter of the common people than by seditions. His wife Zoe suffocated him in a bath and advanced her adulterer to the empire; he soon reduced her to the ranks of private persons. Then came the sedition and disaster of the Antiochenes, many revolts and depredations, and Sicily was lost. Zoe attempted in vain to remove John, her husband's brother, from the midst; yet she compelled her husband to abstain from public affairs and adopted Michael Calaphates. He, cruel toward illustrious men, expelled Zoe, but was compelled by a tumult of the people to recall her and was at last blinded. Zoe and Theodora were restored to their former condition. Zoe recalled Constantine Monomachus and married him. Monomachus, ruled by his wife, experienced George Maniaces as a valiant enemy; thereafter he was attacked by the plots of Theophilus, Eroticus, the Orphanotrophus, Leo Tornicius, Aplespharis, and Romanus Boilas.

The empress Theodora designated Michael Stratioticus emperor. He ruled for one year--

[Printed page 718]

--and was severe toward the soldiers; hence sedition arose. Theodosius, its instigator, was relegated; the Easterners, repeatedly driven by various injuries, aspired to the empire; Bryennius was blinded; Isaac Comnenus at last occupied the empire. Since he was hateful to everyone, he laid down the empire and designated Constantine Ducas, whom plotters had resolved to drown, but he escaped by chance.

Constantine Ducas left three children with Eudocia, who wished Romanus Diogenes to be her husband, so that she might have him as emperor against the Persians. For a time he endured the woman's dominion; then, while waging wars courageously, he was deserted by Andronicus; John at last attacked him, and there arose the gravest civil war of

all, in which, captured and blinded, he ended his life through grief. Nicephorus the eunuch thereafter administered everything under Michael Ducas. John was therefore saluted as emperor; Nestor revolted; Nicephorus Bryennius excited a sedition; when he had been routed, Botaniates was at last created emperor. The Varangians stirred up a movement against him; Nicephorus Basilacius contemplated a more dangerous sedition; Constantine Ducas a very great one; the logothete likewise came under suspicion.

At last the Comneni aspired to the empire. Alexius was proclaimed emperor and by betrayal occupied and plundered Byzantium, and he procured more enemies for himself than others had. When he returned to Constantinople, the plots of commanders, senators, and commoners received him; thereafter those of Humbertopulus, Ariebeas, Nicephorus, and Anemas with the commanders of the soldiery. When the emperor's wife attempted to bar everyone from access to him, the courtiers, Pseudo-Alexius, and the Cilician rendered life scarcely preservable for him.

John Calo succeeded Alexius against his mother's will. He pacified the conspiracies begun against him and reconciled his mother and sister. He also experienced his brothers as adversaries; indeed, his son Isaac revolted to the sultan. He was harassed by a tyrant at Trebizond and at home. Manuel Comnenus followed, who prevailed more against Christians than against barbarians. For he was renowned for the arts by which he frustrated the expedition of the Germans; he afflicted Conrad's army in every way, waged wars against Roger, and stormed the Corcyraeans, in whose siege a bloody sedition arose between Greeks and Venetians. There were hostilities between him and the commanders, and, if it could have happened, there would have been wars.

The boy Alexius perished through the wickedness of his ministers. Andronicus especially plotted against him, and there was not one form of evil. Maria Caesarissa conspired against the Protosebastus, who administered the empire, and aroused the people to arms; a bloody contest arose. Afterwards Andronicus openly sought the empire. The Protosebastus prepared a fleet against him, but all the leading men revolted from the latter; Andronicus seized the reins of the empire, and John Comnenus afflicted him. Andronicus's first plots against the emperor fell in vain; the second succeeded.

Andronicus, harassed by Isaac Comnenus and the king of the Sicilians, had the most sorrowful end among all the emperors. Isaac Angelus waged civil wars against the Sicilian, the Cypriot, the revolting Vlachs, and Branas, by whom he was besieged at Byzantium. He was captured and blinded by his brother Alexius. Nor did Alexius long endure the joys of treason. The sedition of the Cilician Pseudo-Alexius and of Isaac Comnenus, the Vlachs, and the Asens exhausted him. Alexius Angelus experienced nothing except seditions and fears.

Under Alexius Comnenus great disagreements concerning the Eucharist held the Greeks. Besides these, John Comnenus Crassus stirred up sedition, and many others rose up for sedition. Alexius Angelus, the son of Isaac, came as a companion of the Venetians to assault Constantinople; the city was besieged and deformed by fire; Alexius went into exile. The tyranny of Alexius Ducas was brief; Ducas, who was also called Murzuphlus, fled. Yet amid the ashes of the city a new contest arose between Lascaris and Theodore Ducas. At last the Flemings gained possession of affairs; Theodore Lascaris, however, was saluted emperor at Nicaea and seemed about to return to Constantinople, but his father-in-law Alexius hindered him through the Turks, lest the son-in-law recover the empire which he himself had been unable to hold.

Alexius nevertheless, after collecting forces, founded the empire of Trebizond, to which he added Cappadocia and Colchis. Michael Angelus received Thessaly; Michael Palaeologus afterwards occupied it, for seditions and wars were not absent even among the mangled members. Palaeologus recovered Constantinople, and the family of the Palaeologi ruled--Michael, the two Andronici, Manuel, John, and Constantine--and did so amid great fear and the wars of the Turks, and with moderate concord. If, however, they had been fortified by the aid of their neighbors, they would not with difficulty have withstood the Turk.

Behold how difficult it is to rule man, how great things fall in upon themselves. The whole care of the prince, therefore, must be directed to this: that he guard against sedition, whence the greatest wars arise. For who will judge himself safe when he beholds these butcheries?

CHAPTER VI

The Seditions of Other States

[Printed page 718]

§ 1. Scarcely any city has been moved by seditions so Roman in character as Louvain; for all things are similar--the causes, methods, and effects--because, of course, the vices and passions of men are the same. Justus Lipsius recounts them in Book II, chapters 10, 11, and 13.

"I note," he says, "that the first disturbances occurred in the year 1340, when most of the nobles--until that time they alone had governed the state--were at the siege of Tournai, rendering this service as a favor to the English king. But while, I say, they were absent, the plebs, judging that its time had come, seized the state; and, while altering other things, above all it recalled certain exiles of its own body who had been driven out by the laws in the preceding year. When the patricians had returned, there were complaints, quarrels, and arms; a fierce battle was fought in the middle of the forum. But the patricians conquered, supported by the band of their clients and superior through long practice with arms. There was, nevertheless, more flight than slaughter, except that cruelty followed the victory: men dragged from their homes, and even from sacred places into which they had fled, paid the penalty by sword, prison, and exile.

"There was then quiet for twenty years, but untrustworthy quiet, since men's spirits were ulcerated and the murmuring of the plebeians was not concealed. At the beginning of 1360 they burst forth again into movement and the trumpets of war, from a place whence it was not feared. Peter Couterel was mayor, a man who, although noble and one of the patricians, nevertheless, through perversity of character or ambition, already from his first mayoralty--which he had held for nine years--sought every opportunity to provoke or injure the Fathers. One was offered, or he seized it, in the year already named. A certain citizen, bringing fish for sale into the city by cart, when the cart had become stuck in the mud, suddenly brought a horse out from the pastures, harnessed it, and drew out the cart; and immediately--

[Printed page 719]

--returned the horse in good faith and unharmed. Couterel cast the man into prison as guilty of theft. The aldermen were appealed to; they took cognizance of the matter and pronounced him innocent. And when the mayor would not release him, they forbade him the exercise of jurisdiction because he held a citizen in chains contrary to the laws.

"The mayor immediately went to Brussels, to the prince, who was then Wenceslaus, husband of Joanna, a Bohemian by nation and brother of the emperor Charles IV, whom they relate to have come into the light when his mother's womb was cut open. It is permissible to say that this man was the best neither in peace nor in war, and certainly not the most fortunate; and the people of Louvain have no cause to love him greatly. To the matter: he lent credulous ears to the mayor as he slandered the power of the patricians and asserted that it ought, for the prince's own good, to be restrained by him. Nor could supporters of such counsels be lacking at court; among them was a certain Schoonvorst, a very powerful man, but little upright in spirit or counsel. He openly said that the horns of the patricians--these are his words--must be diminished, since they were now too insolent. The prince could do this without his own exertion or ill will, if the plebs were permitted to rise. The prince did not state his judgment openly; Couterel nevertheless readily saw that he had been heard with ears and minds not unfavorable.

"And so he returned home in high spirits, reported the matter to his followers, and put torches beneath every most factious person. Sedition was now at the point of breaking out; nor could the Fathers be ignorant of it, but they acted too remissly, whether expecting to mitigate it by kindness or through that fatal indolence which is usual. Gerard Vorselaer happened to be present during these days, a noble man and soldier, with a chosen troop of horsemen. He offered his service to the Fathers of his own accord and advised them to use it; they dismissed him. But Couterel did not dismiss his undertakings. On a certain day appointed for holding the Senate, he commanded his followers

gradually to assemble in the forum, and that with arms. They came, and now there was a crowd; and he himself, in the manner of one haranguing an assembly, incited them and impressed upon them both the pride of the Fathers and their harsh commands. These were the men who alone occupied the state, who made its honors and money their own, who commanded so many most valiant men as slaves. Had so many innocent men of their own body, punished a few years before by sword, noose, and exile because of certain freer words and deeds, fallen from their memory? The same things awaited them unless they were men; but they were men, and whom did they fear?

“‘It is in your hand,’ he said, ‘to make an end of your evils. Only dare: many against few, prepared against the unprepared, the injured against their assailants; God and men will favor you. By divine kindness we have the prince himself mild in spirit, and he will bear it calmly if you cause them to suffer anything. Keep your injuries before your eyes and liberty upon your lips; and let this be the watchword: go, assert the latter and repel the former.’

“He had spoken, and, while he was still speaking, there were murmuring, shouting, and threats; and, turned toward the senate-house, they directed hands and voices against it. Let the oppressors of the citizens, the plunderers of the treasury, come forth to pay the penalties for their crimes or injuries. And now each began to encourage the other, and they prepared violence. The senate-house was closed, and the Fathers were terrified and unequal to resisting, when Couterel rushed forth and, as though from kindness, counseled surrender and affirmed that they would suffer no further evil. It was prudent to yield to this storm. They yielded and surrendered themselves. But immediately he rushed in, laid hands and chains upon them, and they were led as captives into the citadel.

“Then they broke or unlocked the cabinets and archives of the Senate, plundered the armory likewise, tore apart what was there or carried away whatever was useful to them. The names and number of the captives survive: a little fewer than two hundred, and among them twenty-five knights; the rest had scattered into the neighboring cities or were hiding on their estates and in their country houses. When the tumult had been settled, and so that there might be some form of state, Couterel chose a new senate mixed from the plebs and patricians; for he also found among the latter certain pliant or indolent men suited to his counsels, who would exchange the common injury for a present honor.

“Then he sent men down to the captives to announce danger from the plebs; he sent certain men of the plebs themselves, who, with turbulent voices around the citadel, demanded them for slaughter. Thus, terrified, they became suppliants to Couterel; and at last, each making a separate compact for a great sum of money, they were released. Wenceslaus was in Luxembourg while these things were being done--distant by chance or counsel--but the exiles immediately approached him, made known what had been done, and demanded a remedy and vengeance. They were received coldly, although most of the nobility favored them, as did those among the counselors who had some care for equity and honor. Couterel himself also came, who had made many men his own through gold; and the matter was deferred until the prince should return. This was done in the following year, and meanwhile Couterel continued his command.

“Wenceslaus had now come to Brussels, and there the nobles approached him in a body, begged and urged him to avenge a matter of the worst example and not to open a field to sedition or licentiousness. Separately the people of Brussels pressed him and strove keenly on behalf of their allied city. At last they impelled him to move toward Louvain after gathering hired troops into one body. He came to the Banck. While he was there, the Couterelians, who had neither strength nor spirit against the prince, immediately came to him and promised that they would do what was commanded. Thus the prince, having been admitted, recalled the exiles, but displayed no anger or vengeance against the disturbers. He created Couterel himself, the head of the evils, an alderman in the new Senate, merely removing him from the mayoralty; and according to his institution he chose the Senate itself indiscriminately from Fathers and plebs--a nursery of later disturbances. Love of peace and concord was put forward as the pretext; but by this deed it became evident to the more prudent that the preceding affairs had been administered with the prince not unaware, and certainly not unwilling.

“Thus quiet, but quiet neither very certain nor long, was restored to the city. For the plebs exulted and insulted the patricians as conquered; Couterel himself exercised and increased his domination, until, from weariness with present conditions and fear also of future ones, most of the patricians voluntarily withdrew from the city. This delighted Couterel. His rivals having been removed, he now acted freely and designated himself consul for the following year together with Geldolph Rogge, a weaver. And because he knew from experience that protection lay in gold, he sought it from every quarter--not only at home, but also among foreigners, borrowing it upon the public faith of the city, for the seal was in his hand. He attained so great wealth and power that he gave his daughter in marriage to Henry, lord of Hoogstraten, with a great dowry, as great as Henry had demanded.

“But envy also accompanied him, and complaints before the prince were frequent; neither his son-in-law nor Schoonvorst could sufficiently excuse or protect him. Matters came to such a point that the prince again moved his camp toward the city. The same things happened again: they admitted the prince; he compelled both parties by oath to make peace and even took hostages--twelve from the patricians and forty from the plebs. Couterel retained the consulship, and nothing was changed in the sharing of honors. Yet he himself, frightened by conscience and because he perceived that the prince was now more alienated from him, voluntarily fled, after gathering his possessions, together with several standard-bearers of the factious, into the territory of Liège.

“There, since he kept the roads dangerous and halted or cast into chains merchants going from Louvain to Germany in order to extort money, he seriously stirred the anger of Wenceslaus, who proscribed him and twenty-five weavers. Not even then--

[Printed page 720]

--did he remain quiet, but he attempted, with the secret aid of conspirators, to break into the city and make it his own. He had no success, and punishment was exacted from the conspirators. Thus, his affairs being desperate, he turned to prayers and, chiefly through the work of the lord of Hoogstraten, obtained pardon from exile and returned to Louvain in the year 1369, where he ended an inglorious life under public execration. You may marvel either that he dared such things with so great a spirit or that he ended so meanly.”

In chapter 11 Lipsius says: “Now the deadly sedition must be narrated which, nine years later, flowed from that fountain. Wenceslaus, as I said, had shared honors with the plebs, and had kept matters so for several years, until in the unfortunate war of Jülich he himself was captured and many of the nobility, including those of Louvain, were slain. In this war, therefore, since the patricians had proved their loyalty and spirit, while the plebs had been slow or refractory and had furnished only sixty archers, the prince, returning from custody to Louvain, restored their former honor and magistracy to the patricians, except that thereafter twelve senators should be from the plebs. The plebs bore it with difficulty, but bore it for six years, down to the elections of the year 1378.

“At those very elections, when the Senate had been created according to the stated formula, but the Fathers were openly acting in discord among themselves, the plebs, having long watched for an opportunity, seized it. On the holy day of Mary Magdalene itself, three or four weavers from each district, running through the whole city with shouting and the din of basins, aroused the rest: ‘To arms, to arms!’ They assembled; the senate-house was immediately seized, and the consuls with the aldermen were put in chains. Walter Leidanus, a weaver, was named prefect of the city. Soon it pleased them, after the example of the people of Ghent, to assume white caps or hoods as the badge of the faction. It was done; and men were then carried so readily into novel and turbulent affairs that not a few patricians did not refuse but placed that same badge upon their heads and the faction in their hearts.

“Meanwhile Wenceslaus, returning from France--for he had gone there--and informed of these things, came to Louvain; and, once again to placate the plebs, he changed the order of the Senate and admitted them to one half. You may marvel at his inconstancy, and more if, believing the writers, you judge these concessions to have been made not only to the circumstances but also to money, of which he assuredly received some considerable sum from the public treasury. Moreover, he compelled the citizens by oath to deal peacefully with one another, as befitted members of one

body. Certain patricians nevertheless refused this and chose to lack a fatherland rather than be subjected to the injuries or insults of the plebs.

“Thus most of these, living at Aarschot or Namur, harassed the plebs and carried off any of them caught in the fields or roads, and demanded ransoms. The latter in turn set fire to their estates, likewise seized those whom they could, and subjected some to the sword of the executioner. Finally, in the city itself those patricians who remained conducted themselves suspiciously or were suspicious, especially after the murder of Walter Leidanus, who was among the leaders of the White Caps. He happened to have been sent to Brussels on behalf of the state and, returning at night from dinner, was killed, as is thought, by the ambushes of John Calster and William Wilre, patricians who were then staying in that city.

“When the news was brought, Louvain was thrown into confusion; the plebs threatened and murmured; the optimates feared. And these, in order to show themselves innocent and unaware, sent envoys to Joanna--for her husband was still absent in Gaul--to ask that the authors of the murder be investigated and punished. When she delayed, the plebs, judging that they were being mocked or that the matter was being conducted by agreement, seized arms and came into the forum. The Fathers also were summoned into the senate-house. Some of them came; others, foreboding something sorrowful and deadly, changed their clothing and fled the city. Immediately a guard was placed at the Senate, and the seditious rushed to the doors with furious spirit and stood beside them; a part even entered, with no one preventing them. There voices were heard: ‘Give us that man, and that man--at once, at once!’ And those who had been admitted seized them one by one as their names were called and cast them headlong from the windows--I shudder to say it--while the plebs below received them upon lances and darts and tore them to pieces. About seventeen perished in this madness; and one man of the plebs was added to them because, taking pity on Platuotius, his former patron, he had hidden him beneath benches and covered him with his garment.

“These things were done on the sixteenth day before the Kalends of December, and those of the Fathers who remained and were found at home were put under guard. After the deed came coldness, and soon repentance or fear entered. For how would the prince receive these things? He would return shortly and exact punishments from guilty and innocent alike.

“And so they prepared as intercessors the people of Léau, Tienen, Diest, Lier, and Brussels, and also those of Liège and Tongeren; and behold, sooner than expected, Wenceslaus came to Brussels. He was preparing arms and engines, intent upon vengeance, when envoys from the aforesaid cities came to him and humbly sought pardon, offering whatever expiation of the slaughter he might wish. At last, after long deliberation, it was prescribed that fourteen principal authors from the plebs should be relegated to Cyprus and that a fixed sum of money should be given to the kinsmen of the slain. It seemed to everyone a mild settlement, falling short of the magnitude of the crime; then there was this disgraceful thing, that money for the journey was assigned to the exiles themselves from the state as though they were envoys.

“And so it did not serve to placate their spirits. For the patrician youth murmured that they did not regard the blood of their parents as for sale or as to be redeemed by that modest sum of money. And now, having occupied neighboring places or fortresses, they waged war upon their own citizens and drove off plunder from every quarter. Nor did the plebeians cease to return or augment violence and crimes; at last they went farther and struck secret treaties against the prince with the people of Ghent, who then bore arms against the count and ruled almost all Flanders.

“Finally, after mutual slaughters on both sides, Wenceslaus, at last taught that his indulgence to the plebs had been vain and rash, took up arms and besieged the city. They resisted, raised defensive works, and, being unequal by themselves, awaited aid from the people of Ghent. But when that aid failed, and the people of Ghent were themselves pressed by Count Louis and the French, recourse was once again had to prayers. Arnold of Hornes, bishop of Liège, coming into the camp himself, carried them to the prince and obtained pardon under fixed laws. A few were punished; more, through indignation or fear, changed their fatherland, especially the wool-workers, who went to England.”

Chapter 13 has it thus: “There is not yet an end: from the wool-workers we pass to the butchers; and from this body also there were men who disturbed the state. Paul Loenken, a butcher from the lowest plebs, after the slaughter of Charles the Bold and while deliberation was being held concerning the marriage of Mary with Maximilian, made himself and his plebs a part of the state. He spread rumors that Maximilian was being awaited falsely and that the senators were thus mocking them; it was better and safer for them to possess and exercise command themselves. He then aroused the aforesaid dregs of the people, unexpectedly seized and carried off certain men from the Senate, and was about to subject them to the sword, had not the public executioner withdrawn himself. The leaders of the Academy also now intervened and by their authority quieted the tumult.

“Mary herself came a little later to assume, according to custom, the auspices of the principate; the seditious neither admitted nor acknowledged her unless they had extorted new rights and immunities. Indeed, when she, in order to suppress them, had armed the archers of the city itself--the more honorable portion of the people--they made an assault and captured certain of the archers and four senators who happened to meet them. Only with difficulty could they be restrained even by Paul himself from punishing them in the same manner. Then they rushed into the citadel where Mary was staying, and compelled the maiden, trembling amid so many evils, to pardon what had gone before and to sanction other things according to their judgment.

[Printed page 721]

“Now, so that there might publicly be the appearance also of a new popular government, twenty guards were assigned to Paul for protection, together with a monthly stipend from the treasury. And thereafter they reveled at the expense of the same public money, drank, and held banquets as though to establish association and loyalty. But while they were carrying on these things, Maximilian arrived sooner than expected; as he drew near, Paul's power began to diminish, and his retainers were taken from him by the Senate. Yet Maximilian himself, although present, resolved to do nothing even as prince, nor to touch this ulcer, unless he became master of the marriage.

“Therefore, after his departure, the Paulians again began to swell up, demand back the retainers, and throw affairs into confusion. But Maximilian, at last informed concerning the whole matter and its danger, sent Engelbert of Nassau, seneschal of Brabant, ahead to Louvain with cavalry, and was himself soon to follow.

“Clouds and scoundrels scatter before the sun. Paul fled into Zeeland, and there, when recognized, paid with his head. Most of these things, and certainly their beginnings, were done in the absence of Louis Pinnoccius the mayor--for he had gone into Germany among the envoys--who, being the man he was, prompt in spirit and vigorous in hand, would have crushed or at least repressed them. God and fate judged otherwise.

“But, that I may finish, this sedition also diminished the city, since many not only of the plebs but also of the optimates scattered into the countryside or their strongholds and established their residence there from weariness with so many disturbances. You see the causes and the times by which a city once most flourishing lost its flower and possesses from its ancient glory and abundance nothing except this shadow.”

The first sedition arose through the absence of the aristocratic nobility, which ruled like the Roman patricians; so too did the Roman seditions, because many nobles had fallen in war, while the rest oppressed the citizens by an inequitable command. This also happened at Louvain; otherwise a just and innocent nobility would not have been hated.

Then the exiles were recalled. Hence came slaughter and flight, and the insolent victory of the nobility, which embittered the citizens. It grew raw again thereafter when the countryman was cast into prison, just as the Roman sedition once grew raw through the crime of Claudius when he gave judgment against freedom in favor of slavery; but here the more just cause was on the side of the nobility. Peace having been made, Couterel ruled; the nobility, after the slaughter of its members, prepared war. At last the seditions were ended by siege and punishment, through which they lost the power to rage.

CHAPTER VII

The Seditions of the Osmanids

[Printed page 721]

§ 1. I have very often made mention of the Turkish Empire and warned that those men err who contend that, because of the common servitude of all, it is free from sedition and tumults. The history of Turkish affairs itself refutes them, as does the nature of the monarchy, which, since it is savage and harsh, must necessarily also be engaged in perpetual fear and danger.

In the year 1328 from the Incarnation, Osman having died, his son Orchan took the prefectures away from his leading men and introduced that servitude which now exists; thereafter they struggled with great evils. For the leading men conspired against Gilderun and called upon the Egyptian. Indeed, deserted also by his Tatar auxiliaries, Gilderun came into the power of Timur and was cast into an iron cage, while the leading men were restored to their dignities.

Thereafter Musa, Suleiman's brother, harassed him, and the army declared Musa emperor. When Suleiman had been destroyed, there was war between Mahomet and Musa; Musa, deserted by his commander and fleeing his brother, was slaughtered by a servant. Meanwhile, while the brothers stirred up wars against one another, Caramanir the prefect revolted and brought hostile arms against Mahomet. But, after peace had been made with Caraman, Mustafa stirred up a greater sedition, and afterwards Torlac and Mustafa again; for it was very easy for them to entice rude men to themselves.

Murad thereafter, through Düzme Mustafa, and with almost all the leading men revolting, was not only cast down from the empire; but, when that Mustafa had been hanged, another Mustafa, the victor's brother, began new disturbances. And lest any evil should be lacking, the Wallachian revolted. Amid these events Ibrahim of Karaman also rebelled, whom Murad was compelled to receive into favor.

Mahomet ruled without many seditions; when he died, the Janissaries plundered Constantinople. The brothers Bayezid and Zizim fought; the Egyptian attacked the victor, not without a conspiracy of the leading men. But the victor over these and others was agitated by Chasan Calisa, a solitary man who feigned holiness; for by the pretense of holiness he easily enticed to sedition peoples who had suffered things deserved and undeserved. Scarcely had he been destroyed when Selim took up arms against his father; and, when the Janissaries conspired, the old man was compelled to lay down the empire. Selim also killed his brother Ahmed and ruled in great fear.

Ibrahim thereafter considered casting Suleiman down from the kingdom. Suleiman came to so great a depth of misery that, when discord arose between his sons, he obtained by great promises from Tahmasp, his host, that his son Selim should be killed together with his grandson--an act than which nothing more disgraceful could be conceived in a father and grandfather. Dragut also rebelled against him when he was now old. Nothing, therefore, is easier than to excite a notable sedition in that kingdom in which the subjects are oppressed and the leading men are in fear, something which we see that the basest of men have been able to do.

CHAPTER VIII

The Causes of Seditions and Tumults on the Part of Rulers

[Printed page 721]

§ 1. Daily losses show that disturbances and movements are frequent in the state. It is my intention to investigate their causes, so that they may be guarded against and, if perhaps no precaution has been employed, may be removed. Their causes arise either from the vice of princes and optimates, or of peoples, or of both; for if ever in any matter each party is guilty, it happens in tumults and civil wars. For there,

In truth, guilt is committed within the walls and beyond them.

It is a sign of a state about to fall when the magistracy is ignorant of manifest vices or dissembles them; when those whom all men judge impious it holds in esteem as though they were upright.

There are, moreover, as many causes as there are vices. For although men are chiefly impelled to rebel by cruelty, avarice, and pride, nevertheless there have frequently been other causes also: fear, lust, luxury, and others. For just as every evil of the body, if it becomes severe, is capable of destroying life--

[Printed page 722]

--so whatever introduces hatred, envy, and contempt of others into the body of the state is accustomed to prepare discord, factions, tumults, and civil wars. The friends of princes destroy them more often than their enemies do.

§ 2. The first and most powerful cause of rebellion is the cruelty of magistrates. For since nothing is dearer to a man than life, men protect themselves in whatever way they can against the bloodthirsty and cruel. We always bear arms against lions, wolves, bears, and serpents, and fortify ourselves with the protection of others, for we know that their rage is always armed against us. The mind of an entire kingdom is no different when its people perceive that the king is cruel: clemency makes kings gods; cruelty makes them demons.

The impious and savage deeds of Mezentius are an ancient example. Hence:

Etruria rises in righteous fury.

I have shown this sufficiently in the chapter concerning cruelty. For cruel men are feared most by those nearest them. Alexander of Phrae, whose savagery was celebrated, was killed in his sleep by his wife's brothers while she herself held the light before them.

We know that Augustus was agitated by many seditions; but when we consider his cruelty, we marvel that he escaped. Suetonius, chapter 27: "For ten years he administered the triumvirate for establishing the state. In it he indeed resisted his colleagues for some time, lest there should be any proscription, but when one had begun he exercised it more bitterly than either of them. For while they were often capable of being entreated by favor and prayers in the case of many persons, he alone contended earnestly that no one should be spared; and he proscribed even Gaius Toranius, his own guardian and the colleague of his father Octavius in the aedileship.

"Junius Saturninus relates this besides: that when, after the proscription had been completed, Marcus Lepidus excused the past in the Senate and held out hope of clemency for the future, because sufficient punishments had been exacted, Augustus, on the contrary, professed that he had fixed a limit to proscribing in such a way that he had left everything free to himself. Nevertheless, in repentance for this obstinacy, he afterwards honored Titus Junius Philopoemen with equestrian dignity because it was said that he had once concealed his proscribed patron.

“While in this same power he blazed with manifold odium. For when, while he was haranguing, he noticed that Pinarius, a Roman knight admitted among the soldiers with a crowd of civilians, was writing down certain things, he judged him inquisitive and a spy and ordered him to be stabbed before his eyes. And Tediū Afer, consul designate, because he had censured a certain deed of his with malicious speech, he terrified with so many threats that the man threw himself down to his death.

“And when Quintus Gallus the praetor, during the duty of salutation, was holding double tablets covered by his garment, Augustus suspected that he concealed a sword; but he did not dare investigate anything immediately, lest something else be found. A little afterwards, Gallus was dragged from the tribunal by centurions and soldiers and tortured after the manner of a slave; and although he confessed nothing, Augustus ordered him to be killed, first gouging out his eyes with his own hand. Augustus nevertheless writes that Gallus sought a conference and plotted against him; that he was cast by him into custody, then banished from the city and released; and that he perished by shipwreck or the ambushes of robbers.

“He received perpetual tribunician power, in which once and again, at each interval of five years, he chose a colleague for himself. He also received an equally perpetual governance of morals and laws; by this right, although without the honor of the censorship, he nevertheless conducted the census of the people three times--the first and third with a colleague, the middle one alone.”

It is monstrous how great a hatred the reputation of cruelty brings. Philippicus killed Justinian II amid the greatest joy of all because he had resolved utterly to destroy the people of Cherson, had even sent a fleet to kill the infants, and ordered a citizen to be slaughtered whenever, after his nose had been cut off, he blew it. Diaconus, Book XIX. The Locrians avenged the cruelty of Dionysius with greater savagery and injustice: for they prostituted his wife together with his daughters, killed them after piercing them with needles beneath the nails of their fingers, crushed their bones, and cursed those who did not taste their flesh. Aelian, Book IX. But enough has been done concerning this matter in the chapter on cruelty.

§ 3. A no less effective and much more frequent cause of seditions is the avarice of rulers. Aristotle noted this in Book V of the *Politics*, chapter 3:

Τούτων δὲ ὕβρις μὲν καὶ κέρδος τίνα ἔχει δύνανται καὶ πῶς αἴτια, σχεδὸν ἐστὶ φανερόν· ὕβριζόντων τε γὰρ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ πλεονεκτούντων στασιάζουσι καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ πρὸς τὰς πολιτείας τὰς διδούσας τὴν ἐξουσίαν.

What force insult and gain have among these things, and how they are causes of seditions, is almost manifest. For when those who bear magistracies are insulting toward private persons and take more and greater things for themselves through injury and avarice, they excite sedition both among themselves and against those forms of administering the state which offer and permit this license.

If you weigh everything in the Roman state, you will find that most seditions arose from the avarice of the nobility. Hence the tribunes of the plebs were instituted, so that they might assist the weaker against the injuries of moneylenders. Hence the agrarian laws were attempted so often, when the plebs, conqueror of nations, wasted away from want while the nobility possessed vast estates.

There are exceedingly many Cleons today who have

τὴν χεῖρ ἐν Αἰτωλοῖς, τὸν δὲ νοῦν ἐν Κλωπιδῶν,

their hand among the Aetolians, or in petitioning, but their mind in the district of Clopidae, or among thefts. Caligula stirred up everyone when he compelled wills to bequeath property to him and set a price upon foodstuffs. Galba, because of the reputation of avarice, was betrayed by the army. For the same cause Didius Julianus was deserted and killed in the palace. His own men betrayed Maurice for that reason when they neglected the protection of the

avaricious prince, and they raised up Phocas the parricide for the same reason. Constantine was killed by his own men in Sicily because of the same sordidness and rapacity; his plunder was diverted by the Saracens into Africa. Perseus, king of the Macedonians, deserted by soldiers defrauded of their pay, was captured with his gold and led in triumph by Paulus Aemilius. Heraclius also, while depriving the Saracens of their pay, lost the empire of the East.

§ 4. Unjust exactions of tributes pertain to avarice; they rarely enrich princes, frequently bring destruction to them and profit to their officers. Darius, who first ordered the tributes of the Persian kingdom, was called **κάπηλος**, or a huckster; he also corrupted morals and was hated by the nation. The Lydians suspended King Achaeus by his feet for avarice in exacting tributes, so that his head emerged into the Pactolus and its gold-bearing water might thus satisfy his thirst.

Bato the Dalmatian freely reproached Tiberius that the Romans supplied the cause of war because they sent not dogs but wolves as guardians of the flock. If we consider present affairs, the exaction of tributes produced the war in Belgium, or furnished its occasion. One must therefore take great care that people not be burdened beyond measure or custom, for when they perceive that they are being despoiled they rise up grievously. For although there are extraordinary necessities, so that a prince is sometimes compelled for the public utility to impose assessments and superassessments, the people are nevertheless so disposed that they interpret what is done for their safety as being given to others. But the most bitter seditions are those which arise when tribute is refused and which assail the ministers above all. Thus the fury of the Israelite people raged singularly against Adoram, who was over the tribute, and stoned him.

[Printed page 723]

A king will therefore act most safely if he exacts small tributes in portions, with the estates consenting after the necessity of the kingdom has been demonstrated; if he preserves the ordinary ones and does not readily command new ones. In the time of Charles VI, new taxes almost overthrew king and kingdom, for the plebs, having risen in tumult, obtained their abolition after the most illustrious men of the magistracy had first been killed. For the same cause the French were expelled from all Flanders after the people of Bruges had made the beginning. The plebs indeed serves humbly and remains quiet so long as customary things are commanded; when it understands that it is being despoiled by unaccustomed methods, it turns to arms.

§ 5. Injustice is either that which truly opposes laws and right, or that which those living in a worse condition judge to be injustice. For although all demand right, that is, what is equitable, and put it forward as a pretext, they nevertheless do not acknowledge true equity. For those who are equal in some respect wish to be peers in all things, and by this reasoning violate justice, that is, equity itself. Although the people and the optimates are equally free, nevertheless equal honor is not therefore owed to a plebeian and a nobleman; for the former is **κατ' ἀριθμὸν ἰσότης**, "equality according to number," not **ἰσότης κατ' ἀναλογίαν**, "equality according to proportion." Again, those who are superior in some respect are willing to bear an equal in no respect, and they judge this just. Thus, when nobles are exempt from civil burdens, they judge it equitable not to pay their creditors, not to appear when summoned to judgment, to display honor to no one, and to exact the services of lesser men.

When, therefore, they perceive that right is denied to them or judgment rendered inequitably, they turn to force. The great commander Julius Caesar never entered greater danger than when, chosen as judge between Cleopatra and her brother and indulging his love of the queen, he pronounced an inequitable judgment against her brother. For then the Egyptians, turned to sedition and almost madness, rose against him with one mind, to such a degree that he was compelled to entrust himself naked to the river and thus escaped to his own men; nevertheless the Alexandrians carried his garments around in mockery. For the sacred writings teach us that a kingdom is transferred from nation to nation because of injustice.

§ 6. Fear is also a great incitement to sedition. For when men have sinned and fear the vengeance of the laws, or when innocent men foresee injuries, they prefer to anticipate them. Thus Aurelian was slaughtered by his own men, partly deserving punishment and partly innocent.

“It happened,” says Flavius Vopiscus, “as events conduct themselves fatally, that he rendered a certain Mnesteus, whom he had as secretary of secrets--a freedman of his own, as some say--more hostile to himself because he had suspected I know not what concerning a certain matter. Mnesteus, who knew that Aurelian was accustomed neither to threaten in vain nor to pardon if he threatened, wrote a brief list of names, mixing those with whom Aurelian was truly angry together with those concerning whom he contemplated nothing harsh, and adding even his own name, so that he might impart greater credibility to the anxiety he had aroused. He read the brief to the individuals whose names it contained, adding that Aurelian had resolved to kill them all, but that they, if they were men, ought to come to the aid of their lives. These men--those who deserved his displeasure having blazed up with fear--mingling resentment with the benefactions and services for which Aurelian seemed ungrateful, suddenly attacked and killed the prince as he made his journey in the aforesaid place.”

Rightly, therefore, Aristotle, Book V, chapter 3:

Διὰ δὲ φόβον στασιάζουσιν οἱ ἡδίκηκότες, δεδιότες μὴ δῶσι δίκην, καὶ οἱ μέλλοντες ἀδικεῖσθαι, βουλόμενοι φθάσαι πρὶν ἀδικηθῆναι.

On account of fear, however, those who have inflicted injury rise in tumult lest they pay the penalties, or those who suspect that they are about to suffer injury; for they prefer to anticipate it. Thus the Rhodians conspired against the plebs through fear of judicial proceedings. For vehement fear, when it produces despair of pardon, is the strongest of all passions. See that heroine:

I would have cast myself upon them.

What did I have to fear, being about to die?

Those whose life, fortune, and reputation are in another's power think more often about what their master is able to do than about what he ought to do. But if they are so conscious within themselves that they judge that their master not only can but also rightfully can and ought to act more harshly, and they now see him ready and prepared for torments and destruction, they will attempt everything in order to escape. If many are afraid, no force of command is so great that it can long endure under the pressure of fear. Hence arises swift and unconsidered rebellion, and indeed rebellion by many, because no one is faithful to the man whom he fears.

When Athens summoned Alcibiades to the tribunal because the affair in Sicily had been badly conducted, it overthrew the city. For he, despairing that he would obtain pardon from the hostile plebs for the disaster received, when he saw that those who had deserved best had suffered the extremity, preferred to entrust his safety to enemies rather than to citizens. Having set out for Lacedaemon, he was the author of the counsel that Gylippus should be sent to the aid of the Syracusans, that war in Attica should be renewed, and that assistance should be brought to the Chians, Lesbians, and others who had revolted from the Athenians; sailing to Ionia himself, he was successful in alienating cities from the Athenians.

Yet there was no loyalty for him among the Spartans either. Their insult and injury reconciled Alcibiades to his fatherland; for when the ephors commanded the commanders to kill Alcibiades, he again brought the Lacedaemonians into hatred, both among the cities and with Tissaphernes the Persian. Thereafter he defeated Mindarus and Pharnabazus in a mighty battle and, after wresting the empire of the sea from the Spartans, handed it to the Athenians. When he had again been reduced to the ranks of private men by them, he was compelled as an exile to see his fatherland captured.

§ 7. Hope is akin to fear. For both those who struggle with adversity hope for better things and those whose affairs proceed prosperously hope for the best. Thus for a long time the Roman Empire was sold, when seditious men impelled military spirits, filled with hope, to crime, and the same men, when frustrated in their hope, deserted the princes.

Dio reports concerning Vespasian: “He was nevertheless not pleasing to the Alexandrians, who were so gravely hostile to him that they mocked and cursed him both privately and publicly. The cause was that, although they had hoped to receive from him, whom they had made emperor first of all, some great gift, he not only bestowed nothing upon them but even exacted money from them; and he collected so much, omitting no kind of tribute, that he did not spare even beggars and made money from divine and human affairs. For he renewed many taxes which had now ceased to be paid and increased many of those which were in force; and he did this in the other provinces subject to Roman command and afterwards in the city. For this reason the Alexandrians hurled many reproaches against him and said, among other things, that he exacted six obols.”

Hope, therefore, aroused the Egyptians, and when disappointed it raged. Those who attempt innovations know this: nothing impels spirits more toward sedition than to inflate them with hope of better things. Thus Cyrus induced the Persians to revolt from the Medes. Antiochus, in like manner, when he was besieging Cypsela, ostentatiously adorned with necklaces and silver arms the nobles of Cypsela whom he had in his camp. And so their kinsmen revolted to him and, as followed, betrayed the city.

Fear and the consciousness of an evil deed are cruel.

[Printed page 724]

Bagoas, through fear of cruelty, killed Ochus, king of the Persians. He raised his son Arsames to the kingdom and killed him in the same manner lest the latter avenge his father's slaughter, and he transferred the empire to Darius. Thus Marcus Duillius, tribune of the plebs, consulted no more for the Senate than for the state when, after the decemvirs had been condemned and all were afraid, he proclaimed that in that year no one should be permitted to appoint a day of accusation against anyone. But hope is sharper because it makes men active, fear sluggish.

§ 8. The license of magnates and princes toward women has excited many seditions. External wars also arose from it; a royal wife, foreign marriage beds, and the carrying off of betrothed women were the cause of many wars. But we are treating seditions.

Livy, Book IV, says that at Ardea civil discord arose between the plebs and the optimates because of the marriage of a certain maiden who was indeed of plebeian birth but most distinguished in beauty. Two young men sought her, one a plebeian and the other a nobleman. The former relied upon her guardians; the latter upon both the favor of her mother, who wished the girl to be joined in the most splendid marriage possible, and that of the optimates. Since the affair could not be completed within the walls of the house, they went to law. After the claim of the mother and that of the guardians had been heard, the magistrates awarded the right of marriage according to the will of the parent.

But force was more powerful. For the guardians, having harangued the men of their party in the forum concerning the injustice of the decree, formed a band and carried the maiden off from her mother's house. Against them arose a more hostile battle line of optimates, which followed the young man inflamed by the injury. A fierce battle took place. The armed plebs, driven from the city, went forth, occupied a certain hill, and made incursions with sword and fire upon the lands of the optimates; it prepared to besiege the city itself. No disaster of war was absent. It seemed to each party that too few arms were present in the city and for war; the optimates summoned the Romans to come to the aid of the city, while the plebs summoned the Volscians to storm Ardea with them.

The lust of Roderic, king of Spain, so inflamed Julian of Tingitana, whose daughter he had dishonored, to vengeance that he called the Saracen Mamolinus into Spain. Thus the intemperance of one man brought first rebellion, then war and the servitude of many centuries, upon the most noble kingdoms.

The people also expelled the Roman kings, despairing that they could otherwise avenge chastity. They also avenged themselves upon the decemvirs for this reason. The tyrant Pandulf, because the daughter of Bellantius had been carried off, was crushed by a conspiracy of her kinsmen.

Aristotle also numbers this among causes that are small but frequent. Assuredly among the people of God lust was expiated by the destruction of almost one entire tribe. Xerxes, the most powerful of kings, while violating his brother's wife and household with unspeakable lust and slaughtering his most beloved brother, was killed by his uncle Artabanus. But nothing was fouler than the contest between Artaxerxes and his son Darius over a concubine. Artaxerxes loved Aspasia and created Darius king. It was the custom that on the day of inauguration it was not lawful to deny the son a gift, requested separately, of whatever he wished. The shameless and ungrateful Darius sought Aspasia. Artaxerxes gave her according to the laws and, a little afterwards, overcome by desire, took her away. Darius plotted his father's death; when detected, he paid with his head. Just as the abductions of maidens and matrons are the most ancient causes of wars, so also the rivalries of leading men have thrown whole states into confusion.

§ 9. Desire for honors and ambition are scarcely absent from any rebellion; but of very many they are the sole causes. The matter seems clear to Aristotle, Book V, chapter 3:

Δῆλον δὲ καὶ ἡ τιμὴ, καὶ τί δύναται καὶ πῶς αἰτία στάσεως· καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀτιμαζόμενοι καὶ ἄλλους ὀρώντες τιμωμένους στασιάζουσι· ταῦτα δὲ ἀδίκως μὲν γίνεται ὅταν παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἢ τιμῶνται τινες ἢ ἀτιμάζονται, δικαίως δὲ ὅταν κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν.

It is clear what honor can do and how it is a cause of sedition; for those who are without honor, seeing others honored, rise in tumult. This happens sometimes justly, sometimes unjustly. The desire to dominate is assuredly the torch of seditions just as it is of wars.

At Rome the Senate was burdensome to the plebs, and the plebs to the Senate. The younger men among the Fathers insulted the plebs; the older men judged their own young men too fierce, yet preferred, if a limit had to be exceeded, that courage should abound in their own men rather than in their adversaries. At first men wish to be made equal; then, lest they lose liberty and equality, they wish to cast others down and command others, and so to repel injury in order that they may inflict it upon others. This throws everything into confusion. For they do not think themselves safe unless they have so prostrated others who are rightfully their equals that they cannot rise again.

Good princes also perished in this way, but after being changed. Pausanias, an example of modesty and of a temperate spirit in victory, being raised up by prosperity, was preparing a Persian peace and had contracted for a royal marriage so that he himself might become king of Greece. For this reason, when he fled into a temple, he was walled in and there perished from hunger, after his mother Alcitha had placed the first stone in the blocking of the entrance.

In the Roman city very many seditions were excited by hope of domination. Whether you examine sacred or profane history, you will find very many things of this kind. Almost all the kings of the Israelites were killed by plotters, and the kings of the Jews also endured conspiracies. Sennacherib was killed by his sons, and other men by others; for those who come to a kingdom through slaughter are generally cast down in the same manner. This, therefore, is what they labor to effect: that no one be their equal and no one their superior, and that they be masters of some; with the outcome uncertain, they kill innumerable men.

§ 10. Overthrows of the state occur for the most part when the excessive power of one man is nourished and made firm. This has been treated rather often, but the evil clings with the greatest tenacity. The preeminence of one man is equally harmful to the liberty of peoples and to the majesty of kings. Aristotle prudently says: "Moreover, sedition arises because of preeminence when one man, or several, obtains ampler resources and greater power than the city or the power of the administration of the state can bear; for monarchy or dynasty is accustomed to arise from such conditions. For this reason in certain places they are accustomed to relegate the more preminent men for a fixed time by means of a potsherd, which the Greeks call ὀστρακίζειν, as at Argos and Athens. And yet it is better to provide

from the beginning that men so preeminent cannot arise in the city than afterwards to remedy an evil born from sufferance and negligence.”

Hence Rome, through the conspiracy of three leading men, was made common to three masters. Hence come oligarchies, conspiracies, and the other plagues. If one man can do everything with the prince, he is unable to bear the envy; if a few obtain control of affairs, they are unable to agree among themselves and betray the prince rather than preserve him, because they turn the prince away from the friendship and society of others. Finally, out of so many thousands concerning whose power the provinces complained, scarcely ten used power moderately; rather, they turned it to the destruction of the plebs, the nobility, the prince, and at last themselves. The cause is that they possess hope neither in the will of the people or leading men nor in that of the king.

§ 11. The error of rulers is equal when they dishonor great men.

[Printed page 725]

For since these men are powerful, bear great spirits, and are unaccustomed to insult, they do not easily let an opportunity for vengeance escape. When Ish-bosheth charged Abner with embracing the royal concubine, he offended a man of great spirit and a support of the kingdom, so that he immediately revolted to David. David likewise, while attempting to reduce Joab to the ranks of private men by substituting Amasa in his place, gave Joab a man to fear not without reason, had Amasa not fallen by treachery.

Coriolanus would have avenged the disgrace of his judgment by the destruction of his fatherland, had his mother's prayers not stood in the way. The Athenians expelled Hippias, who had thus deserved it, but shuddered when he returned with one hundred thousand infantry and ten thousand cavalry. Miltiades nevertheless defeated him, furnished with eleven thousand men; yet toward Miltiades they were most ungrateful, and after fining him an immense sum of money they compelled him to die in prison. If he had wished to flee to the Persians, he could have overthrown Athens with small forces; for what would not the man who defeated one hundred and ten thousand with eleven thousand have done if he had possessed one hundred and ten thousand against eleven thousand? A foolish city, therefore, which, always inequitable and malevolent toward illustrious men, deprived itself of its own defenses.

Baldilus the Gaul, because he had been unjustly beaten by Childeric, killed the king himself and his pregnant wife. Colas the tutor incited three pupils to the murder of Galeazzo Sforza because he had repaid the blows which the boy had received from that tutor. Andrea Lampugnani killed Galeazzo Sforza because Galeazzo had not favored him against the bishop of Como.

Whole states sometimes commit an offense of this kind. Matho, punished with exile together with the army, set out for Carthage and besieged his ungrateful fatherland; he was mitigated only by prayers. The great man preferred to occupy and destroy his fatherland rather than, innocent, to pay the penalty of adverse fortune together with so many brave citizens.

There are, moreover, two ways in which offense is committed in these matters: when a prince admits excessive honors or contemns the other leading men. By that arrogance Caesar alienated his once most friendly and faithful soldiers and armed the leading men for his own destruction. Suetonius, in *Julius*, chapter 76 and those following:

“Yet his other deeds and sayings outweigh these, so that he is judged both to have abused domination and to have been slain rightfully. For he not only received excessive honors, such as a continuous consulship, perpetual dictatorship, and prefecture of morals, besides the praenomen *Imperator*, the surname Father of the Fatherland, a statue among those of the kings, and an elevated seat in the orchestra; he also allowed greater honors than were fitting to human eminence to be decreed to him: a golden seat in the senate-house and before the tribunal, a ceremonial carriage and litter in the procession of the Circus, temples, altars, images beside the gods, a sacred couch, a flamen, Luperici, and the naming of a month from his own name. And he took and gave certain honors according to his own caprice.

“He bore his third and fourth consulships in title only, content with the power of the dictatorship decreed together with the consulships; and in each year he substituted for himself two consuls for the final months, so that in the intervening time he held no elections except those of tribunes and aediles of the plebs. He appointed prefects in place of praetors to administer urban affairs in his absence. On the day before the Kalends of January, when the office of consul had become vacant through the sudden death of the consul, he gave it for a few hours to a man who sought it. With the same license, after despising the custom of his fatherland, he appointed magistrates for several years; he gave consular ornaments to ten men of praetorian rank; and he received into the senate-house men given citizenship and certain men from among the half-barbarous Gauls. Besides this, he placed his personal slaves over the mint and public revenues. He entrusted the care of three legions which he was leaving at Alexandria to the son of his freedman Rufinus, his own catamite.

“Chapter 77. He publicly uttered sayings of no less unrestrained power, as Titus Ampius writes: that the state was nothing, merely a name without body and form; that Sulla did not know his letters, since he had laid down the dictatorship; that men ought now to speak more considerately with him and to regard what he said as laws. And he advanced to so great a degree of arrogance that, when a soothsayer once pronounced the entrails sorrowful and without a heart, he said that they would be more favorable when he wished, and that it ought not to be taken as a portent if a beast lacked a heart.

“Chapter 78. But he especially aroused against himself the chief and inexpiable odium from this. When all the Conscript Fathers approached him with many most honorific decrees, he received them while seated before the temple of Venus Genetrix. Some think that he was held back by Cornelius Balbus when he attempted to rise; others that he did not attempt it at all, but even looked with a less friendly countenance upon Gaius Trebatius when he admonished him to rise. And this deed of his was regarded as all the more intolerable because, when he himself was triumphing and passing by the tribunician benches, he had been so indignant that one man from the college, Pontius Aquila, did not rise for him that he cried out: ‘Then reclaim the state from me, Aquila, as tribune!’ Nor for continuous days did he cease promising anything to anyone except with the reservation, ‘If, however, Pontius Aquila permits it.’

“Chapter 79. He added to so signal an insult in despising the Senate a deed much more arrogant. For when, as he returned from the Latin sacrifices amid modest and novel acclamations of the people, a certain man from the crowd had placed upon his statue a laurel crown bound with a white fillet, and the tribunes of the plebs Epidius Marullus and Caesetius Flavus had ordered the fillet to be pulled from the crown and the man led into chains, grieving either that the mention of kingship had been moved with too little success or--as he claimed--that the glory of refusing it had been wrested from him, he severely rebuked the tribunes and deprived them of their power. From that time he was unable to cast off the infamy even of having aspired to the royal name, although he both answered the plebs when it saluted him as king that he was Caesar, not king, and at the Lupercalia, before the rostra, repeatedly repelled from his head the diadem offered by the consul Antony and sent it to the Capitol, to Jupiter Best and Greatest.

“Indeed, a varied report also spread abroad that he was about to migrate to Alexandria or Ilium, transferring there at the same time the resources of the empire, exhausting Italy by levies, and entrusting the administration of the city to friends. At the next meeting of the Senate a report spread that Lucius Cotta, one of the Board of Fifteen, was about to declare the opinion that, since it was contained in the books of fate that the Parthians could not be conquered except by a king, Caesar should be called king.”

These things seemed intolerable in a new and raw servitude; afterwards they began to be regarded as virtues. There would assuredly be no end if I were to recount examples of brave men who, indignant at contempt of themselves, excited civic movements. Coriolanus, Belisarius, Narses, and others are witnesses. Victor Pisani indeed, when he had been cast into chains by the Venetian Senate and freed by the plebs, was admonished by a distinguished man to avenge the injury; he struck him with a slap and added a declaration greater than all his deeds: “Have I ever contemned the decrees of my fatherland?” But so great a virtue is rare; and if it exists elsewhere, nevertheless the fatherland cannot or ought not trust that it exists, because it can also easily be changed.

[Printed page 725]

§ 12. Many princes have been overthrown because of threats, as I taught above concerning Aurelian. Therefore a magistrate ought not readily to threaten unless it is so that an offense may be avoided; for he exposes himself to the most certain danger. If a prince threatens someone with death, that man considers either fleeing or causing death, and he labors so that the prince rather than he himself may perish. I do not doubt that this pertains to fear. Yet because threats produce the most powerful and violent fear, are very easily carried abroad among the common people, and are augmented, one must abstain altogether from threats.

[Printed page 726]

It is safer to have killed a guilty man than to threaten him with death. For threats are either those of a powerful man, which you cannot escape, and thus they are premature; or those of a weak man, and thus they are vain. In either manner they render execution more difficult. If the one threatening is powerful, his atrocity is odious; if weak, his authority is nothing. He who threatens admonishes his enemy; he does not harm him. For it is easiest for him to inflict upon you the evil which you threatened against another.

I add this also: the man against whom you have threatened evil appears to have an authorized cause to defend himself and to prepare himself for defense as though war had been declared. How imprudent was the declaration of the Roman emperor who was then a tribune with military power: “Evil to my soldiers unless they remain quiet!” For, inflamed by this word, they committed slaughter. He who threatens appears to be carried away by passion and anger and to judge when he has not yet taken cognizance of the matter.

§ 13. Opposing magistracies in the state must be guarded against. Thus the Romans acted most ignorantly when they gave tribunes to the plebs, a perpetual nursery of all seditions; they would have acted much more wisely had they created one of the consuls from the plebs. For the tribunes of the plebs first drove them to such a point that they were compelled to elect military tribunes with consular power; next they extorted intermarriage, thirdly one of the consulships, at last both, and finally the censorship, the dictatorship, and everything. Thus it befell the Romans that they perished through *Δημαγωγούς*, demagogues, and their own tribunes, something which Aristotle relates to have befallen many peoples in Book V, chapter 5.

“Democracies, therefore, are changed chiefly because of the petty wantonness of the tribunes. For in part, by burdening the wealthy with calumnies, they cause them to come together and conspire--for common fear reconciles and joins even the most hostile--and in part by collectively inciting the multitude against them. One may see that this has occurred thus in many cases. For at Rhodes also the democracy was changed when wicked demagogues arose within it. The nobles came together; for the popular haranguers furnished pay to the soldiers and forbade the commanders of the triremes to pay it out. But those commanders, compelled by fear of grave judicial proceedings--which they were to undergo if they did not sail according to law--formed an association and overthrew the power of the people.

“At Heraclea also the power of the people was broken and scattered immediately after a colony had been sent there by the Athenians, through the fault of popular and frivolous demagogues. For when the nobles were injured by them, they were compelled to depart from the city; then those who had been cast out, after assembling and gathering their forces into one body, returned from exile into the city and removed the democracy.

“Likewise the democracy which existed at Megara was dissolved and convulsed. For the demagogues, in order that they might confiscate the goods of private persons, banished many nobles from the city, until they had made a great number of exiles. But the latter, desiring to return from exile into the city, joined battle, overcame the people, and made an oligarchy from the democracy. The same thing, moreover, also happened at Cumae; in that city Thrasymachus utterly destroyed the democracy.

“And in almost all other cities, if anyone wishes to observe and consider them, he may see that the conversions and changes of states take place in this same manner. For sometimes, in order to enter into favor with the people, by inflicting injuries upon the nobles they impel them to make agreements and associations--whether they divide their goods among the people by agrarian laws and introduce an equalization of possessions, or exhaust them with taxes and the discharge of public burdens. Sometimes, by bringing them to judgment on false charges and summoning odium against them, they seek to confiscate the fortunes and resources of the rich. In ancient times also, when the same man became demagogue and commander, democracy was turned into tyranny; for almost all the ancient tyrants were made from demagogues.”

§ 14. Very many men have also lost dominions when they admitted foreigners into the city. Aristotle, Book V, chapter 3: “That which is not of the same nation and stock also has force to excite sedition, until it has come to agreement and conspired together. For just as a city is not made from any multitude offered by chance, so neither is it made at any time whatever. Therefore those who received resident aliens or newcomers into a city have almost all, or certainly very many, struggled with seditions.

“For example, when Achaeans dwelt with the Troezenians at Sybaris, the Achaeans, having thereafter increased in number, cast out the Troezenians. Hence arose the Sybaritic pollution. At Thurii, when the Sybarites unjustly injured the peoples dwelling together with them and received into the city, and claimed the greater part of the territory as their own and indeed all superior things for themselves, they were driven out. When the Byzantines discovered that newcomers were plotting against them and caught them manifestly, as if in the very act of theft, they joined battle, conquered them, and banished them. When the Antissaeans perceived that the exiles of Chios whom they had received into the city were attempting revolution, they joined battle and cast them out. When the Zancleians received the Samians into their city, they themselves were conquered and expelled by them. When the Apolloniates who dwell upon the Euxine Sea invited certain newcomers, they excited sedition among themselves. After the tyrants had been driven out, the Syracusans, having made foreigners and mercenary soldiers citizens, dissented and disagreed among themselves and joined battle. And when the Amphipolitans received colonists from Chalcis, most of them were cast out by these men.”

The Romans therefore prudently ordered the Gauls who had crossed the Alps without injury to withdraw. The Gauls plead their cause in Livy, Book XXXIX: “They had been compelled by the excessive multitude in Gaul, want of land, and poverty to cross the Alps in search of a dwelling place, and had settled without injury to anyone in places which they saw uncultivated through solitude. They had also begun to build a town, which was an indication that they had come to bring violence neither upon any territory nor upon any city. Marcus Claudius had recently been sent to them with the message that he would wage war with them unless they surrendered; preferring a certain, although inglorious, peace to uncertain war, they had first committed themselves to the good faith, then to the power, of the Roman people. A few days afterwards they were ordered to depart from both territory and town; they had intended to depart quietly to whatever place in the world they could. Then their arms, and lastly all the other things which they carried and drove, were taken from them. They begged the Senate and People of Rome not to rage more bitterly against harmless men who had surrendered than against enemies.” The Roman people returned their arms and ordered them to depart.

Nations do not easily grow together unless they are gradually rendered similar by marriage, dress, and language. The Bebryces admitted the Phocaeans into the city. When the latter flourished in arms and resources, their hosts began to envy them and considered removing them from the midst. When this became known, the Phocaeans killed the Bebryces, conquered by a notable stratagem, and alone possessed the city.

Would that those who first called the barbarians into the empire and gave them lands had done this, and likewise those who afterwards let the Turks into Europe. And now also, while I write these things, what else are those men doing who, after gathering auxiliaries of foreigners from every quarter, rebel against the emperor Ferdinand--and do so in the sight of the Turks, aided even by a friend and vassal of the Turks--than bringing the tyrant into possession of

Germany? But the sins of those who are perishing produce these discords of princes; and nevertheless those same discords will be quieted by the servitude or destruction of the princes.

§ 15. Arms given to the people for defense easily overthrow the state unless it is administered cautiously. Therefore they must be permitted not to all but to certain selected persons. When the rebels of Aachen had been armed, they expelled the Senate. This once befell many cities of the empire; indeed--

[Printed page 727]

--even countrymen sometimes took up arms. Justinian's Novel 85, under the title *Concerning Arms*, must therefore be restored to force:

"Always invoking our great God and Savior Jesus Christ and his aid, we are zealous to guard unharmed and without calumny all our subjects, whose government God has entrusted to us, and to restrain wars which they, undertaking them according to their own judgment against one another, carry on to their sorrow, thereby bringing a double punishment upon themselves: both that which they inflict upon themselves and that which they suffer from the laws punishing their madness.

"Chapter 1. Wishing, therefore, to free men from movements of this kind, we have provided that no private person engage in the work of manufacturing arms, but that only those make arms who are appointed in public armories or who are called *fabricenses*; and that those who manufacture arms sell them to no private person. Nor do we permit those armorers who are enrolled in the military units--whom they also call *deputati* and who receive rations from the fisc--to manufacture or sell arms to anyone, but only to exercise care over the arms of the soldiers enrolled in the unit in which they serve. If, however, they make anything new, it shall be taken away from them and brought into our sacred arsenal, to be added there to the public arms deposited within it.

"Chapter 2. We wish those who are in the orders of ballista-makers, whom we have stationed throughout various cities, to observe this also. We ordain and decree that they make arms in such a way that they themselves repair and renew only the public arms deposited in the public arsenals of each city. If any of them fashion any new weapon, they shall likewise furnish this among the public arms and shall sell it to absolutely no other person.

"Those appointed over the ballista-makers shall also guard this, at the peril of the fathers of the cities under whom we have stationed the ballista-makers themselves and established the care and custody of the public arsenals. Thus, if either the *deputati* or the *fabricenses* are seen selling arms, the judges in the localities shall take care to subject them to punishments and, in addition, to take the arms without payment from those who purchase them and claim them for the public.

"Chapter 3. Therefore, with God governing this counsel of ours, by the present law we decree that in no city or province of our state shall private persons or anyone else have license to make or sell arms, or to purchase them by any means whatever; rather, those alone who are enrolled among the *fabricenses* shall fashion them and convey them to our sacred arsenal. We decree that this be guarded by Your Highness and by those who shall receive the girdle after you.

"We appoint certain chartularies who are established under Your Highness in the bureau of the *fabricenses*, at the peril of the five chief men among them, men possessing a good reputation and fit for the task. Seeking out those who make arms in this most fortunate city and in the other cities of our state, they shall prohibit private persons or any others besides those who are appointed among the *fabricenses* from conducting the business of manufacturing arms; and in whatever places they discover private persons daring this, they shall cause these arms to be brought forward and applied to the arsenal of the fisc.

"If, however, they are able to find among private laborers artisans fit for the work, they may, if they wish, establish these men in the service, enter their names in a register, and send us the register of artisans, so that by our sacred

rescript they may be stationed in those places in which there are public manufactories, and so that, while manufacturing arms, they may receive rations from the fisc.

“For when this has been done and has been scrupulously observed by the aforesaid persons, license will be given to absolutely no one--neither to private persons dwelling in cities nor to countrymen inhabiting villages--to use arms against one another, to presume to commit murders, and thereby to kill very many men, while public duties perish because cultivators of the land, fearing to lose their lives, resort to flight.

“Therefore those who are directed by Your Highness from the aforesaid bureau of the *fabricenses* to prohibit private makers of arms must receive a sworn declaration also from the local judges and the offices subject to them, and from the defenders and fathers of the cities, that henceforth they will have no power to do anything among those things forbidden by us, but will guard the things decreed by the present law, fearing a punishment both in money and upon the head itself.

“For we decree that the negligent judge of great Alexandria shall pay a penalty of twenty pounds of gold for the things decreed by us, shall fall from the girdle of office, and that his office shall likewise pay a penalty of twenty pounds of gold and undergo capital punishment. The judges of the other provinces, however, shall sustain a loss of ten pounds of gold; they and their offices shall likewise be subject to loss of the girdle. The defenders and fathers of cities shall be fined a penalty of three pounds of gold and shall sustain peril to their heads if, upon discovering any such deed, they do not punish it, or do not report those wishing to do it, but permit it to remain concealed.

“Chapter 4. So that the things which we have forbidden to be done by private persons and certain others besides those who are enrolled among our sacred *fabricenses*, or the arms forbidden to be sold to private persons, may be manifest, we have taken care that this also be signified through the present law. For we prohibit private persons from manufacturing and buying bows and arrows, broadswords and swords which they are accustomed to call *semispathia*, and those which are called *zabae* or cuirasses, and pikes and lances made in any manner or shape whatever, and those called *monocopia* among the Isaurians, and the things called *sitennes* or missiles, and, in addition, *aspides* or shields, and *galeae* or helmets. For we permit none other to fashion these things besides those who are appointed among our sacred *fabricenses*. We permit only smaller knives, which no one uses in battles, to be made and sold by private persons and to private persons. Therefore Your Highness shall promulgate the present general law in this royal city and also throughout the other cities of our state, so that all, recognizing what has pleased us, may observe it.”

The kingdom is finally done for when things that are crimes are called remedies by cunning men and are judged necessary, as Antonio de Leyva was accustomed to boast.

Those, moreover, who must be trained are better trained with public arms, as was done among the Romans.

CHAPTER IX

The Causes of Seditions Arising from Subjects

[Printed page 727]

§ 1. The origin of seditions, just as that of diseases arises from the constitution of the body, so arises from the extent of the empire and its diverse parts. Augustine, Book XIX, *The City of God*, chapter 7: “Although enemies are lacking, nevertheless the very breadth of the empire has produced wars of a worse kind, namely allied and civil wars, by which the human race is shaken more miserably, whether war is waged so that at some time men may come to rest, or whether it is feared that they will rise again.”

Discords of the people therefore frequently arise from no cause, but only from the wickedness and wantonness of the people and of those who lead the people. Of this kind were the seditions of the Israelite people in the desert, directed against Moses and Aaron and against God himself. For what was more equitable and benign than Moses? What was more propitious than God, who overwhelmed the ingratitude of the rebels with daily miracles and benefits? Nor was there any cause of sedition in Samuel, and yet those who rose up rejected him and sought a king. What moved the madmen to follow Absalom and then Sheba as leaders and to bring impious arms against David? I can think of nothing other than the successful wars of the holy king and the spoils of neighboring nations, and thence the luxury which had engulfed very many. Hence Absalom was more suited than David to the vices of the people, and Sheba, as a man of Belial, subject to and a patron of every most shameful man, would permit everything.

[Printed page 728]

To this class I refer the most foolish spectacles on account of which frequent seditions were raised. Actors and pantomimes were expelled from Italy by Nero because various factions arose on their account, to such a degree that soldiers had to be stationed at the theater to restrain the quarrels of their supporters. Thus says Suetonius. Nerva restored them badly; Trajan again removed them well.

God often, on account of the sins of peoples, does not preserve the state even when the prince is excellent.

The Romans rose against Leo III without cause and occasion; the Venetians against Vitalis Michael, alleging that a plague had invaded the city after the fleet had returned; the Bolognese against their own magistrates and Neapolio the legate. Thus seditions frequently arise for which there is no cause in the rulers and no pretext of a cause at all.

§ 2. The cause of Sheba's war, indeed, was faction and envy, because the tribe of Judah had brought the king back while the others were not present. “Why,” they say in 2 Kings, chapter 19, “have our brethren the men of Judah stolen you and brought the king and his household across the Jordan, and all the men of David with him?” And: “I am greater by ten parts in the king, and David belongs more to me than to you. Why have you done me an injury, and why was it not first reported to me that I might bring my king back?” But the men of Judah answered the children of Israel more harshly. What is here other than pure love for the king? And yet see the changeable disposition of the people. In chapter 20, Sheba son of Bochri sounded the trumpet and said: “We have no portion in David, nor inheritance in the son of Jesse. Return to your tents, Israel.” And all Israel separated itself from David and followed Sheba son of Bochri. So easily does contentious envy change men's minds. The part that had been slighted at once attaches itself, not to some noble and brave leader, but to Sheba son of Bochri, a man of Belial. They therefore envied the tribe of Judah--whose perpetual kingdom had been promised--its good fortune, and through the contagion of one man they go mad; for when he had been slain, all came to rest.

The malicious common people, indeed, always behold the good fortune of the nobles with sidelong eyes and, when they can, oppose it. That rust sucks the state dry, and no one can break and lay it low; then it hands the bloodless state over to its enemies to be torn apart.

Such was that famous sedition of the peasants in England: for they complained not so much that they were oppressed as that they were not equal to the nobles. In the year 1381 the men of Kent refused every yoke and said that the nobles must be removed from their midst. They said that all had been born without distinction from the same Adam and that all were equal. And so, after taking up arms, the faction killed many of the magistrates and nobles, plundered their goods, and compelled the king to accept unjust conditions, until at length its authors were punished. Of this kind were the assemblies of the Athenians when they punished with exile illustrious and eminently deserving men.

§ 3. Another customary cause of seditions is when powerful men have consumed their patrimonies. Aristotle most wisely noted this cause in Book V of the *Politics*, chapter 6: “Changes also occur in oligarchies when a few powerful men who govern the state have consumed their family property by living intemperately. For such men are eager for revolution and either themselves seize a tyranny or prepare another man as tyrant: in this manner Hipparinus prepared Dionysius at Syracuse, and at Amphipolis a certain man whose name was Cleobinus brought the Chalcidian settlers into the city; and when they had come, he rendered them hostile to the wealthy and incited them against them. And at Aegina, the man who conducted that business which concerned Chares attempted to change the form of administering the state for such a cause.”

Sometimes, therefore, they attempt to move and innovate something; sometimes they steal public money, from which either they disagree and quarrel among themselves or those who oppose and resist these men as they plunder the state do so--something which happened at Apollonia, I mean the city in Pontus. There is no need to recount modern examples after these ancient ones: those whose resources at home are bad or nonexistent, while their hope is far richer, are seditious. They seek abroad the means of living. In general it is accustomed to happen thus: they attempt to soothe their own evils by the common destruction. They are cheerful in disturbed affairs because some hope shines upon them; in peace their own troubles oppress them. Hence they prefer tumult and uncertain dangers to the certain evils of their own household.

Let the magistrate therefore hold it certain that there are as many enemies in the state as there are men who have ruined their property through wickedness and lust. Julius needed a royal fortune merely in order to have nothing, for he had poured everything out in largesses. There are Catilines and Cethegi for whom the disgraces of poverty arising from luxury are an incitement to crime. Demades, an Athenian orator, formerly very wealthy, was at length expelled from the state as a poor man, having been accused of falsehood seven times. But there is no need to seek foreign examples: the histories exhibit Curio, Milo, and the other wretched disturbers, and especially Julius Caesar and Antony the triumvir.

§ 4. The state is also overthrown when matters gradually reach the point that the power of the magistrate is diminished and those whom the laws command to obey are more powerful. For they do not obey the command unless it pleases their mind. Hence the Roman Empire is rendered weak when there are two or three princes who, if they oppose the emperor, would without doubt bring great difficulties upon the state. The cause is that power without strength is despised.

Thus, Aristotle testifies, the state of the Thebans was changed because there were more and better and stronger men who were not admitted to the administration of the state. The same thing happened to the Megarians, the Syracusans, and the Rhodians. Nor did anything else destroy the empire of Constantinople than princes dissenting from the emperor and possessing such power that he could not reduce them to concord. For in this way it happens that the power of the rich is such as utterly removes the vigor of the magistrate; and in a great empire the power of princes does the same.

Indeed, magistrates elected by lot and commoners destroyed the state of the Athenians. For it is shameful that those should be elected to command others whose relatives, parents, and children no one would dare to name because of shame. Hence noble men endowed with a great spirit, through contempt for base rulers who are mocked even by the common people, can easily conspire and transfer the power to themselves.

§ 5. Dissimilarity also can easily stir up seditions, as when different nations are under one king and some cannot endure the others. Aristotle records that this happened at Clazomenae and Athens. In our own time also we have frequently seen armies collected from various nations mutiny among themselves. We have also seen most illustrious cities agitated by the seditions of admitted foreigners. At Aachen especially the Belgian settlers, who had left their homeland because of errors and rebellion and were already practiced in civil evils, caused disturbance and expelled the Catholics. They did the same at Wesel and Bremen after the Lutherans had been reduced to order.

[Printed page 729]

In former times there was greater danger from this circumstance, when colonies were sometimes led out from different peoples, especially if they were mingled with the old citizens. Thus we frequently read that the beginning of slaughter occurred in colonies. Diversity of regions, however, has more force toward discord than diversity of nations.

§ 6. But if we regard the matter itself, the same cause of seditions arises from the people as from rulers, since, just as men possess the same nature, so also their vices have an affinity. Florus admits this concerning his own Rome in Book V, chapter 12: “For what other thing produced civil madnesses than excessive prosperity? Conquered Syria first corrupted us, and soon thereafter the inheritance of the king of Pergamum in Asia. Those resources and riches ruined the morals of the age, and cast the state, drowned as in a sewer by its own vices, into destruction. For whence would the Roman people have demanded lands and provisions from the tribunes, unless through the hunger which luxury had made? Hence, therefore, the first and second Gracchan seditions and that third, the Appuleian.

“Why was the equestrian order commanded by the Senate to rule through the judicial laws, unless from avarice, so that the revenues of the state and the very courts might be held for profit? Hence again citizenship was promised to Latium, and through this came the arms of the allies. But what of the servile wars? Whence did they come to us, unless from the abundance of households? Whence came armies of gladiators against their own masters, unless lavish largesse, when it indulges the favor of the plebs with spectacles, makes an art of what were once punishments of enemies?

“Now, that we may touch upon the more specious vices, was not canvassing for honors incited by the same riches? Yet thence came the Marian, thence the Sullan tempest. Or did not the magnificent provision of banquets and costly largesse arise from opulence, soon to produce poverty? This drove Catiline to become an enemy of his own fatherland. Finally, whence did that very desire for principate and domination come, unless from excessive wealth? Yet this armed Caesar and Pompey with the torches of the Furies for the destruction of the state. Therefore we shall pursue in order all these domestic disturbances of the Roman people, separately from external and lawful wars.”

All these things are assisted and intensified when they rage among the people: both because they are spread abroad among very many and because the people do not readily resist vices. There is more spirit than counsel in them; they are unstable and change their opinions as the breeze changes storms. They are desirous of movements and changes because there are many agents among them, many who desire revolution. For just as every land is welcome to sailors suffering from hunger and thirst, so every change seems likely to bring something better to poor, restless, afflicted men. This is Plato's oracle in the *Axiochus*: “The people are ungrateful, easily wearied of things, changeable, cruel, envious, unlearned, since they are collected from the dregs of the plebs and from violent impostors. They regard as honorable that which is praised by the majority.”

§ 7. The greatest and almost incurable kind of sedition is that which arises from superstition. For its principle arises from the innermost mind and drives men to every deed, lawful and unlawful, nor does it cease so long as superstitions occupy their minds. It is pleasing in this place to repeat the warning which Justus Lipsius, a most illustrious man and

the great glory of our age, gives in his book *Against the Dialogist*. His words are these: "Therefore I warn you princes earnestly: beware. From nothing does greater danger come to empires and scepters than from an innovated or deceitfully simulated religion. For such men move especially the minds of the plebs and under the appearance of piety impel them where they wish.

"Shall I give examples? Behold these few. Eunus formerly lived in Sicily as a slave (Florus, Book III, chapter 9, and Diodorus Siculus in the *Fragments*); after feigning fanatical madness, while he tossed about the hair of the Syrian goddess, he stirred slaves to liberty and arms as if by command of the gods. Having gathered an army of more than sixty thousand, and openly bearing himself as king, he had subdued all Sicily, had Roman arms not with difficulty restrained him.

"What of that Egyptian false prophet under Claudius, who in Judaea (Josephus, Book II of the *Jewish War*, chapter 12), through this very appearance of piety, attached to himself as many as thirty thousand men? With them he sought Jerusalem, intending to possess that citadel and seat of kingship, had he not been met by the governor Florus and defeated and slain in battle.

"Was not the deed of that Maricus under Vitellius very similar? He, the 'liberator of the Gauls and god'--for he had given himself that name--after stirring up eight thousand men, was drawing the nearest villages of the Aedui with him and was himself about to dare greater things, when the fanatical multitude was crushed or scattered by picked soldiers.

"What of Elmaheli in Africa? He, as Johannes Leo relates in Book II, having won over the people by a marvelous reputation for holiness, openly brought war upon his own king, the king of the Moroccans--Abraham then held that office--defeated him in battle, and deprived him of kingdom and life.

"A different impious man in the same Africa--called Chemen Mennal--practiced a fraud and met a fate not unlike his (the same Leo, Book III). He stirred against the king of Fez a people enticed by the vanity of rites and religion, forbade tribute to be paid, and finally drove the king by open force to the point that by agreement he handed over to him the kingdom of Tlemcen.

"Among the Turks themselves, as the Turkish annals relate, were affairs not stirred several times under this pretext? There was a certain Schaecoculis, a man of simulated holiness, who for this purpose generally dwelt in solitary places; the Turkish prince Bayezid himself, from veneration for his piety, was accustomed to send him annual little gifts in his cave. When the time seemed ripe, after seven years he came forth, disseminated a new sect, and found patrons and followers. With these he invaded and plundered several cities of Asia and defeated the pasha of Anatolia himself in a regular battle. Indeed, a little afterward he also defeated Corcut, son of Bayezid, and soon Ali Pasha, who came against him with strong and veteran forces.

"Why say more? He had brought the Turkish state into the greatest danger when it seemed good to him to turn toward the borders of the Persians, whose king belonged to that same sect. For this is the sect of the Sophilarians, which even now is a chief cause of war between those two peoples. But when on the journey his soldiers attacked and plundered a certain Persian caravan--for thus they call a company of travelers--and killed most of the travelers, Ismael Sophi, king of the Persians, bore it so ill that he immediately exposed the man himself and all his commanders to his guards to be slaughtered, while the rest of the multitude was adjudged and distributed into servitude. This just Nemesis overtook that scoundrel.

"In the same Asia, very recently under Prince Suleiman, as the Turkish annals relate, a certain Calender Zelebis rose up to make a revolution, covered with this very veil of piety. With some number of dervishes he routed several sanjaks and called all Anatolia to arms. But Ibrahim Pasha, sent under the authority and auspices of Suleiman, destroyed him and his faction after a battle of uncertain issue.

"What of the island of Crete--for we must come to ridiculous matters? How wickedly and dangerously did a certain Jew impose upon his own people under the emperor Theodosius, as Socrates relates in Book VII of the *Ecclesiastical*

History, chapter 37? He pretended that he was present as a new Moses, sent from heaven to rescue them from long servitude. He therefore went about from town to town and exhorted them to leave wealth and friends and to follow him into that land of promise; and he added, after the example of the ancient Moses, that he would lead them across the sea itself. They believe him; they assemble; an immense multitude, every age and every sex, proceeds to the promontory under his leadership; they set out for the blessed land. He orders them to leap down, and this was done by very many with insane confidence. They were immediately drowned, with only a few of them caught up by fishing boats.

[Printed page 730]

“The chief author of the crime appeared nowhere, whether he was a man or an evil spirit in human appearance. Finally, were there not such monsters in our own age or that of our fathers? That famous John of Leiden, the welt and stain of his city, a tailor by trade, dreamed of kingdoms and scepters and would have attained them after the city of Münster had been captured, had not the princes of the empire besieged and recovered it with a powerful army and visited him and his followers with condign punishments. Thus I may rightly conclude these things with Livy’s saying in Book XXXIX: ‘Nothing is more deceptive in appearance than corrupt religion, when the divine power of the gods is put forward as a pretext for crimes.’ But if you seek the madnesses of religions and superstitions, read the histories of our age: you will understand that nothing is more efficacious for tumult, slaughters, and tortures.”

[Printed page 730]

§ 8. Guilds and associations also are frequently accustomed to be the seeds of discord, when, not as members of the whole state but as certain independent cities inserted into a great city, they arrogate to themselves more power than is expedient for the common good. Hence *ἐταῖρίαι* (“associations”) and assemblies are prohibited in the laws of the empire, and on this occasion persecution sometimes raged against the churches of the Christians.

Augustus, as Suetonius is our authority, abolished all guilds except the ancient ones. All, that is, except the ancient ones; for those established by Numa remained, as Plutarch is our authority. The various artisans had been distributed into groups, as is accustomed to happen now in cities. There was one law common to all: “That associates who possess the right of assembling shall have power to establish for themselves whatever compact they wish, provided that it does not impair anything in the public law.”

This law must especially be maintained, and all associations must be judged unlawful which have not united under the authority of the magistrate; they must therefore be dissolved, as Marcian laid down. But when others too are rendered suspect in any manner whatever, they must immediately be prohibited, as was done in Italy to the guilds of the Pythagorean philosophers. Yet in former times these men were dealt with barbarously: by a public judgment the philosophers were burned together with their schools--unless perhaps most of them were magicians, which indeed seems probable to me.

Guilds, therefore, must be governed by laws so that they may serve the public good; or, if anything is done privately against the public good, the law of Marcian, Digest 47, title 22, must be observed: “Provincial governors are instructed by imperial mandates not to permit guilds or associations to exist, nor soldiers to have guilds in the camps. But men of slender means are permitted to contribute a monthly payment, provided, however, that they assemble only once in a month, lest under the pretext of this sort an unlawful guild assemble. The deified Severus also declared by rescript that this has place not only in the city but also in Italy and the provinces. They are not, however, prohibited from assembling for the sake of religion, provided that by this means nothing is done contrary to the *senatus consultum* by which unlawful guilds are restrained.

“It is not lawful, however, to belong to more than one lawful guild, as was established both by the Deified Brothers; and if anyone shall belong to two, it was declared by rescript that he ought to choose in which one he prefers to be, and that from the guild which he leaves he shall receive that which belongs to him by reason of the property that was held in common. A penalty has been established: whoever assumes an unlawful guild is held by the penalty by which those are held who have been judged to have occupied public places or temples with armed men.

“Concerning guilds not specially authorized the law is: If any guilds shall be unlawful by mandates, constitutions, and senatus consulta, they are dissolved; but when they are dissolved they are permitted to divide the common funds, if they have any, and to distribute the money among themselves. In sum, unless a guild or any such body has assembled by authority of a senatus consultum or of Caesar, its members hold a guild contrary to the senatus consultum, the mandates, and the constitutions.”

§ 9. No war in Greece was more destructive than the Peloponnesian War. It was civil; the victors over the Persians contended among themselves; it lasted twenty-seven years; many cities were destroyed, all were made mournful by slaughters, fields were ravaged by flame and sword, and the destruction of Athens was deliberated. But what was the cause of the war? The Megarians had burned a grove. Moved by this deed, the Athenians barred the Megarians from their own harbor and from Attica. The Megarians refer the matter to the Spartans; the Spartans desire the law to be repealed. Pericles admits that the cause is of no great importance, but says that liberty is at stake and the patience of Athens is being tested. For if they accept the command now, it must thereafter be endured. He persuaded them of this not only as the greatest orator but also as a trusted counselor. For in truth the Lacedaemonians were threatening the liberty of all, and the other cities sought dominion, for which reason they also destroyed them all.

§ 10. A most slight sedition in Otho's time is famous, arising from an inconvenient distribution of arms. Tacitus, Book I of the *Histories*, recounts it in this manner: “A sedition which under Otho arose from a small beginning, from which nothing was feared, nearly proved the destruction of the city. Otho had ordered the Seventeenth Cohort to be summoned into the city from the colony of Ostia. The care of arming it was given to Varius Crispinus, a tribune of the praetorians. The more freely to execute his orders while the camp was quiet, at the beginning of night he ordered the wagons of the cohort to be loaded after the armory had been opened.

“The time became a ground of suspicion, the reason an accusation, and the pursuit of quiet grew into tumult. The sight of arms among the drunken stirred a desire for them. The soldiers roar and accuse the tribunes and centurions of treason, as though the households of senators were being armed for the destruction of Otho. Some were ignorant and heavy with wine; every worst man sought an occasion for plunder; the common people, as is customary, desired any novel disturbance; and night had removed the obedience of the better men.

“They cut down the tribune who resisted the sedition and a most rigorous centurion; the arms are seized, swords drawn, and, mounted upon horses, they seek the city and palace. Otho was holding a crowded banquet; he himself fears and is feared by his guests. Magistrates and old men and women scatter through the darkness and seek uncertain hiding places by diverse routes through the city. The onset of the soldiers was not restrained even by the doors of the palace from breaking into the banquet, while they demanded that Otho be shown to them. Julius Martialis the tribune and Vitellius Saturninus the prefect of the legion were wounded while they resisted those rushing in. On all sides were arms and threats, now against the centurions and tribunes, now against the entire Senate, their minds frenzied by blind fear; and because they could designate no one man for their anger, they demanded license against all, until Otho, standing upon the banquet couch contrary to the dignity of imperial command, with prayers and tears restrained them with difficulty. They returned to camp unwillingly.”

Otho did this in a sedition most dangerous to the city of Rome: after the first disturbance he entered the camp of the mutineers, calmed or rebuked the soldiers with a gentle speech, and ordered that punishment be taken upon no more than two, who were corrupt and drunken. This measure of severity was gratefully received, and for the present the soldiers who could not be restrained were pacified.

§ 11. Ill-considered liberality of princes also frequently gives cause for discords. For when something is given to one man which another contends is his own, the disputes grow to such a point that not even the giver can quiet them. Thus it happened in the Low Countries in the year 1007. Baldwin the Bearded, count of Flanders, after many services to the emperor Henry II and after winning his favor, obtained from him as a gift Walcheren together with the other islands of Zeeland--and at the same time the material of discord, quarrels, and wars between the Flemings and Hollanders. These

were so bitter and protracted that at intervals they lasted for the space of four hundred years, the Hollanders referring their right and the liberal donation to Emperor Louis, son of Louis the Pious, while the Flemings in no way yielded because of Henry's more recent donation.

[Printed page 731]

§ 12. It also seems difficult to me to preserve liberty where there is indeed one duke, but one whose power is small and, as it were, held on sufferance, whom, while they elect him for the sake of honor, they guard as if suspect, so that neither they themselves nor the duke appears safe. Marino Faliero, elected duke by the Venetians, resolved to destroy the Senate; and had the affair not been revealed through accomplices, he would have perpetrated the crime. Baiamonte Tiepolo had also undertaken to do this through treachery and, after a great slaughter had been committed, was finally defeated. Egnatius, Book IV. Hence it is advisable either to elect no duke or such a one as through guards can accomplish nothing throughout his lifetime; for laws are not sufficiently strong to restrain ambition, and the minds of men are insufficiently steadfast.

§ 13. A marvelous contention about empty things is a cause of seditions and war. Gaspard de Coligny judged it a just cause of war that a place more honorable than that of the French envoy had been given to the Spanish envoy before Maximilian. A greater controversy between the Englishman and the Spaniard obstructed serious business in the year 1598. There was a similar quarrel between the Florentine and the man of Ferrara. Opportunities to wage war against the Turk have sometimes escaped through those trifles.

CHAPTER X

A Fuller Discussion of Seditions Arising from Religion, and the Condition of the State and of Religion in the Year 1617

[Printed page 731]

§ 1. A great part of wars, calamities, and seditions arises either from religion or under the pretext of religion; wherefore the matter must be treated at greater length. Although I treated it in my book *On the Peace of Germany* and in the conclusion to the *Jubilee of Jubilees*, nevertheless this book demands the same subject for itself here. For I think that posterity will be so eager to know about no other matter as about what was done in our most celebrated age. If anyone desires fuller details, let him consult the *Jubilee of Jubilees*.

§ 2. There are altogether two kinds of men who judge the affairs of religion. Some, considering the multitude and variety of opinions and their frequent change, utterly despise every religion; nevertheless they procure and read contentious books and disputations, so that they may feed their minds upon the quarrels of others. Having experienced their sneers and mockeries, Sibrandus Lubbertus avenges himself and describes them thus in his preface *Against Faustus Socinus*:

“The greatest part of men judges perversely concerning the labors and cares which doctors expend in explaining and defending Christian doctrine. For many laugh and scoff at Religion as empty fables and terrors contrived to strike the minds of men. These think that all controversies concerning the dogmas of Christian doctrine are merely disputes about words; and because in their own heart they laugh at every Religion and profess it for no other end than that they may rise in position, they measure the minds of others by their own. They are indignant and rage when they see that there is anyone who refuses to serve their desire and applaud their judgment.

“These men, swollen with worldly glory, complain that the common tranquility is disturbed by diversity of religion, although they themselves are often of so wanton a disposition that they suborn crafty men to forge new dogmas, so that, while pious doctors oppose them, they themselves may take pleasure in these spectacles and render hateful to the people the doctrine which they hate and nevertheless wish to appear to favor. It also happens that, when they intend in their mind to turn everything upside down, they stir up doctrinal disputes, or favor those who stir them up, and prevent the controversies raised in doctrine from being settled or decided by lawful judgment.

“And what is most miserable of all, although they are ignorant of the dogmas of Christian doctrine, they arrogate to themselves supreme judgment concerning them, just as if a blind man could judge rightly concerning colors. Those who are a little more moderate indeed take pleasure in purity of doctrine, but do not think it of such importance that for its sake we ought to undergo such great controversies and contests.”

§ 3. These men indeed are impious and abominable to God. The prophet David in Psalm 1:1 calls them לִצִּים, “mockers.” They are more pestilential than all heretics; for heretics drive men into one error or more, but these despise every faith and every error and pass entirely into atheism. Thus they are λευσασταί, “reproachers, mockers,” as Aquila of Pontus translates it; they are παράνομοι, “transgressors,” as the fifth and sixth editions translate it; and ἐπηρέται, “impostors,” as Symmachus translates it.

Rabbi David says that לִצִּים are men crafty in knowledge for evil, and cunning, and speaking evil above the sons of men, and placing reproach and evil upon the sons of men. For this reason the ancient translator of the Bible rendered the word “pestilential,” when he said: “And he has not sat in the chair of pestilence.” So also the Seventy translators: καὶ ἐν καθέδρᾳ λοιμῶν, “and in the chair of pestilential men.” Indeed, Symmachus also says in Proverbs 20:1, λοιμὸς

ὁ οἶνος, “wine is a pest.” And in Proverbs 9, where our translator renders ἴς as “mockers,” the Seventy have κακός, “evil”; Symmachus says κἂν λοιμὸς γένῃ, “even if you become a pestilential man.”

Holy Scripture wished in so many ways to restrain mockers, so that it might be firmly established that nothing is more pestilential, especially in the cause of religion, than mockery and contempt. For they violate all the laws of nature, spread their poisons most swiftly, and oppose the truth more than any heretics. There are two causes of this.

§ 4. The first is the difficulty of the matters proposed for belief and their profundity, which is liable to the sneers of the ignorant. The gentiles formerly mocked Jews and Christians when they related the innocent nakedness of the first-created humans, the deceit of the serpent, and the flood of the world; they evaded all these things with sarcasms and blasphemous taunts. When had serpents ceased to speak? With what knife had God cut a rib out of Adam? Hence they wished either their own fables to be believed in the same manner or these things not to be believed. In our religion, how many things have mockers impiously jested against the most holy Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Cross of the LORD?

The other cause is that every true religion has certain laws and ceremonies by which humility of mind and patience are gravely and religiously exercised, and which appear to oppose liberty and human pride, which is most tenacious of its own dignity. Of this kind among the Jews was circumcision, on account of which they were a mockery to the gentiles. By way of insult they were called *verpi*, *Apellae*, and *recutiti*. Hence in Aristophanes, after a little slave had uttered many taunts against an old man, he closes them as if with a crowning flourish and swears that he thinks him Ἀπολίκωτον εἶναι, “to be circumcised.” Among Christians there are more such things, as to be baptized, anointed, to confess, to wash the feet of the saints, and other things which, as they are the power of God to us, so are foolishness to mockers.

[Printed page 732]

Bitter sayings and jokes, however, possess great force to break men's spirits. Hence many Jews who were ashamed of the sign of the covenant drew forward their foreskins, so that in any manner they might withdraw themselves from the impious witticisms of unbelievers.

Among these I also number those who profess a definite religion, but only for the sake of their own advantage; yet another religion, from which they know that their associates differ in the most fundamental way, they sometimes persecute with the greatest hostility and at other times acknowledge as true. Thus Bucer and others formerly acted.

§ 5. The year 1617 gave innumerable examples of τῆς χλευαστικῆς κοβείας, “derisive imposture”; for the subjects of all the jubilee sermons pertain to mockery of Catholics, by which nevertheless the entire Church of the martyrs together with the holy Fathers is treated with insult. But concerning that inconstancy in censuring and praising the same religion, reader, receive two notable demonstrations: Abraham Scultetus of Heidelberg and Matthias Hoe von Hoenegg, the Dresden preacher.

In an epistle to the Most Illustrious Louisa Juliana, widow of the Most Illustrious Frederick IV, Abraham numbers among the Evangelical princes the Most Serene Christian, king of Denmark; the Most Illustrious John George, elector of Saxony; likewise the Most Illustrious John Casimir and John Ernest, dukes of Saxony; likewise the princes of Brunswick and Württemberg and other princes who are Lutherans and would not tolerate Scultetus himself in their dominions. But in his sermon he enumerates many princes who expelled from their dominions that faith which the Dane, the Saxon, and the others profess, and proscribed Lutheran preachers; and on this account he praises GOD and insults the Lutherans.

Matthias Hoe practices altogether the same imposture upon both his prince and his helpers. For in his epistle to the Most Illustrious John George, elector of Saxony, page 2, he speaks thus:

Ja Ew. Churf. Gn haben vngezweifelt mit ihrem Christ=Löblichsten Exempel veil andern Potentaten/ vnd furnehme Evangelische Stände und ausserhalb dess Römischen Reichs angereizet/ dass in underscheidenen Könichrichen/

Chur= vnd Furstenthumben/ Landen und Herrschafften/ die Euangelischen eben umb die Zeit/ ihr Jubelfest auch aussgeschrieben/ vnd mit grosser Andacht gehalten haben. Dann so viel nun mit der Zeit Nachrichtung zukommen/ so ist dergleichen geschehen/ in den beyden Königreichen Dennemarck vnd Schweden/ dergleichen ist geschehen in der Chur=Pfaltz/ vnd Brandenburg.

“Yes, Your Electoral Grace, by your most Christian and praiseworthy example, has undoubtedly incited many other potentates and eminent Evangelical Estates within and outside the Roman Empire, so that in various kingdoms, electorates and principalities, lands and lordships, the Evangelicals at the same time also proclaimed their jubilee festival and held it with great devotion. For, so far as reports have now reached us in the course of time, the same occurred in the two kingdoms of Denmark and Sweden; likewise it occurred in the Electoral Palatinate and Brandenburg.”

Behold, he calls the Palatine and Brandenburg jubilee Evangelical and says that it was completed with great devotion. Is it so, Matthias? Do you too Calvinize? Does the Calvinian jubilee seem to you Evangelical and devout? If it is so, it is therefore true; if Evangelical, if devout, then yours is false. Or are you one of those concealed Calvinians whom the Saxons fear?

“By no means,” you will say. “I hate the Calvinists; I ἴσον ᾄδω σύμπαντι--‘sing the same song to everyone’--for in my third sermon, page 15, I placed the Sacramentarians among the fanatics. These are my words”:

Hieher gehören insonderheit die Sacramentirer/ Zwinglianer/ vnd Calvinisten. Dieses Geschmeiss/ ihr meine geliebte im Herren/ hat in Warheit grosse Zerrüttung vnd Verwürrung/ hat ein grosses Gestenck in die Hochzeit Gottes gemacht/ vnd der reinen Göttlichen Lehr sich bösslich muthwillich vnd halssstärrig widersetzet.

“To this class belong especially the Sacramentarians, Zwinglians, and Calvinists. This dred, my beloved in the Lord, has in truth brought great disturbance and confusion, and also a great stench, into the wedding feast of God, and has maliciously, wantonly, and stubbornly opposed itself to pure divine doctrine.”

These things indeed you say, and in the same sermon you approve everything whatever Luther said against the Zwinglians. But your cunning and cold words, coming from the same mouth, prove you an impostor and a mocker. The Calvinists celebrate a jubilee; in the court, as a political man, you profess that they do so piously, but in the church you condemn them. If in the Palatinate and the province of Brandenburg they maliciously, wantonly, and stubbornly oppose pure doctrine, then they cannot piously celebrate a jubilee amid so great an evil. It is the supreme degree of malice to glory in malice. These, then, are pests and mockers, one of whom speaks one way in the palace and another in the church.

§ 6. The other kind of men is vehement, harsh, zealous, ruinously in love with its own opinions, and eager to propagate the religion upon which it has fallen. Of this kind today are generally the Lutherans, who defend ubiquity, and the Calvinians whom they call the Rigid; for others generally call these men Zealots. But Sibrandus, in an epistle to the church which is in London, page 2, nevertheless depicts for us such men also among the “Soft” in the Low Countries:

“There are also arrogant and proud men who measure everything by vainglory and empty pomp and honor. When they see that it is reckoned a praise to learned men if they discover something new in other disciplines, they think that it will likewise be praiseworthy for themselves if they can innovate something in sacred Theology. Because they are ignorant of true Theology, they despair of being able to gain glory and a name by explaining or defending orthodox doctrine; yet because they swell with vainglory and burn with desire for praise, they disturb everything in order to become known. They prefer to become renowned by disturbing churches rather than to grow old without glory in the true and orthodox Religion.

“When they perceive that learned men are preferred to them, they are indignant; and because they can surpass those men neither in knowledge, nor piety, nor learning, nor eloquence, nor skill in action, nor any honorable art, they turn themselves to evil arts. They insinuate themselves into the court, so that they may crush, by the assistance and aid of

courtiers, those whom they cannot conquer by virtue. And what is most shameful of all, they feign the orthodox religion, display zeal for defending sound doctrine, swear to the received confessions and catechisms, and attest this very oath by the signature of their own hand; and nevertheless with all their strength they attack sound and publicly received doctrine, cunningly instill a depraved and new doctrine into their disciples, denounce orthodox pastors and doctors through calumny, stir the civil magistrates against them, expel them from their seats, and substitute in their place pupils of their own errors, which they have sown.”

Religion, therefore, is tossed about between these men, for both parties threaten the pious and orthodox: the zealots press them with quarrels, calumnies, and war; the mockers rejoice inwardly, secure concerning the outcome.

§ 7. I showed in my books *On the Peace of Germany* that there is a great affinity between religion and political government. For the one draws the other with it and frequently changes it. All are led by religion, but in Germany among many men the ordinance of princes is more venerable than that of God. Hence religion has more frequently been changed in most parts of Germany, even in certain free cities of the empire, which nevertheless, because they do not depend upon the will of one man, are generally more persevering in their resolution than the others. Bremen, Wesel, and some other cities, after greedily drinking in Lutheranism, shortly afterward cast it out in disgust, not without a convulsion of the government and exiles among the leading men. Other cities, to the contrary, after initially professing Zwinglianism--as Memmingen, Lindau, Strasbourg, and Orlamünde--later inclined toward Lutheranism. But of these matters elsewhere and at another time. In order that you may see as if in a synopsis the condition of the princes with respect to religion, understand it thus: all the kings and princes of Europe, if you except the Turk, profess either the ancient faith, the Lutheran, or that which they call Reformed, whose leading standard-bearers were Carlstadt, Zwingli, and Calvin. Abraham Scultetus enumerates the Evangelical kings and princes in the following manner in his epistle to the Most Illustrious widow Louisa Juliana.

[Printed page 733]

§ 8. At Heidelberg, 11 November 1617, at which time the following Evangelical kings, electors, princes, and magnates were alive and retained their dominion:

James, king of Great Britain.

Christian IV, king of Denmark.

Gustavus Adolphus, king of Sweden.

Frederick V, count palatine of the Rhine, duke of Bavaria, elector.

John George, duke of Saxony, elector.

John Sigismund, margrave of Brandenburg, elector.

The archbishops of Magdeburg and Bremen.

John, count palatine of the Rhine, duke of Zweibrücken.

John Casimir, duke of Saxony.

John Ernest, duke of Saxony.

George William, margrave of Brandenburg, duke of Jülich, Cleves, Berg, Prussia, etc.

John George, margrave of Brandenburg, duke of Prussia, Silesia, etc.

Joachim Ernest, margrave of Brandenburg and Ansbach.

Christian, margrave of Brandenburg and Kulmbach.

Frederick Ulrich, duke of Brunswick.

John Albert and his lord brother, dukes of Mecklenburg.

John Frederick, duke of Württemberg and Teck, count of Montbéliard.

Louis Frederick, duke of Württemberg and Teck, count of Montbéliard.

Frederick Achilles, duke of Württemberg and Teck, count of Montbéliard.

Magnus, duke of Württemberg and Teck, count of Montbéliard.

The dukes of Holstein, Pomerania, Lüneburg, and Lauenburg.

Maurice, landgrave of Hesse.

Louis, landgrave of Hesse.

Philip, landgrave of Hesse.

George Frederick, margrave of Baden.

John George, prince of Anhalt.

Christian, prince of Anhalt.

Augustus, prince of Anhalt.

Louis, prince of Anhalt.

Rudolf, prince of Anhalt.

Henry Wenceslaus, duke of Münsterberg and Oels, duke of Silesia, Berg, and Liegnitz.

Charles Wenceslaus, duke of Münsterberg and Oels, duke of Silesia, Berg, and Liegnitz.

John Christian, duke of Münsterberg and Oels, duke of Silesia, Berg, and Liegnitz.

George Rudolf, duke of Münsterberg and Oels, duke of Silesia, Berg, and Liegnitz.

Lord Maurice, prince of Orange.

Lord William, count of Nassau, governor of Frisia.

IN FRANCE, the chief lights and pillars of the Reformed Religion were:

Henry, duke of Bouillon, supreme marshal, father of two sons, of whom one was Frederick, prince of Sedan, the other Henry, viscount of Turenne.

Henry, duke of Thouars and La Trémoille, together with his brother, the lord de Soubise.

The duke de Sully and his son, the marquis de Rosny.

The duke de Lesdiguières.

The marquis de Candale, elder son of the duke d'Épernon.

The count de la Suse.

The count de Russy.

The lord vidame de Chartres.

Lord Philippe de Plessis Mornay.

The lord de la Force. And many other leading men, not to mention nobles in great number.

THROUGHOUT HUNGARY AND TRANSYLVANIA, patrons of the Reformed Churches:

Gabriel Bethlen, prince of Transylvania, lord of parts of the kingdom of Hungary, count of the Székelys.

Stephen Bethlen, captain of Huszt, prefect of Máramaros.

Francis Rhédey, count of Bihar county, captain of Várád.

Francis Perényi, count of Abaúj county.

George Perényi, count of Abaúj county.

Gabriel Perényi, count of Abaúj county.

Stephen Török, count of Hunyad, heir and captain of Pápa.

George Rákóczi, count of Sáros, captain of Ónod, and his brother,
Sigismund Rákóczi.

Francis Batthyány, count of Sopron county.

Nicholas Zrínyi, count of Zala county.

George Zrínyi, count of Zala county.

Paul Nádasdy, count of Vas county.

Thomas Nádasdy.

Stanislaus Thurzo de Bethlenfalva, count of Szepes.

Emeric Thurzo, count of Árva.

Peter Révay, count of Turóc.

The widow of Stephen Illésházy with her son, count of Trencsén.

Peter Forgách de Ghymes, free baron.

Nicholas Forgách de Ghymes, free baron, captain of Szécsény.

Michael Károlyi, free baron.

Stephen Nyáry, free baron.

Stephen Thököly, free baron in Késmárk.

Thomas Széchy, free baron, and his son George Széchy.

Sigismund Prépostváry, free baron.

John Lisztius, free baron.

Stephen Lisztius, free baron.

Nicholas Bocskai, free baron in Kővár.

Francis Bánffy de Losoncz, free baron.

Stephen Kákonyi, free baron.

David Zólyomi, free baron in Székelyhíd.

The widow of Francis Paczot.

Sigismund Máriássy.

Paul Máriássy.

Andrew Kapi.

Stephen Korlát, captain of Szendrő.

John Bakos in Osgyán.

Ladislaus Barkóczy, vice-count of Zemplén county.

Stephen Pétnéházy, count of Szaránd, captain in Jenő.

Wolfgang Kamuti.

Caspar Pető, captain of Gesztely.

Balthasar Kovács, captain of Galánk.

Thomas Oknai, captain of Szodény.

[Printed page 734]

And very many other nobles and most distinguished citizens of cities and towns, Orthodox men.

IN THE KINGDOM OF POLAND, the following professed themselves followers of Evangelical truth:

Lord Rafał, count Leszczyński, castellan of Wiślica; the counts Ostroróg; the lords Łaski.

The lords Firlej, Sienieński, Urowiecki, Gorajski, Zbąski, Przyjemski, Orzechowski, Gołuchowski, Rej, Sieniuta, Broniewski, Dunikowski, Potocki, and innumerable others.

IN LITHUANIA, the most praiseworthy princes Lord Janusz and Krzysztof Radziwiłł were putting spurs to the course of the Gospel; for in other respects also they rendered helpful service to the Evangelical Church.

IN BOHEMIA, the baron Lord Wenceslaus of Budovitz.

IN MORAVIA, the baron Lord Charles of Zierotin.

IN SILESIA, the baron Lord George of Schönaich.

§ 9. Yet it must be particularly observed among these that those princes and provinces are partly Lutheran and partly, as they call it, Reformed. Next, a great part of the subjects of Reformed rulers are Lutherans and judge themselves to be placed under great persecution. Hitherto they have indeed awaited deliverance from the Evangelical Lutherans in vain; now they are compelled to condemn their hope and gradually receive the bridle. The Saxons bear witness to their vain hope in motive 12, why peace should not be made with the Calvinians:

“The Protestants would earn little gratitude--indeed, they would rather stir curses and groans against themselves--among those who live among the Calvinians and confidently and earnestly expect that they will shortly be liberated by the Estates of the Augsburg Confession and that Calvinism will be abolished, if those men should hear that the Protestants now play the same pipe with the Calvinists and concede, as the saying is, that five is even. If this were done, an occasion and cause would assuredly be furnished for no slight disturbances and movements in the Church of God among weak Christians.”

[Printed page 734]

§ 10. The following princes cultivated and defended the Catholic Religion and celebrated a true Jubilee of constancy.

IN GERMANY, FROM THE HOUSE OF AUSTRIA:

Matthias, august emperor.

Ferdinand, king of Bohemia and Hungary.

Maximilian, archduke of Austria, grand master of the Teutonic Order.

Albert, archduke of Austria, duke of Brabant, etc.

Leopold, archduke of Austria, bishop of Strasbourg and Passau.

Charles, archduke of Austria, bishop of Brixen and Breslau.

John Schweikhard, archbishop of Mainz, elector, etc.

Ferdinand, archbishop of Cologne, elector, etc., duke of Bavaria, etc.

Lothar, archbishop of Trier, elector, etc.

William the Elder, duke of Bavaria, count palatine, etc.

Maximilian, duke of Bavaria, count palatine, etc.

Albert, duke of Bavaria, count palatine.

Wolfgang William, duke of Bavaria-Neuburg and Jülich, etc.

Emmanuel Philibert, duke of Savoy.

Henry of Lorraine, etc.; Francis of Lorraine, etc.

Very many bishops in Germany:

Mark, archbishop of Salzburg, legate of the Roman See.

John Gottfried, bishop of Bamberg and Würzburg, duke of East Franconia.

Philip Christopher, bishop of Speyer, supreme judge of the Imperial Chamber.

The reverend bishop of Chur.

George Gottfried, bishop of Worms.

Theodore, bishop of Paderborn.

James, bishop of Constance.

Henry, bishop of Augsburg.

William, bishop of Basel.

I omit the other princes, counts, barons, and magnates, as also the free cities and states in Germany and Switzerland.

IN ITALY:

Paul V, pontiff of the first See and of the Church, the mother of all, together with what they call the Ecclesiastical State. Next, the kingdom of Naples with Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, and Liguria. In these there is a great number of dukes, counts, and nobles.

If we add to these the noble and wealthy city of Venice, its dominions, and its islands, we shall produce such a great army of Roman blood and illustrious men that from one state we shall equal half the opposing party.

But what if I enumerate Etruria and the grand duke of Florence and his sons, and the family now grafted into the House of Austria? Their distinguished piety in defending the faith and religion is illustrious, and the Ottoman forces are cut down by their fleets.

In France the greater number are Catholics. These names were sent to me by a friend:

The King.

My lord the King's brother.

The prince de Condé, prince of the blood.

The count de Soissons, prince of the blood.

OTHER PRINCES:

The lord de Guise.

The lord du Maine.

The lord de Nevers.

The lord de Longueville.

The lord de Vendôme.

The chevalier de Vendôme.

The lord de Saint-Paul.

The lord de Nemours.

The prince d'Auvergne.

The lord d'Elbeuf.

The prince de Joinville.

The lord de Chevreuse.

The count d'Harcourt.

The lord d'Alès.

The lord de Lauragne.

The duke de Retelois.

The duke de Fronsac.

[Printed page 735]

DUKES:

The duke d'Épernon.

The duke d'Angoulême.

The duke de Montbazon.

The lord de Candale, duke d'Halluin.

The duke de Montmorency.

The lord de la Valette, colonel-general of France.

The Grand Esquire of France.

The duke de Ventadour.

The duke de Retz.

The duke de Roannez.

The duke d'Uzès.

MARSHALS OF FRANCE:

The marshal de Roquelaure.

The marshal de Brissac.

The marshal de Bois-Dauphin.

The marshal de Souvré.

The marshal de Vitry.

The marshal de Thémynes.

The marshal de la Châtre.

MARQUISES:

The marquis de Rouillac.

The marquis de Mirebeau.

The marquis de Mortemart.

The marquis de Trans.

The marquis de Canisy.

The marquis de Vieuville.

The marquis de Villaine.

The marquis de Ruffec.

The marquis de Thémynes.

The marquis de Sablé.

The marquis de la Verdin.

The marquis d'Éternel.

The marquis de Beuvron.

The marquis de Cœuvres.

The lord de Saint-Chamond.

The marquis de Moüy.

The marquis de Villeroy.

The marquis de Cortaubau.

The marquis de Villars.

The marquis d'Oraison.

The marquis de Marigny.

The marquis de Portes.

The marquis d'Allègre.

The marquis d'Estin.

The marquis de Ravel.

The marquis d'Omtesort.

The marquis d'Alluy.

The marquis de Sidul.

The marquis de Fimarcon.

The marquis de Mirepoix.

The marquis de Timbrune.

The marquis d'Araigny.

The marquis de Bressieux.

The marquis de Cessac.

The marquis de Gimolx.

COUNTS:

The count de la Rochefoucauld.

The count de Saint-Aignan.

The count de Gramont.

The count du Lude.

The count de Lauzun.

The count de Torigny.

The count de Termes.

The count de Grampe.

The count de la Marque.

The count Chombere.

The count de Treme.

The count de Sancerre.

The count de la Voute.

The count de Curson.

The count de Carton.

The count de Mauleurier.

The count de Cars.

The count de Tonnerre.

The count de Cremail.

The count de Susse.

The count de Grignan.

The count de Vertu.

The count de Breme.

The count de Pegnillem.

The count de Tournon.

The count de l'Estrange.

The count de la Vedan.

The count de Frasque.

The count de Mauret.

The count de la Roche-Guyon.

The count de Carsses.

The count de Cresse.

The count de Gransay.

The count de Maille.

The count de Maran.

The count d'Aubigon.

The count de Sanzay.

The count de Chantel.

The count de Chasteau-Vilain.

The count de Chasteau-Neuf.

The count de Monranel.

The count d'Ax.

The count de Chiverny.

VISCOUNTS:

The viscount Duza.

The viscount de Pompadour.

The viscount de Brigul.

The viscount de Polignac.

The viscount d'Ambetterre.

The viscount de Pomy.

The viscount de Foncande.

The viscount de l'Arboust.

The viscount de Saint-Girons.

The viscount de Bordes.

The viscount de Poise.

The viscount de Cere.

The viscount de Chanemy.

The viscount de Clere.

The viscount de Marcossy.

The viscount de Dune.

THE CARDINALS:

Cardinal de Guise.

Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld.

Cardinal de Sourdis.

Cardinal du Perron.

Cardinal de Verneuil, bishop of Paris.

Cardinal de Verneuil, bishop of Metz.

The duke de Joyeuse, son of the lord de Guise, abbot of Fécamp and coadjutor of the archbishop of Narbonne.

BISHOPS:

The archbishop of Toulouse, son of the lord d'Épernon.

The bishop of Agde, son of the count d'Auvergne.

[Printed page 736]

The bishop of Lodève, son of the lord de Ventadour.

The bishop of Comminges, son of the marshal de Souvré.

The bishop of Le Mans, son of the marshal de la Verdin.

The bishop of Viviers, son of the count de Suze, nephew of the lord du Maine.

The bishop of Marseille, brother of the lord de Saint-Luc.

More than forty knights of the Holy Spirit.

Moreover, many lords of rank bearing the titles of the King's lieutenant in all the provinces of France, whom I would not know how to number for you, such as the lords de Goudrin, de Cregny, de Pralin, Bassompierre, d'Orlame, d'Alincourt, Montauban, who is prince of Guéméné, de Bordeille, d'Ambleville, de Montpessart, Denis the brother of

the lord du Maine, de Liancourt the King's first equerry, d'Andelot de Saint-Géran, and de Saint-Luc; and more than four thousand, if it were necessary to set down the whole.

Moreover, all the Parlements of France, which are all Catholic: namely, the Parlement of Paris, the Parlement of Toulouse, the Parlement of Rouen, the Parlement of Bordeaux, the Parlement of Rennes in Brittany, the Parlement of Dijon, the Parlement of Aix, the Parlement of Grenoble, and Sens.

But if one has a mind to proceed also westward from France and to behold the great kingdoms beyond the Pyrenees--kingdoms now allied to France by a double marriage--we shall find very many cultivators of the ancient religion. First, Philip III, the Catholic king, his three sons and two daughters. Next, the most powerful princes, whose catalogue, in the same manner in which it was transmitted to me by a most learned and most friendly man, I shall gladly render here to you, reader.

A Report of the Titles of Spain, the Amount of Each Man's Annual Income, and Where Each Man Has His Estate

THE DUKE OF FRÍAS, marquis of Berlanga, count of Haro, lord of the house of *los Siete Infantes de Lara*, lord of the seven daughters, constable of Castile and great presiding judge, head of the house of *los Velascos*. His ancestral house is in Burgos; his estate is in Old Castile, the forests of Biscay, and Soria; annual income, 80,000 ducats.

THE DUKE OF MEDINA DE RIOSECO ("of the torrid river"), count of Módica and Melgar, viscount of Esterlin, admiral (*thalassiarch*) of Castile. He was born of royal blood from Don Fadrique, master of Santiago, who was a son of King Alfonso XI and natural brother of King Peter, surnamed the Cruel. He is head of the Enríquez family; his house is at Valladolid; his estate is in the province of Campos, Catalonia, and Seville; his income is 100,000 ducats.

THE DUKE OF ALBA and Huesca, marquis of Coria, count of Salvatierra, viscount of Saldares, lord of Valdecorneja ("valley of crows"), head of the house of Toledo. His ancestral house is at Salamanca; his estate is in Old Castile, the kingdom of Granada, and the borders of Portugal; his income is 80,000 ducats.

THE DUKE OF INFANTADO, marquis of Cenete and Santillana, lord of *el Real de Manzanares*--of the royal domains which derive from apples and the things pertaining to them--head of the house of *los Mendozas*. His house is at Guadalajara; his estate is in the kingdom of Toledo, the mountain forests of Old Castile, and the province of Álava; income, 80,000 ducats.

THE DUKE OF ALCALÁ DE LOS GAZULES, marquis of Tarifa, count of Burno and Villamartín, *adelantado mayor* of Andalusia, head of the house of *Riberas*. His ancestral house is at Seville; his estate is in the same kingdom; income, 150,000 ducats.

THE DUKE OF ALBURQUERQUE, count of Buendía, head of the Cuevas family. He has his estate in Albuquerque and a house in Extremadura and Old Castile; 40,000 ducats.

THE DUKE OF ESCALONA, marquis of Villena and Moya, count of Saint Stephen, head of the Pacheco family. His house is at Toledo; his estate is in the kingdom of Murcia; he has 130,000 ducats annually.

THE DUKE OF OSUNA, marquis of Peñafiel, count of Ureña, head of the house of Girón. He has his house or seat at Peñafiel, and his estate in the kingdom of Seville; 100,000 ducats yearly.

THE DUKE OF ARCOS, marquis of Zahara, count of Marchena, head of the Ponce de León family. His house is in Seville, and his estate there also; 80,000 ducats yearly.

THE DUKE OF BÉJAR, marquis of Gibrleón, count of Benalcázar, head of the Zúñiga de Sotomayor family. His house is in Seville; his estate is there and in Old Castile; 70,000 ducats annually.

THE DUKE OF GANDÍA, marquis of Lombay, head of the Borja family. His house is at Valencia, and his estate in the same kingdom; 60,000 ducats.

THE DUKE OF SESSA, count of Cabra and Baena, head of the Córdoba and Aguilar families. His house is at Córdoba and Granada; he has his estate in the same kingdom of Granada; annual income, 70,000 ducats.

THE DUKE OF MEDINACELI, marquis of Cogolludo, count of El Puerto de Santa María, head of the Cerda family. He has his house at Medinaceli and his estate in the kingdom of Toledo; 50,000 ducats.

THE DUKE OF MEDINA SIDONIA, marquis of Sanlúcar de Barrameda, count of Niebla (“cloud or vapors”), head of the Guzmán family. He has his house in Seville and in the port of Sanlúcar, his estate in the kingdom of Seville, and an annual income of 130,000 ducats.

THE DUKE OF MAQUEDA, marquis of Elche, head of the Cárdenas family. He has his estate in the kingdoms of Toledo and Valencia; 40,000 ducats yearly.

THE DUKE OF NÁJERA, count of Treviño, Valencia, and Don Juan, head of the house of Manríquez de Lara. He has his house in Nájera, his estate in the province of La Rioja, and an income of 50,000 ducats.

THE DUKE OF FERIA, marquis of Zafra, head of the Figueroa family. He reports his estate in Extremadura, his house in Zafra, and 50,000 ducats.

THE DUKE OF CARDONA AND SEGORBE, marquis of Comares, lord in Lucena, *alcaide* of *los Donceles*, joined by blood to the kings of Aragon and to the house of La Cerda. He has his house at Valencia, Cardona, and Barcelona, his estate in the kingdoms of Valencia and Catalonia and at Córdoba, and an annual income of 110,000 ducats.

THE DUKE OF SOMMA, marquis of Palamós, Neapolitan admiral from the house of Córdoba. He has his house at Belpuig and an income of 40,000 ducats.

THE DUKE OF VILLAHERMOSA (καλοπόλις, “beautiful city”), count of Ribagorza, from the family and blood of the kings of Aragon. He has his house at Zaragoza, his estate in the kingdoms of Aragon and Valencia, and 25,000 ducats annually.

THE DUKE OF PASTRANA, prince of Éboli, head of the Silva house of the kingdom of Portugal, whence Ruy Gómez de Silva came into Castile. He has his house at Madrid and Pastrana and an income of 50,000 ducats.

[Printed page 737]

THE DUKE OF FRANCAVILLA, prince of Mélito, from the house of Mendoza. He has his house at Toledo, his estate in the same kingdom, and reckons 40,000 ducats yearly.

THE GREATER MARQUISES:

THE MARQUIS OF ASTORGA, count of Trastámara, lord of the house of Villalobos, head of the Osorio family. He has his house at Astorga, his estate in the kingdom of León and the province of Campos, and 50,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF AGUILAR, count of Castañeda, from the house of Manríquez de Lara. He has his ancestral house at Carrión and Aguilar de Campos, his estate in the mountains and the province of Campos, and an income of 40,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF DENIA, count of Lerma, head of the Rojas family. His house is at Denia and Valencia, his estate in the same kingdom and in Old Castile, and his income 25,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF MONDÉJAR, count of Tendilla, from the house of Mendoza. He has his house at Mondéjar, his estate in the Alcarria, and an income of 36,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF NAVARRÉS, master of Montesa, chief and head of the Borja family. He has his house at Valencia, his estate there, and an income of 20,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF PRIEGO, lord of the house of Aguilar and Córdoba. He has his house there at Córdoba, his estate in the aforesaid kingdom, and an income of 50,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF SARRIA, count of Lemos and Castro, lord of Villalba and Ulloa, head of the house of Castro. He has his house at Lemos and Sarria, his estate in the kingdom of Galicia, and an income of 80,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF LOS VÉLEZ, *adelantado* of Murcia, from the house of Fajardo. He has his house at Los Vélez, his estate in the kingdom of Murcia, and an income of 60,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF SANTA CRUZ, from the house of Bazán, created a judge with supreme authority on 23 January 1584. He has his house at Granada and 36,000 ducats annually.

THE MARQUIS OF VILLAFRANCA, from the house of Toledo. He has 30,000 ducats annually.

THE MARQUIS OF VELADA, from the Ávila Toledo family. He has his house at Ávila and Velada and an income of 20,000 ducats.

THE LESSER MARQUISES:

THE MARQUIS OF AYAMONTE, from the house of Zúñiga. His ancestral house is at Seville, his estate in the same kingdom, and his income is 26,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF ALTAMIRA, from the house of Rojas. He has his house at Altamira and an income of 12,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF VIANA, from the Pimentel family. His house is at Valladolid, his estate in the kingdom of Galicia; 14,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF CAMARASA AND SABROSO, count of Ricla, *adelantado* of Cazorla, from the house of Cobos and Mendoza. His house is at Valladolid, his estate in Catalonia, and his annual income 50,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF CORTES, from the house of Toledo. His ancestral house is at Cortes, his estate in the kingdom of Navarre; 16,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF MONTEMAYOR, from the house of Silva. His house is at Montemayor, his income 15,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF LA GUARDIA DE SANTA EUGENIA, head of the Mexía family. His house is at Salamanca, his estate in the kingdom of Jaén, and his income 40,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF MONTESCLAROS, from the house of Mendoza. His house is at Guadalajara; 16,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF LAS NAVAS, head of the Ávila family. His house is in the city of Ávila, his estate in its neighboring district; 16,000 ducats annually.

THE MARQUIS OF POZA, from the house of Rojas. His houses are at Valladolid, Poza, and Madrid, his estate in Old Castile; 20,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF ESTEPA, from the house of Centurión of Genoa. His house is at Estepa, his estate in the kingdom of Seville; 25,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF TÁBARA, from the Pimentel family. His house is at Valladolid, his estate in Old Castile; 16,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF VILLAMANRIQUE, head of the Portocarrero family. His house is at Seville, his estate in Extremadura; 16,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF VILLANUEVA DEL RÍO, head of the Enríquez family. His house is situated at Seville; 25,000 ducats annually.

THE MARQUIS OF LA ADRADA, from the house of la Cueva. His house is situated at La Adrada, his estate in the kingdom of Toledo; he has 10,000 ducats annually.

THE MARQUIS OF CAÑETE, from the house of Mendoza. His house is at Cañete, his estate in its district and borders; 15,000 ducats annually.

THE MARQUIS OF FRÓMISTA, from the houses of Benavides and Enríquez. His house is at Frómista, his estate in the province of Campos and Old Castile; he has 10,000 ducats annually.

THE MARQUIS OF FALCES, head of the Peralta family. His house is in the city, his estate in the kingdom of Navarre; 8,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS DEL VALLE, from the house of Cortés. His house is at Seville, his estate in New Spain; 50,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF ARDALES, count of Teba, head of the Guzmán family. His house is in the city of Málaga, his estate in the kingdom of Seville; 16,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF ALCALÁ DE LA ALAMEDA, from the Portocarrero family. He has his house at Seville and 1,000 ducats each year.

THE MARQUIS OF ALCANICES, from the Enríquez family. He has his house at Alcañices and his estate in its district; 16,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF AGUILAFUENTE, from the house of Zúñiga. His house is at Ráfales, his estate in Old Castile, and his income 12,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF PIOZA, from the Ulloa family. His house is at Valladolid; 12,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF VILLAMANRIQUE, from the house of Zúñiga. His house is at Seville, his estate in the same kingdom; 16,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF AUÑÓN, from the house of Herrera. His house is at Madrid, his estate in the Alcarria; 25,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF MOLINA has his house in the same place and an income of 6,000 ducats.

THE MARQUIS OF CERRALBO, from the house of Castro. He has his house at Ciudad Rodrigo, his estate in its borders or jurisdiction, and 8,000 ducats.

COUNTS OF THE FIRST CLASS:

THE COUNT OF BENAVENTE, head of the Pimentel family. He has his house at Valladolid, his estate in the region of Campos, and an income of 100,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF ALBA DE LISTE, from the Enríquez family. He reports his house at Zamora, his estate in Old Castile, and an income of 40,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF MIRANDA, head of the house of Acuña and Avellaneda. He reports his house at Peñaranda--

[Printed page 738]

--his estate in Old Castile, and an income of 35,000 ducats.

THE CONSTABLE OF THE KINGDOM OF NAVARRE, from the house of Toledo. He has his house at Pamplona, his estate at Aoiz in the kingdom of Navarre, and an income of 25,000 ducats.

COUNTS OF THE SECOND CLASS:

THE COUNT OF SALINAS AND RIBADEO, from the houses of Avellaneda and Mendoza. The ancestral seat is at Burgos and the estate in Biscay and its mountains. On account of the brave deeds of his ancestors for the king of Castile in the conquest of the city of Toledo, he has the privilege of dining together with the king of Castile on the days of Easter and the Nativity; and the royal garments fall to him, likewise the horse and drinking vessel which the king uses on those days. He has 20,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF AGUILAR, head of the Arellano family. He has his seat in the city of Demanda, his estate in La Rioja and the jurisdiction of Cameros, and an income of 15,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF ARANDA, from the house of Urrea, lord of Almormo. He has his seat or family--that is, ancestral--house at Aranda, his estate in Aragon, and an income of 16,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF ALCAUDETE, from the house of Córdoba. He has his ancestral seat at Alcaudete and reckons 8,000 ducats in annual income.

THE COUNT OF AYTONA, from the house of Moncada. He has his ancestral seat at Barcelona, his estate in Catalonia; 14,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF ALTAMIRA, from the house of Moscoso. He has his seat at Altamira and an income of 8,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF BUENDÍA, lord of Dueñas, from the house of Acuña. He has his seat at Dueñas, his estate in the land of Campos, and reckons 20,000 ducats annually.

THE COUNT OF AYLLÓN, from the houses of Ayllón and Córdoba. He has his seat at Ayllón and an income of 8,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF BELCHITE, from the house of Híjar. He has his house at Zaragoza, his estate in Aragon, and an income of 10,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF CASTELLAR, head of the Saavedra family. He has his seat at Seville, his estate in the same kingdom, and an income of 14,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF CASTRO, from the houses of Mendoza and Manríquez. He has his house at Castro and 10,000 ducats annually.

THE COUNT OF CHINCHÓN, head of the Bobadilla family. He has his seat at Madrid, his estate in the kingdom of Toledo, and 40,000 ducats annually.

THE COUNT OF CIFUENTES, head of the Silva family. He has his house at Toledo, his estate in the same kingdom of Toledo; 25,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF CORUÑA, from the house of Mendoza. He has his house at Guadalajara and an income of 20,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF FUENSALIDA, head of the Ayala family. He has his house at Toledo, his estate in the same kingdom, and an income of 20,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF CANIMO has his house there at Canimo and 6,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF GELVES, head of the house of Portugal. He has his house at Seville and his estate in the kingdom of Seville; 22,000 ducats annually.

THE COUNT OF GOMERA, from the house of Ayala. He has his house at Gomera; 16,000 ducats annually.

THE COUNT OF OLIVARES, from the house of Guzmán. He has his house at Seville, his estate in the same kingdom, and an income of 40,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF COCENTAINA, head of the Corella family. He has his house at Valencia, his estate in the same kingdom of Valencia; 14,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF FUENTES in Aragon, head of the house of Heredia. He has his estate in that kingdom, his house at Zaragoza, and 10,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF MEDELLÍN, from the Portocarrero family. He has his house at Medellín, his estate in Extremadura, and 35,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF MONTEAGUDO, marquis of Almazán, from the house of Mendoza. He has his house at Almazán, his estate in the kingdom of Aragon, and 18,000 ducats annually.

THE COUNT OF MONTERREY, from the house of Acevedo. He has his house at Salamanca, his estate in the kingdom of Galicia, and an income of 18,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF OROPESA and of La Deleitosa (“the delightful”), lord of Segulla, from the house of Toledo. He has his house at Talavera, his estate in the kingdom of Toledo, and an income of 35,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF ISERNO, from the Manríquez family. He has his house at Valladolid, his estate in Old Castile, and an income of 20,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF OÑATE, head of the Guevara family. He has his house at Oñate, his estate in the province of Álava, and an income of 10,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF MORATA, from the house of Luna. He has his house at Morata, his estate in Aragon, and an income of 12,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF ORGAZ, from the house of Mendoza. He has his house at Orgaz and 12,000 ducats annually.

THE COUNT OF LA PUEBLA, from the house of Cárdenas. He has his house at Llerena, his estate in Extremadura and the kingdom of Granada, and 18,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF PRIEGO, from the houses of Carrillo and Mendoza. He has his house at Guadalajara and Priego, his estate in the mountain forests of Cuenca, and 12,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF PUÑONROSTRO, head of the Arias family. He has his house at Madrid, his estate in the kingdom of Toledo, and an income of 20,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF PAREDES, from the Manríquez family. He has his house at Paredes, his estate in the province of Campos, and 14,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF RIBADAVIA, from the house of Avellaneda. He has his house at Valladolid, his estate in the kingdom of Galicia, and 10,000 ducats annually.

THE COUNT OF SÁSTAGO, from the house of Alagón. He has his house at Zaragoza, his estate in Aragon, and an income of 18,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF SAINT STEPHEN, head of the Benavides family. He has his house at Úbeda, his estate in the kingdom of Aragon, and an income of 15,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF GELVES, from the house of La Cerda. He has his house at Gelves and 8,000 ducats annually.

THE COUNT OF BARAJAS, head of the Zapata family. He has his house at Madrid, his estate in the kingdom of Toledo, and an income of 12,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF LA PUEBLA DE MONTALBÁN, from the houses of Girón and Pacheco. He has his house at Puebla de Montalbán, his estate in Extremadura, and an income of 20,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF BAILÉN, from the house of Ponce de León. He has his house at Bailén, his estate in the kingdom of Jaén, and 16,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF NIEVA, from the Velasco family. He has his house at Nieva, his estate in La Rioja, and reckons 12,000 ducats from his annual income.

THE COUNT OF SALVATIERRA, from the house of Ayala. He has his house at Salvatierra, his estate in the province of Campos, and 10,000 ducats from his annual income.

THE COUNT OF LUNA has his estate in León and his house there, and 20,000 ducats.

[Printed page 739]

THE COUNT OF LA GUERRA, from the house of the Carrillos, has an income of 60,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF UCEDA, from the house of the Mexías, has his house at Ávila and reckons 10,000 ducats from his annual revenue.

THE COUNT OF FUENSALDAÑA has his house at Valladolid, his estate in Old Castile, and 8,000 ducats from his annual income.

THE COUNT OF LODOSA, from the house of ... has his house in the kingdom of Navarre, together with his estate, and has an income of 8,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF SANTA GADEA, *adelantado* of Castile, from the house of the Padillas and Acuñas, has his house at Santa Gadea and an income of 20,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF ALMENARA, from the house of the Próxitas, has his house at Valencia, his estate in the same kingdom, and an income of 8,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF OLIVA, head of the family or house of the Centellas, has his house at Valencia and his estate in the same kingdom; 18,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF ALBAIDA, head of the family, or chief of those bearing the surname of Milán, has his house at Albaida, his estate in the kingdom of Valencia, and an income of 10,000 ducats.

THE COUNT OF ELDA, chief of his family, of the house of the Colomas, has his estate in the kingdom of Valencia and his house at Elda; 8,000 ducats.

VISCOUNTS:

THE VISCOUNT OF PERALTA has an annual income of 6,000 ducats.

THE VISCOUNT OF GUEBULI has an income of 8,000 ducats.

THE VISCOUNT OF CHELVA has an income of 6,000 ducats.

ADMIRALS, OR COMMANDERS OF THE SEA:

THE ADMIRAL OF CASTILE has an income of 40,000 ducats.

THE ADMIRAL OF ARAGON has an income of 80,000 ducats.

THE ADMIRAL OF VALENCIA has an income of 10,000 ducats.

ADELANTADOS:

THE *ADELANTADO* OF ZARAGOZA, 12,000 ducats.

THE *ADELANTADO* OF GALICIA, 8,000 ducats.

THE *ADELANTADO* OF CANANA, 10,000 ducats.

THE *ADELANTADO* OF CASTILE, 12,000 ducats.

PRIORS OF SAINT JOHN:

THE PRIOR OF SAINT JOHN OF THE KINGDOMS OF CASTILE AND LEÓN has an income of 100,000 ducats.

THE PRIOR OF SAINT JOHN OF CATALONIA, 14,000 ducats.

THE PRIOR OF SAINT JOHN OF VALENCIA, 7,000 ducats.

THE PRIOR OF SAINT JOHN OF ARAGON has an annual revenue of 6,000 ducats.

THE PRINCE OF ASCOLI, head of the Leyvas, has his house in the city of Santo Domingo, his estate in the province of La Rioja and in a duchy of the kingdom of Naples, and an income of 50,000 ducats.

MASTERS:

THE MASTER OF SANTIAGO, who is the king himself, has 200,000 ducats annually.

THE MASTER OF CALATRAVA has 100,000 ducats.

THE MASTER OF ALCÁNTARA, 100 ducats.

His Royal Majesty claims these three masterships for himself.

ARCHBISHOPS:

The archbishop of Toledo, 200,000 ducats.

Of Seville, 100,000 ducats.

Of Santiago, 60,000 ducats.

Of Granada, 50,000 ducats.

Of Zaragoza, 50,000 ducats.

Of Valencia, 60,000 ducats annually.

Of Tarragona, 20,000 ducats.

Of Burgos, 40,000 ducats.

BISHOPS:

Of León, 16,000 ducats.

Of Úbeda, 12,000 ducats.

SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS UNDER THE ARCHBISHOPRIC OF TOLEDO:

Of Sigüenza, 40,000 ducats.

Of Cuenca, 36,000 ducats.

Of Córdoba, 40,000 ducats.

Of Segovia, 20,000 ducats.

Of Palencia, 30,000 ducats.

Of Osma, 20,000 ducats.

SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS OF THE ARCHBISHOPRIC OF SANTIAGO:

Of Plasencia, 40,000 ducats annually.

Of Salamanca, 20,000 ducats.

Of Coria, 25,000 ducats.

Of Astorga, 20,000 ducats.

Of Badajoz, 20,000 ducats.

Of Ciudad Rodrigo, 14,000 ducats.

Of Orense, 8,000 ducats.

Of Tuy, 7,000 ducats.

Of Mondoñedo, 7,000 ducats.

Of Zamora, 16,000 ducats.

Of Lugo, 6,000 ducats.

SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS OF THE ARCHBISHOPRIC OF ZARAGOZA:

Of Pamplona, 16,000 ducats.

Of Calahorra, 16,000 ducats.

Of Huesca, 12,000 ducats.

Of Barbastro, 8,000 ducats.

Of Tarazona, 16,000 ducats.

SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS OF THE ARCHBISHOPRIC OF SEVILLE:

Of Cádiz, 14,000 ducats.

Of Jaén, 30,000 ducats.

Of Ávila, 20,000 ducats.

SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS OF THE ARCHBISHOPRIC OF VALENCIA:

Of Cartagena, 12,000 ducats.

Of Orihuela, 8,000 ducats.

Of Segorbe, 8,000 ducats.

Of Albarracín, 8,000 ducats.

Of Majorca.

SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS OF THE ARCHBISHOPRIC OF GRANADA:

Of Málaga, 30,000 ducats.

Of Almería, 13,000 ducats.

Of Guadix, 12,000 ducats.

SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS OF THE ARCHBISHOPRIC OF TARRAGONA:

Of Girona, 10,000 ducats annually.

Of Lérida, 10,000 ducats annually.

Of Urgell, 8,000 ducats annually.

Of Elna, 7,000 ducats annually.

Of Urque, 6,000 ducats annually.

Of Barcelona, 8,000 ducats annually.

Of Cerdanya, 4,000 ducats annually.

Of Tortosa, 12,000 ducats annually.

But if one should also choose to traverse in thought the kingdoms of the Indies, their nations and powerful peoples, we shall produce a number twice as great as that of those who are scattered among the various sects. So many names of praetors, governors, and naval commanders--

[Printed page 740]

--would have to be recounted that I think I would produce weariness and resentment.

But now let us revisit the North and enter Poland, noble in men, arms, and--what is chief--in cultivated nobility. There first come before us King Sigismund, of pious and courageous spirit and experienced in achievements, his son Vladislaus, the emulator of his father's virtue, and the rest of the royal offspring.

There follow the princes and lords of the court of the Most Serene Archduke Albert.

The prince of Orange, who died most steadfast in the Catholic faith in the year of the Lord 1618, on 20 February.

The duke of Aerschot, count of Azenberg, knight of the Golden Fleece.

The duke of Chimay, count of Beaumont, lord of Avesnes and count of Zevenbergen.

The knight of Arenberg.

The duke of Croÿ, marquis of Havré, count of Fontenoy, knight of the Golden Fleece.

The baron of Fénétrange, brother of the duke of Croÿ.

The prince of Ligne, knight of the Golden Fleece, governor and captain of the county of Artois.

The marquis of Roubais, his son.

The count of Egmont, knight of the Golden Fleece, governor and captain-general of the county of Namur.

The prince of Gavre, his son.

Frederick, count of Bergh, count of Boxmeer, knight of the Golden Fleece, governor and captain-general of Guelders, the duchy, and the county of Zutphen.

Count Henry of Bergen, lord of Stevensweert, his brother.

The count of Berlaymont and of Lalaing, knight of the Golden Fleece, governor and captain-general of the duchy of Luxembourg and the county of Chiny.

The count of Champlitte, knight of the Golden Fleece, vice-captain-general of Burgundy and Charolais.

The marquis of Varambon, knight of the Golden Fleece.

The baron of Balançon, his brother.

The marquis of Marnay, count of Pont-de-Vaux, knight, etc.

The count of Solre, knight of the Golden Fleece.

The count of Hoogstraten.

The count of Bossu.

The count of Bucquoy, knight of the Golden Fleece, lieutenant and captain-general and grand bailiff of Hainaut, and count of Hautekerke.

The prince of Barbançon.

The count of Reulx.

The count of Megen.

The marquis of Renty.

The marquis of Trazegnies.

The count of Vertain.

The count of Hénin, duke of Bournonville.

The count of Beaurieux.

The count of Frezin.

The count of Sainte-Aldegonde, governor and captain of the duchy of Limburg, of Valkenburg, Dalhem, and Rode-le-Duc.

The count of Noyelles.

The count of Warfusée.

The count of Middelburg.

The count of Enghien.

The count of Falais.

The count of Croix.

The count of Estaires.

The count of Willerval.

The count of Bailleul.

The count of Bassigny, baron of Boxtel.

The baron of Grimbergen.

The lord of Bredam.

The lord of Marle, in whose hands is the highest charge of the treasury.

The lord of Coppigny, who also is a treasurer.

The marquis Spinola, captain and commander, governor-general of Belgium in the name of the Catholic king and of the archduke.

The count of Añover, prefect of the archduke's court and stable.

The marquis of Belvedere, commander-general of the cavalry.

The count of Fürstenberg.

The marquis of Malaspina, an ordinary officer in the court of the Most Serene Archduke.

When I showed Abraham Scultetus's catalogue to a noble and learned man born in Poland, he wrote back to me in this manner; for I thought it advisable to set down his own words:

“Of all those families which the heresiarch cites on his own behalf, some persons have denied the faith; nevertheless, the chief heads of those same lines have remained uncorrupted from the ancient time when the Roman Catholic faith was brought in, and they persevere steadfastly to this day. For of the Lesnow family of Lesno, and of their line, which he cites on his own behalf, even at the present time there exist as many ardent Roman Catholics as neither the man who cites them nor the man cited by him can number the hairs upon their heads.

“Moreover, all the counts of Ostroróg--with the exception of the one cited--exist not only as defenders of the Roman Catholic religion but also as its most vigorous champions, distinguished for faith, wisdom, and power. Their head and chief, the palatine of Poznań, in a recent judgment at the public disputation at Lublin, condemned the new Gospel and its followers with a most weighty judgment.

“Of the very numerous progeny of the Firlejs, if only two, enveloped in the deadly darkness of the new Gospel, are unable to break forth into the discharge of public office in religion or in the state, to the supreme grief of their kin, the whole family is not therefore to be judged from them. From that family as many princely men, palatines and bishops, and as many other powerful senators, have flourished in the Roman Catholic faith at every time, and flourish now, as are recounted in the annals. Among them now the Most Illustrious and Most Reverend bishop of Płock, a little before vice-chancellor of the kingdom, so restrains the defenders of the new Gospel by doctrine and power that throughout his entire diocese they are permitted neither to open schools of the new Gospel nor even to open their mouths.

“Moreover, Nicolaus Firlej, a most worthy senator of the kingdom, publicly suppressed the seducers of the new Gospel by his authority and prudence in the aforesaid disputation at Lublin.

“The others whom the heresiarch reports as entangled in the errors of his Gospel are such that, in the very numerous families and ranks of their lines, which have always professed and now profess the Roman Catholic religion, they are not even noticed.

“But as for the heresiarch's adducing one or another of the princes and counts on his own behalf, his very poverty is readily proved by the fact that out of the almost innumerable number--

[Printed page 741]

--of princes, dukes, and counts he was able to recount a sufficiently scanty supply.

“For our part, against those adduced we can present to his eyes, in troops, as many men of the Roman Catholic religion as he has never seen, nor will ever be able to see, with eyes darkened by the shadows of his Gospel.

“First of all, Lesser Poland offers itself, in which the whole house of the marquises of Mirów and of the Gonzagas maintains and defends the Roman Catholic faith from antiquity.

“The whole family of the Komorowskis, counts of Árva and Liptó.

“The entire, very ancient line of the counts of Tęczyn.

“The whole family of the Lubomirskis, counts of Wiśnicz.

“The palatine himself and the castellan of Cracow, princely men in power and authority, together with all the senators, profess and maintain the Roman Catholic religion.

“In Greater Poland, moreover, the count of Górka, general of Greater Poland.

“Count Stanislaus Karnkowski of Górka, together with all the ranks of his family, professes the same religion.

“The palatine of Poznań, count of Ostroróg.

“The counts of Tarnów. All the senators, too, as many as are found in that duchy, declare themselves by daily proof to be the most ardent defenders and champions of the Roman Catholic religion.

“From the duchy of Masovia it is not expedient to recount any of the princes, senators, or nobles, since all and each of them so cherish and defend the Roman Church, embraced from antiquity, that the seducers of the new Gospel experience not only that they cannot flow in with crafty words, but that not even the journey there is safe.

“From the grand duchy of Lithuania we do not deny that two Radziwiłłs have rather frequently applied spurs to the new Gospel; but we know that far more powerful dukes of the same line, by applying the same spurs, have so driven and goaded that very new Gospel as to dispatch it, together with its defenders, all the way to hell.

“From the same duchy, those men would now gladly remove the applied spurs if they could, lest through the disturbance of the whole duchy, and with the spurs of the new Gospel applied to them, they themselves should be driven forward and trampled down. For Duke Radziwiłł, palatine of Vilnius; Duke Radziwiłł, palatine of Troki; Duke Albert Radziwiłł in Ołyka and Nieśwież; and Duke Nicolaus Radziwiłł not only have been of the Roman Catholic religion from antiquity, but have also built very many splendid churches and magnificently endowed them; they also erected a college of the Society of Jesus worthy of their name and religion.

“In the same duchy, all the dukes of the royal Jagiellonian family.

“All the dukes who derive their origin from the line of the grand dukes of Lithuania disdain even to look upon the darkness of the new Gospel down to the present day.

“Count Chodkiewicz, commander-general of the forces of that same grand duchy, persecutes the new dogma of the pestilential Gospel as vigorously as he does the enemy of his country, together with the power of his very extensive family and the whole order of senators, of whom not one is found in that duchy to be a follower of the new Gospel.

“From the duchy of Volhynia and Ruthenia: Duke Janusz Ostrogski, lord of Cracow.

“Duke Janusz Ostrogski of the same name, palatine of Volhynia.

“Duke Alexander Ostrogski, palatine of Braclaw.

“Duke George of Zaslaw.

“All the Sanguszko dukes.

“All the Czartoryski dukes in Czartorysk.

“All the Wiśniowiecki dukes.

“Duke Constantine in Jaroslaw.

“Duke Janusz in Jaroslaw.

“All the Korecki dukes, of Korets.

“All the Koszyrski dukes.

“And the remaining ducal families deriving their origin from the grand dukes of Lithuania, Ruthenia, Masovia, Halicz, and Volodymyr--to recount their number would be idly to fill innumerable leaves--profess the Roman Catholic faith. They oppose the invaders of the new Gospel in actual fact no less than the faithless incursions of the Turks and Tatars, and, together with His Royal Majesty and all the orders of senators and dignities, strengthen and champion the Roman religion by piety, zeal, arms, and, whenever it is expedient, by life itself.”

Nor are there lacking in the most noble kingdoms of Hungary and Bohemia those to whom the ancient Catholic religion and piety are dear and who have defended it with great constancy. The diets themselves, the labor and expenditure lavished for their princes, and faith preserved amid disasters demonstrate this.

Since, therefore, this is the condition of the religions, if one attends to their defenders, one will not easily be able to overpower another by force and arms. But if arms and wars should in some measure press the Catholics, nevertheless the victors will not be able to enjoy a lasting peace, since they disagree bitterly among themselves, and there are not lacking those to whom a partnership in victory will prove burdensome.

CHAPTER XI

The Condition of the European Religions, If One Considers Their Doctrine and Doctors

[Printed page 741]

The following, for the most part, are the doctors and prelates of the dissenting sects whose names especially I found in the catalogue of the spring fair of the year 1618 and whose writings I acquired--although the writings of some could not be obtained, either because they had not yet appeared or because their printers were ashamed of them:

The academics of Strasbourg.

Andreas Finnolot.

An anonymous author, *Unbekant gegen Christian Gottliebs*.

The preachers of Strasbourg.

An anonymous author on the Jubilee.

Andreas Cramerus.

Abraham Scultetus.

Adrianus Smoutius.

The Arminians and Gomarians in Holland.

Balthasar Meisnerus.

Caspar Holstenius.

Caspar Melissander.

Caspar Finckius.

Christophorus Schleupnerus.

Christophorus Zieglerus.

Conradus Dietericus.

Christophorus Adolphi.

Christophorus Walpurger.

The Danish preachers.

Daniel Angelocrater.

[Printed page 742]

David Pareus.

Ehrhardus Lautterbach.

Aegidius Strauch.

Fridericus Helbachius.

Friderich Franck.

Fridericus Balduinus.
Georgius Engelman.
Georgius Zeaeman.
Gaudentius, on the celebrants of the Jubilee.
Guilielmus Barret, an Englishman.
The academics of Heidelberg.
Hartmannus Braun.
Henricus Altingus.
Henricus Eckardus.
Henricus Hopffner.
Henricus Hirtzwegius.
Iacobus Martini.
Ioannes Gisenius.
Ioannes Simonius.
Ioannes Grocius.
Ioannes Tarnovius.
Ioannes Affelmannus.
Ioannes Staden.
Ioannes Schröder.
Ioannes Heinrich Hiemer.
Ioannes Schneider.
Ioannes Pandocheus.
Ioannes Salmuth.
Ioannes Ioachim Beutherus.
Ioannes Michael Beutherus.
Ioannes Leibius.
Ioannes Georgius Siegwart.
Ioannes of Rochester, against Robert Bellarmine.
Ioannes Schreiter of Annaberg.
Ioannes Sharpius.
Maximilianus Rittern.
Martinus Rober.
Matthias Hoe von Hoheneck.

Matthias Haffenreffer.

Melchior Schaererus.

Michael Mulingus.

The *Popish Market*, by an unnamed author.

M. M. D.

Nicolaus Hartkopfius.

Nicolaus Martini.

Nicolaus Pomeranus.

Nicolaus Grevinchovius.

Paulus Laurentii.

Polycarpus Leyser.

Fourteen sermons by various authors concerning the Jubilee feast.

The academics of Rostock.

Robertus Sarisburiensis.

Sibrandus Lubbertus.

Sigismundus Evenius.

Simon Gediccus.

The scholastics of Neuhaus.

The academics of Tübingen.

Thomas Weinrichius.

Thomas Tuke the Englishman's *Index of Faith and Religion*.

Vincentz Schmucken.

Wilhelmus Alardus.

The professors and doctors of Wittenberg.

The preachers of Württemberg.

Wolffgangus Frantzius. And

Others whom obscure fame conceals.

Their multitude forbids the naming of the Catholic doctors of this time. The academies themselves, and the colleges both of canons and of religious, would fill many pages.

As regards doctrine, it is one and the same among all Catholics, namely that which was explained in the Council of Trent and in other synods. Once you depart from it, you will behold a vast multitude of all the sects, each of which claims for itself the most certain truth and the most thoroughly tested sanctity, and most boldly condemns the others. Since, therefore, a later age will marvel at the variety, absurdity, and blasphemies of the heresies, something must be said briefly about their authorities and opinions.

Saint Augustine, Philastrius, and, before them, Epiphanius once compiled catalogues of the various heresies; in our own time Lindanus, Prateolus, Sanderus, and, in an abridgment, our own Iacobus Gualterus in his chronological table, in which he compared the new heresies with the old, have done so.

Martinus Lutherus was the first to begin the innovation and to seek liberty for ambition and lust. The proclamation of indulgences furnished him the occasion, but internal evils--which have always disturbed peaceful affairs--avarice, illicit loves, and the pride of an unquiet disposition furnished the cause. But because he did not have all things settled, and because not only do true things conflict with false ones but false things also conflict with one another, he could never suitably weave and arrange that work without destroying one thing after another. So, if anyone should construct a great building without a plan, he necessarily has to tear down many things, because his hands were swifter than his counsel. Hence, at the very beginnings, not only sermons and writings but even the merriments and pleasantries of the table, about which the Lutherans have written entire books, were fruitful in new heresies. And indeed, as Lutherus himself and Matthias Hoe in his third Jubilee sermon confess, he himself encountered thirty fanatical spirits, just as that huge sow beneath the holm oaks lay after bringing forth a litter of thirty heads.

Ioannes Gisenius, professor at Giessen, admits this either candidly or when driven by the necessity of truth, in thesis 7: "Although in his first writings he defended certain things that manifestly favor the papists, in the following writings, nevertheless, he cast them off and condemned them. For successively, by assiduous prayer, meditation, and trial, he was led into the truth and learned to recognize and soundly refute the impieties of the papists." Luther himself explains this in the preface to volume 1 of the Latin Jena edition: "Before all things," he says, "I beg the pious reader--and I beg him for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ himself--to read these things with judgment, indeed with much compassion, and to know that I was once a monk and a most insane papist when I undertook this cause." And a little later: "Thus you will find in these earlier writings of mine how many and how great things I most humbly conceded to the pope, which at a later time and at the present time I regard as the highest blasphemy and abomination, and execrate. You will therefore ascribe this error, pious reader, or--as they themselves slanderously call it--contradiction, to the time," etc.

Since, therefore, at the beginnings he did not speak by the Spirit of God or by heavenly grace, he contradicted himself. For if God had placed the word in his mouth, he would not have asserted with such certainty anything abominable or anything contrary to manifest truth. Saints and learned men indeed err at times; but one who condemned the whole Church and antiquity and professed himself to be a new Elijah ought not to have erred in all things and altered everything.

Furthermore, of those who altered the faith preached by Luther, some wholly defected from Luther and condemned him; others made little sects under a famous name that enjoyed favor--

[Printed page 743]

--among the Germans.

His most bitter enemy was the man who had promoted him, Andreas Bodenstein of Carlstadt, who was bought so that he might attack his client, as many celebrants of the Jubilee relate the history, especially Matthias Hoe in his third sermon, page 116. The Lutherans attribute the Sacramentarian and Anabaptist heresies to him, as Erasmus Alberus does in his book *On the Accursed Doctrine of the Carlstadtians*. Melanchthon, in his commentary on Colossians, says that he denied infant baptism. Others credit Zwingli with Anabaptism because in his book on baptism he writes that it is more useful for baptism not to be conferred upon children; indeed, Balthasar Pacimontanus, whom most affirm to be the father of the Anabaptists, defended himself by a writing of Zwingli that rejected infant baptism. But one ought not to labor greatly over the author of the evil; reasons for averting the evil must be sought. Thomas Müntzer and Nicolaus Storch held the leading parts in that tragedy.

The first branch of Lutheranism, therefore--though torn from the tree--was Anabaptism, and it was divided into very many sects. They deny that the Son of God took flesh from the Virgin; approve promiscuous intercourse; issue

commands; do not acknowledge the magistracy; seek a reputation for innocence through outward masks; indulge dreams; study magic; and think that those who do not follow their sect can be killed. They have many things in common with the others and many peculiar to themselves. Their leader was Christophorus Schaplerus, who incited the peasants to wars. Campanus, akin to this group, also added this: he denied the distinction of persons in the Trinity. I think the Scripturarians, Paulinians, Batenburgers, killers of pastors, Blood-men, Aegidians, Demoniacs, and Sabbatarians pertain to these, holding even wives in common; also the Sleepers and the Wailers, among whom there are as many sects as heads. With Carlstadt acting as midwife on one side, Zwingli giving birth, and Oecolampadius assisting, Sacramentarianism was born. The Lutherans are accustomed to call it Zwinglianism and Calvinism and especially detest it.

Zwingli imitated the errors of Berengarius, but added more; Carlstadt and Oecolampadius assisted him. With the Pelagians he rejected original sin and the necessity of grace. But all the Lutherans charge him with Nestorianism. Calvin followed Zwingli, adding many errors: that faith is not one; that it is not without unbelief; that there is no implicit faith; that Scripture is uncertain and easy to understand; that faith cannot be lost; that God predestined men to evils and sins; that there is a real distinction in the divine essence; that the Trinity is not to be adored; that Christ, according to his human nature, was ignorant; that he refused the office of mediator, despaired, and endured the punishments of a damned man; that he merited nothing for himself; that the glory of the pious is not granted before the last day; and that the Church can fail. Certain Lutherans enumerate three hundred and more errors of the Calvinists: Eckard's *Fasciculus*, Cramerus, and others.

The Sacramentarian heresy was divided into many sects, as Luther warned. From it arose the Bucerians and Melancthonians, occupied in perpetual reconciliations, although they defended errors peculiar to themselves. Martyr likewise taught a singular opinion. Castellio permitted whatever religion each person wished. He removed the Song of Songs from the canon because he said that it was an immodest song.

Łaski wholly rejected baptism. Valentinus Gentilis mixed the Qur'an with the New Testament. Ludovicus Alemannus denied that the body of Christ is received even by faith. Petrus Richerius denied that Christ is to be adored in human flesh; at last he judged that the Father alone is to be adored. There are also others whom they call the Significatives, Tropists, Energetics, Arrhabonarii, Adessenarians, Metamorphists, Iscariotites, Metaphorists, Antipuritans, Pseudo-Irenics, Arminians, Sibrandians, Vorstians, and Venatorians. The polemical writings of the Netherlanders show the various and pernicious errors of these men, especially of the later ones.

And these are the men who wholly opposed Luther. Yet no fewer wage bitter wars among themselves under his name and hurl thunderbolts against one another. There were two parties, the Rigid and the Mild. The head of the latter was Melancthon, together with the Wittenbergers and academics generally; the head of the former was Illyricus Flaccus. Their errors grew cruel even to exiles and proscriptions. Then the Brentians, or grosser Ubiquitarians, became strong. At the same time, especially in Prussia, arose the Osiandrians, who taught that we are justified by the essential righteousness of God. Stancarus so opposed him that he attributed the power of justifying to Christ's humanity alone and denied it to his divinity, being an Arian in this respect. Andreas Musculus, a distinguished Ubiquitarian, attacked both positions; for he attributed justification to both the divine and the human nature and, to make his position more vehement, said that the divine nature died on the cross. The Tübingen theologians adhered to Osiander in part, saying that the essential righteousness of God is imputed to us. Thereafter Nicolaus Amsdorff and the Mansfeldians tore Saxony apart in a great dispute, when they opposed the Majorists, the Antinomians, defenders of free will, the Adiaphorists, and the Stancarians concerning good works, and condemned them in a synod that had been held. Chytraeus, Functius, the Pastillarians, Interimists, Anti-Adiaphorists, Lutheropapists, Luthero-Zwinglians, Heshusians, and Hutites revived the errors in various quarters with various opinions and multiplied them so greatly that there is scarcely agreement among any of them.

The Concord of Berg was vaunted about the year of the Lord 1580, and in the following years most conspired to support it--but with the result that soon most Lutherans defected from it, and most provinces from the Lutherans.

Those who openly fight against the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Anabaptists are the Ostorodians--or, if you prefer, Socinians--deniers of Christ's merit, redemption, and divine righteousness, Arians throughout Poland, Hungary, and Transylvania; Servetians, who mingle Sabellianism, Eutychianism, and Anabaptism; the Effrontes, who shaved their foreheads until they drew blood, anointed them with oil, boasted that they were Christians without baptism, and said that the Holy Spirit was a certain motion and therefore could not be adored without the crime of idolatry; the Ochinists, who admit polygamy; the new Sabellians; the Bacularians; and those who form the greatest crowd, the Epicureans, atheists, and Libertines. This is the condition of the religions that contend most vigorously in Europe. A great part of the people either does not care about the controversies or is certainly ignorant of them. The more learned men are partly on others' sides and partly on their own, for by the vehemence of disputing they generally lose the truth and strike against some heresy. There are many Lutherans, and of various stamps; many Calvinists; and perhaps no fewer Anabaptists and Socinians--

[Printed page 744]

--but very many who have determined to fuse all the religions into one.

The Novatians once did this, as the author of *Heresy* 38 and Epiphanius in *Heresy* 59 attest. They declared that they and the Catholics were imbued with nearly the same faith, but that they nevertheless differed in doctrine; and they blamed the Catholics in the time of the Arian emperor Valens: "You contend on account of a trifling subtlety of doctrines." There were also Rhetorians, who taught that all heresies walked on the right path and taught the truth. So Philastrius relates in his *Catalogue*, and Augustine in *Heresy* 72; and Augustine marvels that it could enter anyone's mind to judge thus. That opinion always gains strength when provinces fall into the manifold labyrinths of errors. For profane men are thereby led, provided only that they preserve the peace of the state, not to fear conspiring together in one error.

Zeno's peace taught this: his *ἐνωτικὸν πρόσταγμα*, his pacificatory or unitive edict, by which he wished the Eutychians, Dioscorians, and Catholics to remit something of their own opinion so that they might unite in one religion. That measure nevertheless produced greater dissensions, just as the Lutherans weakened themselves by nothing more than when they forced otherwise incurable errors together into the single Book of Concord. By a not dissimilar reasoning, Ioannes Sturmius in 1578 established a middle way: he wished a new religion to be fused from the opinions of Protestants and Catholics by the judgment of seventy men; but he aroused against himself the anger of all theologians. Our most learned Gualterus relates in his chronological table, page 380, column 2, that Ioannes Serranus, minister of Orange, said to a certain powerful Catholic lord that his religion differed from the Roman religion only in ceremonies, that his own had too few ceremonies and the Roman too many, and that it was not difficult to reconcile the one with the other, namely by increasing the number of the former and diminishing that of the latter. Prevented by death, he did not finish the book he had begun on this subject. A certain conciliator under the fictitious name Christianus Constans attempted the same thing. He asserts that the Roman and Calvinian religions are not two religions but one, if the matter is to be judged truly and genuinely, as Gualterus himself explains at length under the year 1600, page 8, column 4, section 1. If Gualterus had seen Pareus's *Irenicon* and the polemical writings of the Lutherans--all of which were published after his chronological tables--he would have marveled far more than Augustine did at the Rhetorians.

Since, therefore, there are so many heresies, and they increase day by day, draw states into factions by their increase, rend apart the members of Europe, set some against others and the whole before the Turks: recognize, O kings and princes, the condition of your religion; take thought for your own souls, for the salvation of your subjects, and for the state and civil order. A return must be made to one religion. For either each of you will obstinately defend his own opinions, and thus there will be as many dissensions as men; or you will give each person the power of holding and teaching opinions, and thus in one word you will overthrow the state. For men will come who will deny that the magistracy has any right, who will say that all things are common, and who, with pleasure pandering to the efficacy of their errors, will introduce them into morals.

This change of religion was brought into Europe by many seditions and wars; it cost altogether much blood, with which Africa, Asia, and India could have been acquired. From it, even now as I write these things, civil wars rage in many places, are being prepared in more, and are feared by all. Alas, will you descendants deny it? Amid so many faiths, will the Son of Man, when he comes, find faith?

CHAPTER XII

The Unexpected Origin of Seditions, and Their Origin from Small Things

[Printed page 744]

Aristotle gives a most true warning in *Politics* V.4:

γίγνονται μὲν οὖν αἱ στάσεις οὐ περὶ μικρῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκ μικρῶν.

Seditions arise not concerning small things, but from small things; for men disagree and excite seditions concerning great things. In these cases, nevertheless, you will observe that, when a small matter has kindled a great fire, it has generally arisen from the corrupt morals of the people, or that great contempt and wickedness were displayed in a small matter.

Tarquinius was expelled from Rome because of his son's adultery. The chastity of wives is not a small matter but a great one, for which it is right that a husband fight as for a sacred thing; yet amid the lusts of gentile and barbarian kings it was not esteemed so highly that Brutus and Collatinus, if this alone had been the crime, could have stirred Rome and Collatia. But they had been embittered by the king's crime, pride, and tyranny. For Livy says of him in book I: "Then, conscious that from himself an example of seeking the kingship wickedly could be taken against himself, he surrounded his body with armed men; for he had no right to the kingship apart from force, since he reigned neither by command of the people nor with the senators as his sponsors. Added to this, since he placed no hope in the affection of the citizens, was the necessity of securing his kingdom by fear. In order to instill it in more persons, he conducted trials of capital charges by himself alone, without counselors. For that reason he was able to kill, drive into exile, and deprive of property not only those suspected and hated, but those from whom he could expect nothing other than plunder." And when he was constructing the Capitol, the Great Sewer, and other works by the hands of the oppressed plebs, he was the object of great hatred, which lacked only an occasion.

Aristotle relates things not dissimilar. At Syracuse a tumult arose because of the crimes of two men, one of whom was guilty of adultery and the other of a more loathsome crime. But when each attached a part of the citizens to himself, they stirred up a sedition by which the form of the state was changed. Yet the sedition indicates the corrupt morals both of the magistrates and of the people: these fighting for adultery, those for *παιδεραστία* (*pederasty*). For in a vicious people, since each of the worst men is very prone to tumult, sedition arises most easily.

At Histaea a sedition arose from a dispute between two brothers over the division of an inheritance, as Aristotle attests. For when the wealthier brother injured the other and detained the paternal property, the other, poor brother called the poor citizens to his aid, while the former called the wealthy; and a battle of the poor against the rich was produced, which would never have occurred if even a shadow of justice had appeared in the courts.

It is established from the history of the Delphic sedition that there was an appearance of right on both sides. The sedition of the Mytilenaeans, moreover, had its origin in the neglect of justice. Timophanes left two wealthy daughters surviving him; Doxander sought them in marriage for his sons, suffered a refusal, and stirred the Athenians to an impious war.

The matter that made the consulship common to the plebs was also small: a sister married to a plebeian was mocked by her sister, who had entered a patrician house, because she was terrified at the unfamiliar sound of the lictor striking the door. Certainly that mockery would have had no power to produce a sedition if it had fallen in peaceful times of the state. But the tribunician disputes about making the consulship common to the plebs had already preceded it--

[Printed page 745]

--and an author was being sought who would renew the contests that had been broken off.

Suetonius, in his *Augustus*, reports a ludicrous cause of great danger. For when, at a spectacle of games, Augustus had ordered through an attendant that a common soldier sitting in the fourteen rows be made to rise, and a rumor had been spread by his detractors that he had soon afterward killed the same man under torture, he came within very little of perishing through the gathering and indignation of the military crowd. It was his salvation that the man who was being sought suddenly appeared, unharmed and without injury. From what a cause, small in appearance, did Philip the Macedonian perish! It was because he did not avenge an insult done to a young man. But it arose from a great fault and error of government, because the king, intent upon wars, was neglectful of justice and honor.

Trebellius Pollio relates that Regillianus was made emperor by a joke. "For when," he says, "certain soldiers were dining with him, Valerianus, a tribune, stood beside them and said, 'From what do we believe the name Regillianus to be derived?' Another immediately said, 'We believe it, because it comes from *regnum*, kingship.' Then a learned man who was present began, as though grammatically, to decline and say, '*Rex, regis, regi, Regillianus*--king, of a king, to a king, Regillianus.' The soldiers, since mankind is very prone to those things which it is thinking, said, 'Therefore can he be king?' Likewise another: 'Therefore can he rule us?' Likewise another: 'God has imposed upon you the name of king.' Why say more? After these words, when he came forth on the following morning, he was hailed as emperor by the officers." Thus jesting cleverness bestowed upon this man what either boldness or judgment bestowed upon others. It was plainly a ridiculous designation of a prince; but if you consider the condition of the state, you will understand that there was plainly nothing strange in the chief power being handled so lightly. For the soldiers regarded making and killing an emperor as a matter of sport. This was the time in which, under the rule of Gallienus, thirty tyrants tore apart the Roman world. By no dissimilar levity Claudius was once dragged forth and placed upon the throne while trembling and expecting death. And before this, two common soldiers undertook to transfer the Roman Empire, and transferred it, as Tacitus attests. Proculus was made emperor at dice: for when "emperor" had come up ten times, one man cried, "Hail, Augustus," and the rest of the crowd, with similar madness, hailed him as emperor.

Zosimus reports concerning Magnentius: "Magnentius, rising from the table as though for the sake of some necessary business, when he had withdrawn from the guests for a very short time, again presented himself for them to behold, wrapped in a royal robe as though upon a stage. There, when the guests had called him king, all the inhabitants of the city of Autun--where these things were done--likewise came to the same opinion. And because the fame of the matter extended farther, the rural plebs also streamed together from outside the city." But the state was sick at that time, and the soldiery gained profit from sedition; otherwise the entire vicinity would have mocked the masquerading king. Now, advancing with great power, he inflicted great disasters.

There are innumerable such cases. In a sportive contest at the castle of Treviso under Otto IV, when the Venetian standard was torn, a vast sedition was stirred up. At Florence, when the young men Donatus and Cerchi disturbed the horses of others at dances, the city received a great calamity from the tumult. But the causes had already preceded these incidents. For the minds of the Venetians and Italians had been embittered, and the factions of the Florentines thought any cause sufficient for oppressing their enemies. These, therefore, are signs of a state constituted in the worst manner: when states fall at the slightest impulse, it is proof that they had stood in a slippery place. For those things are prone to fall which, when an impediment has been taken away or any weight added to the other side, rush down.

CHAPTER XIII

Chance Events Sometimes Furnish a Cause of Sedition

[Printed page 745]

I call those things fortuitous which are not committed through the fault of princes or of the people and which by their own nature have no reason why they should stir up sedition. God has his own fixed reason why he brings them upon us or permits them to occur. Nothing is fortuitous to eternal providence, which numbered the hairs of our head before the foundation of the world. We judge something to have happened by chance because it was contrary to expectation. The fortuitous causes of seditions, however, are calamities, such as famine, fires, floods, and other things that make spirits sorrowful and imbue them with much hatred. For since there is a very great number of evil men in a state, they are embittered by calamities and grow savage, like wild beasts, rather than becoming tame. Thus provoked, they easily make an attack upon the magistracy and others, although these have not injured them. Prudent princes will assuredly attempt what Fabius did:

Fabius, soothing these complaints, taught that it was shameful

To rage against disasters, and kept the crowd from anger;

For to be broken by adversities was not the part of men.

The Hebrews in the desert, if Pharaoh rages, if water is lacking, if they desire flesh, do not deal by prayers, but murmur against God and Moses and rage against their disasters. The good are tested by adversities as gold by fires; the evil are burned up like chaff. The cause of this fact is that the unhappy, since they bear evils impatiently, become angry, envy the fortunate by comparison with their own fortune, and grieve. Hence they are readily indignant at all by whom they are not assisted, and especially at the magistrates.

Among the other hardships from which seditions arise, famine is the chief. The cause of this is that, when bodies have been emptied, it stirs the humors and renders men malevolent and bilious. Léry, in his *History of the Voyage to Brazil*, relates that, when the Calvinian church, after its affairs among the barbarians had gone badly, was afflicted by famine on the return voyage, its members became fierce, morose, and irascible. These are his words, page 325:

“Before I put an end to this discourse, I should like to observe in passing something that I noticed in others, indeed most of all in myself, for I experienced two famines, and such that I believe no men ever escaped more horrible ones. When bodies have been weakened by want of food, nature is failing, the senses are disordered, and the spirits dispersed, men become not only fierce but also morose and irascible. Moreover, that irascibility may deservedly be called a kind of madness. Hence it comes about that in our vernacular speech one who is oppressed by hunger is aptly said to rage with hunger. Furthermore, because experience teaches all things more distinctly, I see that it is not without cause that God, when threatening his people with famine unless they obey his commandments, expressly declares that it will come to pass that the eye of the man who had been tender and delicate will be very evil toward his brother, his dearest wife, and his children, so that he will not give any of them some of the flesh of his children which he will eat. For, in addition to the examples that we have related from sacred history concerning parents who ate one of their children, and concerning certain soldiers who, after they had tasted the corpses of those who had died in war, declared that they had resolved to lay hands upon the living if that evil had lasted longer, I can affirm that during that famine at sea we could scarcely, indeed hardly at all, converse peaceably with one another, although we were restrained by the fear of God; indeed, that--may the Lord pardon us--we looked upon one another with evil eyes.”

From this, therefore, arise bitterness of spirits, complaints, and tumults. Under the emperor Claudius there was an immense famine in the Roman--

[Printed page 746]

--Empire. Dio recounts the tumult that arose from it at Rome; scarcity of grain, too, and the famine arising from it, was taken as a prodigy. There were not merely secret complaints: they surrounded Claudius while he was administering justice with turbulent shouts and, driving him to the farthest part of the forum, pressed him until he broke through the hostile crowd with a body of soldiers. It was established that no more than fifteen days' provisions remained for the city. By God's great kindness and the mildness of the winter, relief was brought to affairs at their extremity. Yet, by Hercules, in former times provisions were carried from the regions of Italy into distant provinces; nor is sterility the affliction now, but rather we put Africa and Egypt under exertion, and the life of the Roman people has been entrusted to ships and accidents.

Hence came the monstrous savagery with which men devoured one another. This happened in the siege of Jerusalem, when mothers themselves cooked their children. The army of Cyrus in Scythia had already raged against its own men in this manner, and, as Herodotus says in book III, the army of Cambyses ate every tenth man selected by lot. The seditious soldiers of the Carthaginians were subdued by famine alone, although before that they had consumed the bodies of captives and slaves. Sabellicus, *Enneads* IV, book 9: this happened also at Numantia, Saguntum, Calagurris, Tauromenium, and Rome at the time of the Gothic siege, when men cried out, "Set a price on human flesh." Byzantines and Placentines suffered the same thing under Totila; the Nevomantini and Samanduni in the siege of Sinderovia gnawed their own hands. Cromerus relates that it happened in Poland in the year 1315, book XI. What wonder is it, therefore, that seditions arise from famine, since it changes men into beasts?

There is a second reason why men riot on account of famine: they think that by the providence of the prince grain could have been gathered in good time or brought from elsewhere. Thus Octavius, Antonius, and many others were endangered because of famine. Wicked citizens, however, abused that occasion to seize the state, as did Spurius Maelius and others. Tiberius and other princes therefore prudently assumed the care of the grain supply themselves, lest anything be neglected by ministers.

The whole Senate was never in greater danger than when it was unwilling that Pompey be put in command of the fleet against the pirates; for the plebs blazed up with such anger that it hastened to destroy the Senate. The cause was that navigation, obstructed by the power of the pirates, had produced famine. Dio, in his *Pompey*.

Disasters in war also stir up domestic seditions, either by fear or by contempt. When it was announced in Mithridates' camp that his commanders had been slain by Lucullus, so great a terror suddenly invaded the army that they departed from the camp, abandoning the king; and, reverence for his authority having been removed, they plundered from others as much as each could, pillaged the king's own precious furnishings, and killed a commander in order to take his costly garment.

A prince must always fear a sedition arising from contempt if a defeat suffered in war is announced, if it is serious, dangerous, and difficult to repair. For men think that a prince placed in danger and afflicted has fallen beneath them. But if they hated him before, they exult vehemently and cast off the yoke. When the city had been burned by the Gauls, the Latins and others moved war out of contempt for it. After the defeat at Cannae the allied cities defected. Once the prince's authority and the fear of him have been removed, hatreds break forth most freely; and when men have hope from the opposite side, they incline toward it.

Pertinent here is what Herodotus reports in book II concerning Apries, king of the Egyptians, when he was defeated by the Cyrenaeans. When Apries, having sent an army against the Cyrenaeans, suffered a great defeat, the Egyptians imputed it to him and rebelled, thinking that they had been sent down by him to manifest destruction so that, once they had been annihilated, he might rule the other Egyptians more securely. Both those who returned and the friends of those who had perished bore this most grievously and openly defected.

When Apries learned of this, he sent Amasis to pacify them with words. When Amasis had arrived and was rebuking them and dissuading them from doing such things, one of the Egyptians, standing behind him, placed a helmet around his head; and, when it had been placed upon him, he said that he had put it on him for the kingship. Nor was this done against Amasis's will, as he showed. For as soon as he had been declared king by the Egyptians who had defected, he prepared himself as though about to march against Apries.

When these things were learned, Apries sent to Amasis one of the Egyptians who were with him, a respected man named Patarbemis, with orders to bring Amasis to him alive. When Patarbemis arrived, he summoned Amasis to Apries. But Amasis--he was sitting insolently upon a horse to exhort his men--foolishly ordered him to take this to Apries; and when Patarbemis asked him to go to the king, since he had been summoned, he replied that he had long been devoting his attention to doing so, and that Apries would have no complaint about him, for he would both present himself to Apries and bring others with him.

Patarbemis, not ignorant of Amasis's purpose, both from his speech and from the preparations he saw, judged that it belonged to his diligence to inform the king as quickly as possible of what was being done. When he returned without bringing Amasis, Apries, moved by anger, without uttering a word ordered his ears and nose cut off. When the other Egyptians who until then had sided with Apries saw a man most highly approved among them treated so shamefully and unworthily, they did not delay even so long, but passed over to the others and surrendered themselves to Amasis. Having heard these things also, Apries armed his auxiliaries--for he had around him about thirty thousand auxiliaries from the Ionians and Carians--and advanced against the Egyptians. He had an immense royal palace in the city of Saïs, worthy of being seen. Thus the Aprians and Amasians took their stand against one another at the city of Memphis, intending to attempt the decision of battle.

CHAPTER XIV

The Order and Method of Stirring Up Seditions

[Printed page 746]

Since so great a wickedness has no need of instruction, I think it the act of an insane man to teach the art of stirring up sedition. But to set forth publicly the things that histories furnish and that princes must know is the task of the political writer; for in this way the prince will recognize the signs and indubitable prognostics of sedition and, when he perceives that matters are tending toward it, will meet it in good time. Therefore, when either the people itself, or the nobles, or some one man from the crowd does those things which inspire or reveal in the multitude or the nobles a hatred of the present condition, sedition is not far away. This generally is not believed until it has begun to rage.

And indeed, when the people itself inclines toward tumult, the contrivance cannot be secret. For free and ill-considered words against the chief men or the prince, heard with attention and applause, indicate that the minds of the people are estranged and that they will dare something if they find a leader. When the mime is ordered to repeat these words, “Magnus, you are our misery,” who could doubt that favor had already been transferred from Pompey to Caesar and that, when an occasion was given, Pompey would be cast down? But when a private person or one of the chief men attempts a revolution, he carries on secret counsels, and the treason is not recognized until everything has been prepared and arranged.

Those, therefore, who attempt to move the people or the chief men to sedition do this in order to bring them into hatred of the magistrates. Then, because hatred languishes when hope and fear are absent--for it ventures little besides abuse--they remove fear of punishments, but instill a fear of many hardships if men remain quiet. Finally, they bring hope of better things and fill light minds with empty things. Sometimes they also set forth money as the rewards of treason.

[Printed page 747]

They procure hatred of the magistrate by relating true things and by calumniating. Calumnies are of two kinds: either they artfully invent false things, or they increase beyond measure things that are true.

A sedition is most dangerous when it is born from true evils, for it never ends except with the destruction of one of the parties or with a change of the state. Scripture presents an example in 3 Kings 12. For they complain truly: “Your father imposed a most harsh yoke upon us; you, therefore, now lessen a little the rule of your father and the most grievous yoke that he imposed upon us, and we will serve you.” Nor does Roboam deny it: “My father made your yoke heavy.” This had been done by the old man when his expenditures upon seven hundred queens and three hundred concubines became immoderate. Jeroboam therefore easily led away ten tribes here, and, so that the defection might be ratified with blood, Aduram, Roboam's treasurer, was overwhelmed with stones. And in truth, seditions arise for the most part from a true beginning and from true evils, as what I taught concerning the causes of seditions has demonstrated. For either kings conduct themselves wickedly and tyrannically, or subjects unjustly oppose good kings.

But this is the worst thing: although sedition can be healed at its beginning, within a short time, when there is no measure in avoiding or avenging evils, the injury increases. And thus, while each party executes vengeance not by reason but by anger, it always inflicts a more grievous evil than it suffers. This customarily occurs because vengeance for a civil injury seems to provide two things: consolation to the man who received the injury and security for the future. It always provides the first for angry men, but not the second. It provides the first because to give back is sweet. For in anger there is a mixture of pain and pleasure. The man who returns pain thinks himself excused, even if it is greater than what he received. Truly and philosophically Homer says:

ὥς ἔρις ἔκ τε θεῶν, ἔκ τ' ἀνθρώπων ἀπόλοιτο,
καὶ χόλος, ὅς τ' ἐφέηκε πολύφρονά περ χαλεπῆναι,
ὅς τε πολὺ γλυκίων μέλιτος καταλειβομένοιο,
ἀνδρῶν ἐν στήθεσσιν ἀέξεται ἥϊτε καπνός.

But may contention and anger perish from gods and men--

Anger which compels even the wise man to blaze up,

Which is much sweeter than dripping honey,

Growing in the breasts of men like smoke.

They therefore do not weigh injuries with equal weight, but pain against pain, so that, as though they had equalized the law of retaliation, they inflict something greater in return for the offense. Like men who strike back a ball they have received, they drive it back more strongly, assisted by the impetus of its coming. So greatly has this seemed good to many that they think vengeance is well sought even by death:

Though the gods destroy me, nevertheless they desire that I be aided,

Because before I perish they will give me time to take vengeance.

This evil, therefore, is sweet; it increases with practice; and although “vengeance” is an inhuman word, the thing itself is most eagerly sought and grows beyond measure. Hence it is the custom not only of barbarous peoples but also of the most cultivated to take vengeance; so little do they differ from those whom vices close to those of beasts have brutalized far from every fellowship of human law. Amid laws and magistrates, each man is the avenger of his own pain, and continual precautions against crimes are thrown off, while vengeance not only imitates the crime but exceeds it, and while men hate all whom they have injured and by whom they are injured. But the second thing, that is, security, it rarely brings, because the defeated man rarely remains quiet. And we have seen slaughters go round in a circle until power was transferred to foreigners.

Sometimes there is need of the greatest art and diligence in order that a defection can be foreseen. The Ionians who inhabited Asia suddenly defected from Darius and, after auxiliaries had been assembled in Greece and especially at Athens, burned Sardis. The cause of the defection was given by a plan of Darius that seemed safe but was unjust: he had planned to transfer the Ionians to Phoenicia and the Phoenicians to Ionia, so that he might thus tear the Greeks away from intercourse with Greeks and from their *συνμαχία* (*alliance*), and place in the midst another nation friendly to neither. When Histiaeus the Greek learned this in Persia, he burned letters onto the shaven head of a messenger, by which he disclosed the matter to Aristagoras, leader of the Greeks. The latter, when the messenger's head had again been shaved and he had read the letters, began a savage war as though for altars and hearths. Darius could not have foreseen this sedition in any other way than by suspecting that his purpose would not remain secret. And Aristagoras indeed was killed, and Histiaeus was driven onto a cross; nevertheless Darius could not accomplish the migration of the nations.

They openly sow calumnies in order to disturb quiet men and stir up seditions. Tarquinius Superbus furnished an example in the council of the Latins. Another was furnished under Aurelian, when a secretary displayed a document upon which he said that the names of men destined for death had been written. Absalom also overreached his father by manifest calumny, 2 Kings 15: “Your words seem to me good and just, but there is no one appointed by the king to hear you.” And Absalom would say: “Who will appoint me judge over the land, so that everyone who has a suit may come to me and I may judge justly?” Yet the greatest regard for justice was maintained by David. Thus Valerius came under suspicion of seeking the kingship because of the house he had built, nor could he dispel the calumny except by its demolition. Aulus Albinus was stoned by the army because of false suspicions his enemies had spread, Valerius

Maximus IX.8. These things have now become excessively customary in our own times, in which every deed and saying of princes is taken in the worse sense. Homer once presented Thersites as the example of those who railed against kings and moved sedition.

Enemies, too, when they could not calumniate brave men with words, disparaged them by the facts themselves. Coriolanus devastated the fields of the plebeians and left those of the patricians untouched, in order to kindle manifest dissensions. Hannibal likewise refrained from the fields of Fabius Maximus in order to render him suspect; but Fabius broke the force of the calumny by declaring the field public property. The Romans did not do these things without a precedent. The Lacedaemonians left the fields of Pericles untouched so that they might create resentment against him and a suspicion of treason. But he gave them as a gift to the state, by which act he obtained great praise and proved his fidelity more fully to the Athenian people.

Another kind of calumny occurs when all things that are vicious, or seem so, are raised to a greater degree, and good things are taken in the worse sense. This became so manifest at Rome in the tribunes of the plebs that there is no need of another proof. Nothing ever done by the Roman Senate was so pleasing as when it decreed pay for the soldiery, and nothing was received with such great joy: men flocked together, praised the senators, grasped their hands, and said that they had truly been called fathers. What did the tribunes do? Alone untouched by the common joy and concord of the orders, they denied “that this was as joyful to all the senators, or would prove as prosperous, as the senators themselves believed,” Livy IV. “The plan was better in its first appearance than it would prove in practice. For from where could that money be raised except by imposing a tribute upon the people? From the property of some, therefore, they would be generous to others.

[Printed page 748]

“Nor, even if the others endured it, would those whose terms of service had already been completed suffer others to serve under a better condition than that under which they themselves had served, and the same men both to have made expenditures for their own pay and to make them for that of others.”

But when they heard that the army was also to winter in the siege of Veii, they magnified everything and twisted it to the worse sense. They repeatedly said: “This was the thing for which pay had been established for the soldiers; nor had they been mistaken that this gift would be smeared with the poison of their enemies. The liberty of the plebs had been sold; the youth had been removed forever and banished from the city and the state, and now did not yield even to winter or the season of the year so as to see their homes and affairs. What did they think was the cause of this continued military service? They would surely find no other than that nothing might be done for their interests through the frequent presence of those young men in whom lay all the strength of the plebs. Moreover, they were harassed and subdued much more bitterly than the Veientes. For the latter passed the winter beneath their own roofs, defending a city with excellent walls and by its natural position; the Roman soldier endured under skins amid work and labor, buried beneath snow and frost, not laying down his arms even in the span of winter, which is a rest from all wars by land and sea.

“Neither kings, nor those proud consuls before the tribunician power was created, nor the grim command of the dictator, nor the oppressive decemvirs had imposed this form of slavery, that men should perform perpetual military service. The military tribunes exercised kingship over the Roman plebs. What, then, would those men do as consuls or dictators who had made their proconsular likeness so savage and cruel? But this happened not undeservedly: not even among eight military tribunes had there been a place for any plebeian. Previously the patricians had been accustomed to fill three places with the utmost contention; now they went eight abreast to obtain commands, and not even amid the crowd did any plebeian cling on who, if nothing else, might remind his colleagues that those who served were their free men and fellow citizens, not slaves; that at least in winter they ought to be led into homes and beneath roofs; and that at some time of the year they ought to see their parents, children, and wives, exercise liberty, and elect magistrates.”

What could have been more shameful than for citizens thus to rage against the concord of their fellow citizens? But it was done, nor was it passed over by the senators. For Appius depicts for us the nature of these calumniators in its native colors:

“If it was ever doubted, Quirites, whether the tribunes of the plebs have always been the authors of seditions for your sake or for their own, I hold it certain that in this year the doubt has ceased. I both rejoice that at last an end has been made for you to a long error, and, because this error was removed especially amid your prosperous affairs, congratulate both you and, on account of you, the state. Is there anyone who doubts that the tribunes of the plebs were never so offended and agitated by any injuries done to you, if perhaps there ever were any, as by the senators' gift to the plebs when pay was established for those serving as soldiers? What else do you believe they either feared at that time or wish to disturb today except the concord of the orders, which they judge to be the thing most capable of dissolving the tribunician power?

“Thus, by Hercules, like wicked craftsmen they seek work: they always wish something in the state to be sick so that there may be something for whose treatment they are summoned by you. For do you defend or attack the plebs? Are you the adversaries of the soldiers, or do you plead their cause? Unless perhaps you say this: ‘Whatever the senators do displeases us, whether it is for the plebs or against the plebs.’ And just as masters forbid their slaves to have any dealings with other men and judge it right that others refrain equally from kindness and injury toward them, so you forbid the senators intercourse with the plebs, lest we call forth the plebs by our courtesy and generosity, and lest the plebs be attentive and obedient to us. How much more, if there were in you anything--I do not say of a citizen, but of a human being--ought you at last to favor and, so far as lay in you, to indulge instead the courtesy of the senators and the obedience of the plebs? If that concord should be perpetual, who would not dare promise that this dominion will in a short time be the greatest among its neighbors?”

No one doubts that such men must be eliminated from the state as pests. The reason is that even the best princes have many things that must be amended; their administrators commit many faults; the princes themselves seem to commit more, and they actually commit some. If all these are gathered together, exaggerated, understood with a hostile mind, and infected with the poison of a malevolent tongue, the state must necessarily collapse.

[Printed page 748]

Calumnies are indeed effective for stirring up hatred, but sometimes by the same means men produce fear, as in the death of Aurelian. Sosis of Syracuse contrived plots and a tumult against Dion by this art. Stained with blood and speaking in a lamentable voice, he delivered himself to the multitude, asserting that he had suffered these things from Dion and that all men must expect all the same things. The sedition was indeed composed at that time; its author afterward paid the penalty at Athens. Pisistratus had long before cast the Athenian people into the same fear. For in order to oppress Megacles and the wealthy, he inveighed bitterly against him in an assembly; on the following day he came wounded, complaining that he had been treated so unjustly and insultingly by the nobles. The people, agitated by anger and fear, since they believed that this savagery threatened the bodies of them all, gave Pisistratus three hundred bodyguards for the protection of his life; with these he seized the tyranny. Dionysius obtained bodyguards through the same fear and seized power. For since fear is a most effective passion, and one that makes men anxious and suspicious, it is easily employed for sedition.

They oppose all things, lest the adverse party should be rendered stronger in any manner. Herodian demonstrates this concerning Antoninus Caracalla and Geta. But their hatred and dissensions increased day by day. For whether certain commanders and magistrates were being chosen, each particularly favored his own friend; or whether they pronounced judgment, they always held different opinions, sometimes with great danger to the man whose case was at issue. For they valued their own partisan zeal more highly than right or equity. Even at the games themselves they always belonged to different factions. Besides this, they omitted no form of plots, repeatedly attempting to impel cooks and

cupbearers to poisonings. This was almost the perpetual work of the Roman tribunes: to obstruct levies, magistracies, and trials.

Those men act more criminally who bring the state and the army into danger so that they may make the magistrates hateful and overthrow them. By this fraud Philip, as Capitolinus attests, deprived the younger Gordian of both empire and life. First, through Philip's artifices, the grain ships were turned away; then the soldiers were led into those places in which a grain supply could not be obtained. Hence he immediately rendered the soldiers hostile to Gordian, for they did not understand that the young man had been deceived by Philip's artifices. But Philip also added this: he spread a rumor through the soldiers that Gordian was a young man and unable to govern the empire, and that it was better for the man who governed the soldiery and understood the state to rule. He also corrupted the officers and brought it about that Philip was openly demanded for the imperial power. In the same manner Stilicho spared the barbarians so that he might raise his son to the imperial power.

When magistrates see a prudent, active, and keen man doing this--that he may grow famous, come forward by means of expenditure, and lead clients--and when he does it neither from prodigality nor folly, they ought to determine with certainty that something greater is being constructed by these beginnings. Thus Caesar acted. Plutarch, in his *Caesar*: "In addition to these things, by the splendor of his dinners and table and, in sum, of the rest of his life, he gradually gathered power in the state. His enemies, judging that this power would soon vanish when his expenditures failed, securely permitted him to become famous in the state. But too late, when it had already become immense and overwhelmingly strong, and they perceived that it was openly breaking forth into a revolution, did they notice that no beginning of any affair is to be judged small, because continuation does not immediately render it great, and because, from the very fact that it is despised, it succeeds in not being impeded.

[Printed page 749]

"Accordingly Cicero, who was the first to regard Caesar's conduct in the state with suspicion and fear, and who, as in a calm sea, perceived the fierceness concealed beneath his humanity and flattery, used to say that in all Caesar's other undertakings and actions he discerned a tyrannical disposition. 'But,' he said, 'when I see his hair so carefully arranged and the man himself scratching his head with one finger, on the contrary, that man does not seem to me likely to conceive so great an evil in his mind as to overthrow the Roman state.'"

This, too, was an art of the ancients. Manlius had freed debtors and bought favor by the loss of his wealth, which he thought he would recover when he had seized the state. Spurius won over the people by an agrarian law, Maelius by largesse. All were men of excellent spirit and not unworthy of command, and perhaps would have been most excellent kings if they could have come to the scepter without crime.

In addition to immense hopes, they also scatter money. Herodian, in his *Elagabalus*: "His mother also secretly gave money for him to distribute privately among the soldiers, so that he might possess their goodwill, increased also by the pledge of money--for this is what they chiefly regard." Many Romans, so that they might hold the first place in a sedition and crush the opposing parties, poured out their patrimonies. Marcus Livius Drusus, tribune of the plebs, promised the courts to the Senate, the Senate to the equestrians, lands to the plebs, and citizenship to the Latins, so that he said he had left nothing for anyone else to bestow except heaven and mud. Agrippa also came under suspicion because he bestowed many things upon the people, adorned Rome, and gave oil and salt to all. Sejanus tested the dispositions of the citizens, and especially of the soldiers, by gifts.

It would be a long and unnecessary discussion to speak of those who overcame citizens and enemies by money; men give all things for money. When Seleucus had proclaimed a reward of one hundred talents for the head of Theodotus, who had charge of the treasury at Sardis, and now all things were full of suspicions, Theodotus himself opened the citadel to him. For when he saw that money was stronger than fidelity among his own men and observed that amid civil wars he was not safe, he preferred to hand over both the entire treasury and himself rather than to die honorably and prove his fidelity to his prince.

They are accustomed to make a show of zeal for peace so that all things may be received more gently. Tacitus: "A few days after the Kalends of January, letters were brought from Belgica from Pompeius Propinquus, the procurator: the legions of Upper Germany, having broken their reverence for the military oath, demanded another emperor and permitted the Senate and Roman People the decision of choosing him, so that the sedition might be received more gently." We have seen the rebellions of France, the Low Countries, and Bohemia; nothing could have been said or done more gentle in appearance, more artfully colored, or more disguised. They said that they loved their kings, obeyed them in all things, acted against hidden enemies, and wished the royal majesty to be defended by all. "For king and law," they inscribed upon their standards. Yet Caesar displayed nothing other than the safety of the state, nor did Pompey display anything else. And Cato deservedly reproaches the soldiers:

You were Pompey's army,

Not Rome's.

The shameless boldness of many has also raised itself up to stir peoples by inserting themselves into a favored and illustrious family. Smerdis pretended that he was the son of Cyrus and the brother of Cambyses whom Cambyses had killed, and, because of the hatred for Cambyses, who ruled most cruelly, he was eagerly received, until, when the fraud had been discovered, he was killed by seven nobles. Herodotus, book I.

In the same manner, the man whom they pretended to be the son of Antiochus Epiphanes was assisted by the cities. He grew so powerful that he killed Demetrius Soter; and if, corrupted by the kindness of fortune, he had not acted with excessive intemperance, he could have held the kingdom for a long time. Archelaus, Andriscus, Anarhates, Alexander, Herophilus, Chamaces, the false Neros, Scriboniani, Commodi, Frederici, Henrici, and Richardi practiced a similar kind of fraud. But men do not readily believe them unless a change is already desired. Thus these dangers hang over a state when its present condition is hated. Here also care must be taken that such men do not grow strong in power; for in this way they establish the belief more firmly, and those to whom that error is profitable maintain and defend it even knowingly and willingly.

Some states have been so constituted that they do not easily admit civil disturbances, as among the Chinese. For the people cannot easily move itself, since it is oppressed by the immense power of the governors; nor can the mandarins who govern do so, for they are from the common people, and, in the second place, they lack military force. Third, they have ministers assigned by the king, and the military magistrates are subject to the civil. Our Jarric describes these things in the *Indian Treasury*, volume II, book 2:

"The third good that arises from this form of state is that civil wars and internal disturbances, which rise here and there, are wholly cut off and removed. For the king's sons and brothers can stir up none while grasping at the kingdom. Although they are kept splendidly, nevertheless, in the place to which they are banished, it is unlawful for them to set a foot outside, under the appointed penalty of death, unless the king's permission has been obtained--a permission that he will never give. In addition, they govern no affairs, but power has been entrusted to the mandarins alone; nor is it easy for the mandarins to stir up any disturbances. For those who are permanent and military are subject to the civil officials, while the latter hold power for only three years. Moreover, because they generally reach this summit of honors through learning and virtue, and since most are plebeian and humble, they cannot therefore rely upon the aid of friends or blood-relations; and if perhaps relatives by marriage pressed them or suggested loftier ambitions, it would be in vain. For mandarins are always appointed on foreign soil.

"Furthermore, they are so distinguished from one another that those who preside over military affairs do not involve themselves in political and civil affairs; those who care for the state have no care of the royal treasury; and the prefects of the treasury do not concern themselves with either civic or military affairs. Finally, because magistrates are not permitted to attach to themselves any ministers other than those whom the king assigns, no handle is thereby given to anyone for secret disturbances or the stirring up of civil wars."

Nevertheless, just as that arrangement, now tested in China, is praised during a long peace, so in European, Asian, and African kingdoms it is altogether useless, indeed very pernicious. For when the state is constituted in this form, no man of any ability and prudence devotes himself to military service. Hence they are by no means safe by their own strength. A proof is that the Japanese, whose resources do not equal a hundredth part of those of the Chinese, assembled one hundred and fifty thousand men and attacked the kingdom. Although they were repulsed after suffering a defeat, nevertheless everyone sees how greatly the Chinese are held in contempt if one considers military affairs, since the lord of that island dared to attack so great a kingdom with a fleet and thought that he could possess it. This hope would be no less foolish and wicked than if the king of Britain trusted that by the strength of his islands--

[Printed page 750]

--he could reduce all Europe, united under one king, into his power. The form of their state therefore renders the Chinese unwarlike; and if some one keen and able man rebelled with the aid of neighboring kings, he would easily seize or tear apart China. Thus one must not greatly praise a state that is composed of slaves and, as it were, women--certainly of men unwarlike and therefore more exposed to warlike nations.

Other states have been so constituted either by their laws or by the custom of the people that at a slight impulse they are borne up and down, as was the kingdom of the Egyptians. Therefore the disposition of the people must be known; for some have been so disposed that they cannot and will not act without sedition. Trebellius Pollio attests concerning the Egyptians: "And this is familiar to the people of the Egyptians: as though furious and mad, they are led by every trifling matter to the greatest dangers of the state. Often, because salutations were neglected, a place in the baths was not yielded, meat and vegetables were withheld, slaves' footwear was involved, and on account of other such things, they advanced through sedition all the way to the greatest danger of the state, so that armies were armed against them.

"Accordingly, in their accustomed madness, when on a certain day the servant of a certain governor who then ruled Alexandria had been beaten in military fashion because he said that his sandals were better than a soldier's, the assembled multitude came in uncertainty to the house of the commander Aemilianus and pursued him with every instrument and fury of sedition. He was struck with stones and attacked with the sword; no weapon of sedition ceased. Therefore Aemilianus was compelled to assume the imperial power, since he knew that he must perish from every quarter."

Meanwhile the Jews who lived around Cyrene, under a certain leader named Andrew, slaughtered Romans and Greeks alike. They ate their flesh, girded themselves with their intestines, smeared themselves with their blood, and clothed themselves in their skins. They sawed many in two from the crown of the head, threw many to the beasts, and also forced many to fight one another, so that as many as two hundred and twenty thousand men perished. In addition, in Egypt and Cyprus under the leadership of Artemion, a similar slaughter of the Cypriots was perpetrated, in which two hundred and forty thousand men were lost. From this it comes about that a Jew is not permitted to enter Cyprus. If one should perhaps be driven to the island by the force of a storm, he is killed. But the Jews were subdued both by others and especially by Lucius, whom Trajan had sent. A prince, therefore, ought to know the nature and morals of his people.

CHAPTER XV

Remedies against Seditions and Civil Wars

[Printed page 750]

The remedies are altogether of two kinds. Some are prophylactic: they remove the causes and preserve beforehand. Others are applied when affairs have already been disturbed, in the midst of their heat. Of the former kind are those things already said concerning right instruction; for if they are observed, tumults will not easily arise and can be quieted with little labor. For if the prince preserves his authority and power and consults the safety of his subjects, he will easily regulate a quiet state by laws. To this pertains the enumeration of seditions and of the causes of tumult, so that by considering them a prudent magistrate may render his city immune from those evils by which he has seen others perish. But since plots are laid even against the holiest and most just magistrates, either from the depraved nature of the people or from the vices of certain men, we must treat of guarding against them and restoring peace.

The first and safest remedy is to meet the beginnings; for here plainly:

Medicine is prepared too late

When evils have grown strong through long delays.

The first movements subside under modest remedies; when they have gathered impetus, they devastate everything. And it is established that it is easier to exclude pernicious things than to govern them, and not to admit them than to moderate them once admitted. Nevertheless, admitted things, when they are small at the beginning and have not yet placed themselves in undisturbed possession, readily allow themselves to be cut back. The reason why all things are easily corrected at the beginning is that the contagion has not seized many; next, the few who are the authors conduct everything timidly; many are ignorant of the causes and attach themselves through folly.

Thus, in the affair of Saint Paul, when the city of Ephesus was filled with confusion, most did not know for what cause they had assembled, yet they cried for two hours, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." How easily did the town clerk restrain such great movements? Acts 19:35: "Men of Ephesus, what man is there who does not know that the city of the Ephesians is the worshiper of great Diana and of Jupiter's offspring? Since, therefore, these things cannot be contradicted, you ought to be quiet and do nothing rashly. For you have brought forward these men, who are neither sacrilegious nor blasphemers of your goddess. But if Demetrius and the craftsmen who are with him have a case against anyone, court days are held and there are proconsuls; let them accuse one another. If, however, you seek anything concerning another matter, it can be resolved in a lawful assembly." If the magistrate had not met the affair at the beginning, it would have come to slaughter and plunder; then the mere investigation of questions and judgments would have hurled them into further evils.

Histories teach that very many seditions were suppressed at their beginning. For although many conspiracies were entered into and plots laid against individual emperors and kings, they were nevertheless removed from the midst only by the last of them; they therefore suppressed very many. The Spartans quieted a most dangerous sedition with a word. The Partheniae had established as their signal that they should throw mud into the middle of the forum to begin the tumult. When the ephors learned of it, they ordered it proclaimed by the herald: "Those of you who wish to remove mud from the forum, depart"; and thus the sedition was dispersed. Polyaeus IV. If they had begun to remove the mud, that tumult would have raged with the slaughter of the magistrates and the state.

All tumults indeed must be treated immediately, but they must not immediately be met by an assault; for when resistance is made to an evil that cannot be conquered, it is provoked and rages farther. When the people is in motion and fury, measures that soothe it must be taken, and the people must be questioned gently. Thus it was done in the

Roman secession. The counsel is no different in individual cases. Caesar, already supported by legions, secure through magistrates he had bought, pleasing to the people, and strong through his conspiracy with Pompey and Crassus, ought not to have been provoked; but he should have been permitted the powers which they could not take from him. Tiberius approached Sejanus cautiously and gradually. Nicolaus Utranus forbade anything to be done against Cosimo de' Medici once he had already been strengthened. Thus, when a sedition burns with a great cause, or when it has been strengthened through delay, it must be attacked not by engines but by mines.

Seneca puts it beautifully. They say that a physician, when he had to treat the daughter of a king and could not do so without iron, while gently warming the swollen breast, applied a scalpel covered with a sponge. The girl would have resisted the remedy if it had been applied openly; because she did not anticipate it, she endured the pain--the woman who is healed secretly only when deceived. This must be done in a fresh sedition when men have, or seem to themselves to have, great causes for rioting. For the first onset of the plebs must be guarded against; presently--

[Printed page 751]

--when it has subsided, individuals flee apart in fear, no one trusts another, and all are anxious for their safety.

Yet in this matter nothing is more pernicious than through delay and negligence to give men time to compare counsels, strengthen themselves, gather auxiliaries, and--what contributes most to breaking their hope of pardon and is an impediment to quiet and peace--to commit offenses. For the farther they advance, the more gravely they transgress, because they injure others more in order to protect their own position. By this slowness, too, while they fight for altars and hearths, they are rendered bold, contemptuous of dangers, and altogether warlike; for this reason they cannot be compelled to their duty except by great expenditures and wars. Caesar warned that dangerous and great things must be done, not deliberated about; this must be said especially of seditions. Here assuredly that saying has a place: the swifter an onset is, the stronger it is. Hence in the Capitol, in the forum, in the very gathering of the people, seditious men were killed by the Romans. Courts did not sit against violence; the sword was drawn.

Despair must never be cast upon rebels. He who hopes for nothing despairs of nothing and dares everything. He thinks anything preferable to perishing amid mockery and the insulting of enemies. Despair is always dangerous; for after a man has renounced safety, he seeks consolations for destruction and companions in death. Severity must therefore be used in such a manner that a hope which is not vain is shown to those who return to their senses. The Roman state was tossed by such savage wars because the defeated placed no protection in the mercy of the victor. They renewed the war in Africa, in Spain, at Pharsalus, and in Sicily because they preferred to drag out their life through unhappy wars rather than be slaughtered like sheep. They remembered the times of Marius and Sulla.

Alexander Severus overcame a conspiracy by kindness. Lampridius relates a witty history. When a certain Quintius Camillus, a most delicate senator of an ancient family, wished to rebel and aimed at tyranny, and when this had been reported to Alexander and immediately proved, Alexander summoned him to the palace and thanked him because, when good men declined it, he voluntarily undertook the care of the state that was to be imposed upon them. Then he proceeded to the Senate and called the man--who was afraid and wasted away by so great a corruption of conscience--a partner in the imperial power. He received him into the palace, admitted him to his table, and honored him with imperial ornaments better than those he himself used. And when an expedition against the barbarians was announced, he either urged him to go himself, if he wished, or to set out together with him. When Alexander made the journey on foot, he invited him to the labor; when Camillus held back after five miles, he ordered him to sit upon a horse; and when after two stages he was wearied even by the horse, he placed him in a carriage. When Camillus refused this too, whether from fear or shame--indeed, when he even abdicated the imperial power and was prepared to die--Alexander dismissed him; he commended him to the soldiers, by whom Alexander was singularly loved, and ordered him to go safely to his estates, where he lived for a long time.

In a similar manner the tyrant of Athens recalled his seditious friends. When the friends of Pisistratus had withdrawn from him, he came to them with his bedclothes. When they marveled, he said that he had come so that, if he persuaded

them, he might bring them back, but if not, he might remain with them. Severus certainly acted more rightly than if he had raged against a most delicate man unused to labor. For dangers and fears, when the counsels and examples of others are added, arouse even cowards. Otho was soft and ruined by pleasures, yet he fought bravely and accomplished death by his own hand--not bravely indeed, but nevertheless obstinately, and showing what more he could do when so prepared to die. Even Sardanapalus, an example of luxury, did not fear the flame of his burning palace.

Men must therefore not be reduced to despair, even when unarmed. Weapons remain to the despoiled; and if those are lacking, fury will furnish weapons. But if the fury has cooled, others will be inflamed for vengeance. The speech of a Campanian citizen sufficiently demonstrates this, Livy XXVI, where he introduces Vibius Virius speaking thus:

“What sort of surrender do you think that will be, by which we once surrendered ourselves and all our possessions to the Romans in order to obtain aid against the Samnites? Has it already departed from your memory at what time and in what fortune we defected from the Roman people? Have you forgotten how, in the defection, we killed with torture and insult the garrison that could have been sent away; how often and with what hostility we broke out against those besieging us; how we attacked their camp; how we summoned Hannibal to crush them; and, as the most recent act, how we sent him from here to attack Rome? Come, on the other side, review the hostile things they have done against us, so that from this you may know what you are to hope.

“When a foreign enemy was in Italy, and Hannibal was the enemy, and all things blazed with war, they omitted all else, omitted Hannibal himself, and sent both consuls and two consular armies to attack Capua. For a second year they keep us encircled and shut in and waste us with famine, themselves undergoing with us the utmost dangers and most grievous labors; often slaughtered around the rampart and trenches and nearly driven from their camp at the very end. But I omit these things. It is an old and customary matter to suffer labors and dangers in attacking an enemy city. This is the proof of execrable anger and hatred: Hannibal attacked their camp with immense forces of infantry and cavalry and captured part of it; they were not moved from the siege by so great a danger. He crossed the Volturnus and burned the Falernian territory; they were not called away by so great a disaster to their allies. He ordered hostile standards to be borne against the city of Rome itself; they despised even that storm hanging over them. He crossed the Anio and placed his camp three miles from the city; at last he approached its very walls and gates; he showed that he would take Rome from them unless they abandoned Capua--and they did not abandon it.

“If you go toward the lairs and cubs of wild beasts stirred by a blind onset of rage, you turn them aside to bring aid to their own. Rome besieged, wives and children whose wailing was almost heard even here, altars, hearths, temples of the gods, and the tombs of their ancestors profaned and violated did not turn the Romans away from Capua. So great is their eagerness to exact punishment, so great their thirst to drink our blood. And perhaps not unjustly: we too would have done the same if fortune had been given us. Therefore, since it seemed otherwise to the immortal gods, although I ought not indeed to refuse death, while I am free and master of myself I can escape by death the tortures and insults that the enemy hopes for, and by a death not only honorable but also gentle. I shall not see Appius Claudius and Quintus Fulvius supported by insolence in victory; nor shall I be dragged in chains through the city of Rome as a spectacle in a triumph, then in prison or bound to a stake, my back torn by rods, to submit my neck to the Roman axe. Nor shall I see my country destroyed and burned, nor Campanian mothers, virgins, and freeborn boys carried off for violation. They overthrew Alba, from which they themselves had sprung, from its foundations, so that neither the stock nor the memory of their origins might remain; much less can I believe that they will spare Capua, toward which they are more hostile than toward Carthage. Therefore, for those of you whose resolve it is to yield to fate before they see these many and great bitter things, a banquet has today been furnished and prepared at my house.”

Twenty-seven senators accompanied him and took poison after the banquet. How greatly could Rome have profited if it had conducted its wars more mildly! They rebelled for so long because they feared tortures.

[Printed page 751]

Furthermore, just as a sedition sometimes arises from fortuitous events, so at times it is quieted by them.

[Printed page 752]

The annals of Tacitus furnish an example. Chance softened a threatening night that was about to break forth into crime. For the moon was seen to grow dim in a clear sky. The soldier, ignorant of the reason, accepted this as an omen of present affairs and compared the failure of the star to his own labors, supposing that the things they pursued would turn out prosperously if brilliance and splendor were restored to the goddess. Therefore they made a din with sounding bronze and a harmony of trumpets and horns, rejoicing or grieving as it became brighter or darker. After clouds arose and obstructed it from view, and it was believed to have been buried in darkness, as minds once struck by superstition are changeable, they lamented that eternal labor was portended for them and that the gods abhorred their crimes. If such events obtain a true or skillful interpreter, they effect the greatest change in the rude crowd; if a malicious one, they customarily make it more savage.

It is customary, if the authors of seditions cannot be removed, to win them over by gifts and soften them with the hope of pardon. For if they hope for pardon and trust that they will obtain it by a lawful way, they will easily turn their sails backward and be reconciled to the state. If, moreover, they abandon those whom they have stirred up, all things will soon become tranquil; for when the wind has fallen, the sea lies placid. Nor is it contrary to the authority of the prince to strengthen public peace by the safety of one wicked man, to remove civil wars, and, so that many good men may be preserved, to preserve even some wicked men. No one treats this wound more easily than the man who made it.

Nevertheless, I would not wish this to be done in the manner in which the sophist spoke. For when the law was that whoever had moved a sedition should die and whoever had quieted one should receive a reward, and the man who stirred it up had himself quieted it, a question arose concerning the reward. The sophist replied: "Which comes first, to move a sedition or to quiet it?" When the answer was "to move it," he said: "Let him first die, therefore, and then, if it can be done, let him receive the reward." Far from the state be public fraud, by which the fellowship of the human race is altogether dissolved. Let the prince remember that it is much more beautiful and praiseworthy to make a friend from an enemy than to kill an enemy. The people drove Cimon into exile, but, when the necessity of the state pressed, it acted to have him recalled. Gracchus prevented Scipio from being led to prison, although before this they had lived as bitter enemies.

But at this point the man who has been injured must be warned to propose and maintain a reconciliation truly, not feignedly. Antigonus treacherously punished with death the man persuaded by his promises. Leucon likewise postponed his vengeance but exacted it grievously. Certain trierarchs were attempting treason. He ordered them to remain quiet, lest, if the enemy conquered, it should seem that a calumny had been constructed against them; meanwhile he adorned their relatives with dignities and prefectures, but when the war was ended he killed them all. Agathocles killed all the suspected men, up to five hundred, at a banquet, after he himself had played the flute and danced at the banquet. Polyaeus V.

If the authors of sedition can be recalled to duty neither because they are elated by prosperity nor through fear of punishments, occasions of discord and distrust sought among them disarm the seditious. It is exceedingly customary to render the enemy's commanders suspect. But it is a strong protection, especially when the rioters are governed by the command of several nobles or of the people. How easily did the envoys of the Tarquins incline noble young men, even the Brutuses themselves, toward the kings? Livy I: "A king was a human being, from whom one could obtain something wherever there was need of right or of injury; there was room for favor and for a benefit; he could both become angry and forgive, and knew the distinction between friend and enemy. The laws were a deaf and inexorable thing, more salutary and better for the needy than for the powerful; they had no relaxation or pardon if one exceeded the limit. Amid so many human errors, it was dangerous to live by innocence alone."

This is more readily done in sedition than in war, for many reasons. Behold how great a crime: not merely to act so that kings might be brought back upon equal conditions, but, when a reward was offered from the other side, to betray everything. Behold: in that very year they brought themselves to betray their liberated country, their father the

liberator, the consulship that had arisen from the Junian house, the senators, and the plebs to a king who was formerly proud and was then a hostile exile. Rebels of other nations will do the same if there is a reward for the work. If they do not, nevertheless they can be rendered mutually suspect, when some nourish rivalries against others and exercise private enmities; when some come to honors through canvassing, others are rejected, and merits are not weighed, but wealth or affinities. Hence come the offenses and indignation of many men against kings.

When subjects seek from a magistrate something not unjust or wicked by nature, it must be granted in such a manner that he does not appear compelled by force or fear--or else one must yield altogether; for it is better to escape the blow than to be wounded. When the Roman Senate had granted the people the power of creating military tribunes, all those created were patricians; the bitterness of the plebs showed itself not so much in the execution as in maintaining the right. But if a king or Senate, when it sees some one man employing largesse, wishes to allure the people by its own beneficence, it will also render the attempt of others ineffectual. For several men can give many more things, and give them from the public treasury, than private persons can. Xenophon yielded his horse to a common soldier who murmured against him and ran up a mountain on foot. His fellow soldiers, indignant and stirred by the danger, urged Xenophon to preserve himself for the duties of a commander and execrated the detractor.

Those who desire revolution must frequently be confronted with this fact: the men whom they themselves place over affairs are not better than the others. If this is done suitably and opportunely, a bridle can easily be imposed upon all seditions. For since the most loathsome men stir up sedition, they can hardly be judged worthy of command. There is a remarkable example in Livy XXVI:

“Thence he turned his course to Capua, which was luxuriating in long prosperity and the indulgence of fortune. Above all amid all its corruptions, Pacuvius Calavius, himself a noble and popular man but one who had obtained wealth by evil arts, had rendered the Senate subject both to himself and to the plebs by the license of a plebs exercising liberty without measure. When he happened to hold the highest magistracy in the year in which affairs had gone badly at Lake Trasimene, he judged that the plebs, long hostile to the Senate, would dare a great crime when an opportunity for revolution arose: if Hannibal came to that place with his victorious army, it would slaughter the Senate and deliver Capua to the Carthaginians. Although a wicked man, he was not utterly ruined; since he preferred to rule over an unharmed rather than an overthrown state and believed that none could remain unharmed when deprived of public counsel, he devised a plan by which he might both preserve the Senate and render it subject to himself and the plebs.

“Having summoned the Senate, he first declared that a plan of defection from the Romans would in no way be pleasing to him unless it were necessary--for he had children by a daughter of Appius Claudius and had given his daughter to Livius in marriage at Rome. Yet a much greater and more fearful danger was at hand: the plebs did not aim to abolish the Senate from the city by defection, but wished by slaughtering the Senate to deliver the state, emptied of it, to Hannibal and the Carthaginians. He could free them from this danger if they entrusted themselves to him and, forgetting their contests in the state, trusted him. When all, overcome by fear, entrusted themselves to him, he said: ‘I shall shut you in the senate-house and, as though I too were a participant in the contemplated crime, shall find a way for your safety by approving counsels which I would oppose in vain. Receive from me whatever pledge you yourselves wish for this.’

[Printed page 753]

“When a pledge had been given, he went out, ordered the senate-house to be closed, and left a guard in the vestibule so that no one might approach the senate-house without his order or be able to leave it. Then, having summoned the people to an assembly, he said: ‘Campanians, the power you have often desired of exacting punishment from a wicked and detestable Senate you now possess safely and freely--not by storming the houses of individuals in a tumult, houses which they protect by guards of clients and slaves, with the greatest danger to yourselves. Accept them all, shut up in the senate-house, alone and unarmed. Do nothing hurriedly or perhaps rashly. I shall give you the right of pronouncing sentence concerning the life of each, so that each may pay the penalties he has deserved. But before all things you

ought so to indulge your anger that you regard your safety and advantage as more important than anger. For you hate these senators, as I think, but you do not wish to have no Senate at all. Assuredly either a king--which must be abominated--or a Senate, which is the sole counsel of a free city, must be possessed. Therefore two things must be done by you at once: you must both remove the old Senate and elect a new one. I shall order the senators to be summoned individually, and I shall consult you concerning the life of each; what you determine concerning each will be done. But before punishment is exacted from the guilty man, you will elect into his place a brave and active man as a new senator.'

"Then he sat down and, when the names had been covered in an urn, ordered the man whose name first fell out by lot to be summoned and brought out from the senate-house. When the name was heard, each man cried that he was evil and wicked and worthy of punishment. Then Pacuvius said: 'I see what sentence has been given concerning this man. He is cast out as evil and wicked; choose a good and just senator.' At first there was silence, from want of a better man to be proposed. Then, when someone, laying aside shame, named somebody, at once a much greater clamor arose: some said they did not know him; others objected now his disgraceful acts, now his lowliness and sordid poverty, or his shameful craft or manner of gain. This happened much more with the second and third senator, so that it appeared that the men repented of the senator himself, but lacked anyone to substitute in his place. For there was no purpose in naming the same men, who had been named for nothing other than to hear reproaches; and all the others were much more lowly and obscure than those who first occurred to their memory."

And indeed, among so many seditions and disturbances of all nations, this must especially be noted: the constitution of the state has very rarely been made better. For if those who rise against the magistrates and citizens are conquered, the ancient form of the state remains; if they conquer, since they are worse than the conquered, they administer it worse. This is the ordinary disaster of the seditious; and I appeal most freely to all history. Whoever considers the outcomes will pronounce it an oracle.

CHAPTER XVI

Various Methods of Restraining Seditions Employed by Different Men

[Printed page 753]

It has seemed good to join together the various methods by which princes have met seditions, and to stuff them, as it were, into a medley--not because they are all to be approved and employed, for some confound everything by malicious deceit, perjury, and cruelty, but because it is nevertheless permissible to fashion similar measures by imitation according to that manner, without crime, for the public safety.

Pompey, as Frontinus relates in Book II, chapter 11, when he regarded the people of Catina as suspect and feared that they would not receive a garrison, asked them to allow the sick among his men meanwhile to recover with them; thereafter, having sent the bravest men in the appearance of invalids, he occupied and held the city. It was indeed moderate in that he did not kill anyone; it was dissembling and fraudulent in that he sent strong men in place of sick men.

Dissembling and fraudulent also was Caesar, who discharged the seditious from service, and then, after the instigators had been killed, received those discharged men again. Hanno acted thoroughly wickedly and with Punic faith. Four thousand men had begun to riot because their pay had not been rendered; first he deceived them by promises, and then betrayed them to the Romans. For, having promised that he would compensate for the injury of the delay by liberality, he brought them back to quiet and obedience. Having done this, he sent them out for plunder and at the same time, through an agent under the guise of a deserter, informed Otacilius that the Gauls would go out to plunder. When ambushes had been placed by him, they were all slaughtered, and Hanno was freed both from the danger of sedition and from payment of their wages, but was bound by the greater crime of perfidy.

With equal perfidy Cassander entrapped Nicanor, who was estranged from him, when he was prefect of Munychia. Lysimachus was much more cruel, because he raged against innocent and pitiable men. Six hundred Autariatae had been stripped of their baggage. He suspected that, as men who had been exasperated, they would stir up a sedition; and so, after they had been led out by fraud, he slaughtered them all. Those of Enna who were killed by Pinarius can be judged to have been killed justly, since they were already contriving a revolt. For when they demanded the keys back, he ordered them to assemble in the theater and deliberate; when they persisted in their opinion there, he ordered them to be killed. Nor can the Spartans be accused of cruelty when, without fraud and falsehood, they sent a plotter into an ambush.

Cinadon had laid plots against the ephors. They sent him into a certain district of Laconia, ostensibly for the sake of a secret affair; there, after being tortured by cavalymen sent ahead for this purpose, he disclosed his accomplices, whom the ephors immediately killed. Polyaeus, Book II. When three thousand men had revolted from Antigonus, he sent Leonidas to them under the pretense of desertion; Leonidas first persuaded them not to join one another, and thereafter betrayed them themselves.

When the Macedonians frequently rioted against Alexander but the Persians loved him, he elevated the latter, gave them Persian commanders and Persian reinforcements. Diodorus Siculus, Book XVII. By that transfer to the Persians he restrained open violence, but not the monstrous hatreds by which he was afterwards overwhelmed and drank poison.

Julius Caesar broke up a sedition by fortunate rashness, something which can be done only if the man against whom they rage possesses great authority. Pompey, Caesar's son-in-law, did the same. He was a man of great spirit. When the soldiers threatened that they would seize the money which was to be carried in the triumph, and when his friends advised him that he should instead divide it among them himself, he answered that he would die rather than succumb

to military license. After chastising the soldiers in a stern address, he threw the laurelled fasces before them so that they might begin their plundering with these. These men acted thus for their own safety, but Antigonus for another's. For he skillfully quieted a sedition of the soldiers against Antipater. They were demanding their pay from a man who was destitute, and very little prevented them from stoning him. Antigonus advanced over a bridge like a man about to address an assembly; they yielded from his path and followed to hear what he wished to say. Meanwhile, while he defended Antipater in a long speech, the latter escaped. Polyaeus, Book IV.

Hamilcar's stratagem against deserters and those contriving sedition was remarkable, especially because it was free of Punic malice. When Gauls in great numbers were deserting from him to the Romans, he ordered his most trustworthy

[Printed page 754]

men to feign desertion and to kill the Romans who came to receive them. Thus neither did others flee, nor did the Romans receive fugitives.

Eumenes also acted in a civic manner, for by borrowing money from his rivals he defended his own safety; for lest they lose their money, they protected him with great fidelity. In that way certain cities in Germany were drawn into an alliance in war, lest they lose what they had already expended. Leucon preserved himself in the same manner, but added a falsehood. For, being assailed by plots, he received money on loan from merchants, alleging that his enemies had been surrendered to him through a betrayal. After receiving the money, he acknowledged the plots and took the merchants as bodyguards; he defeated the plotters.

It seems more proper to impostors than to princes to meet seditions, both civil and military, by forged letters as though written by a counterfeiter's hand; yet many have also employed this. For commanders themselves are accustomed to invent false plans, ambushes, betrayals, flights for refuge, and panic terrors, so that the soldier may be prepared for everything and may become thoroughly acquainted with the thoughts of all. When letters concerning Eumenes' life had been scattered in his camp, he gave thanks because no one had sought the price of the crime, and added that he himself had scattered the letters for the sake of making a test. Besides, he said that Antigonus did not wish to conquer in such a way as to establish in his own person a most wicked example.

I marvel that Alexander the Great, who professed such strength of mind, cast himself down to such base things as to pry into the secrets of all his men who had written letters to Macedonia. For when, while stationed in Hyrcania, he had advised them to write letters to their people with the envoys whom he was sending into Macedonia, he arranged for the letters to be recalled from the journey and read them; and against those whom he found to have written anything against him he conducted himself as an enemy. It was an altogether dangerous business, and one which compelled the king to be cruel. Polyaeus, Book IV; Curtius and others.

Ingeniously, Iphicrates equipped a fleet in hostile attire and, when he was received with unrestrained eagerness by those whom he suspected, plundered the city. By an alien dress Datanes deceived both his own men and his enemies; for, when he knew that plots were being laid against him, he fought in another's dress in battle, and thus was able both to remain concealed and to mark the plotters.

The things tyrants have done in this kind are abominable. Augustus was defiled by adulteries with matrons; yet his friends excused him more disgracefully by saying that, because he was assailed by many plots, he sought out the secrets of husbands by means of those shameful acts. Dionysius was more cruel in this kind. For he enlisted female musicians and prostitutes, and, after they had been tortured, inquired what their lovers had said concerning the tyranny; he afterwards killed those who had spoken dangerously.

He also sometimes pretended that he was dead or ill, so that he might explore men's inclinations. Dionysius certainly spread a report among the soldiers that he had been killed; he then slaughtered those who had shown joy at the event. He also did the same when he had published abroad that he was in extreme danger; for, when many men rejoiced, he came forth with his bodyguard and ordered them to be slaughtered. By a theatrical device as well, after hearing an

itinerant performer, he avoided real dangers and terrified those who were contriving sedition. A certain man at Syracuse professed that he knew an art by which plotters could be recognized and guarded against. Having been admitted to Dionysius, he said, "If you say that you know plotters beforehand." Dionysius, after giving great rewards to the teacher, boasted that he had learned a wonderful art of escaping plots, and was safer because of it. But this was the imposture of a madman; for that same man who taught Dionysius such a secret disclosed it to others also. Nor is it likely that it was betrayed by Dionysius, since by it he could be safer only so long as it was kept silent.

To impede a sedition it has often been profitable to conceal it or to show oneself trustful toward the very men involved. Frederick, having understood that the men of San Miniato were looking toward rebellion, indicated that he wished to place treasures and captives among them. In place of treasure he sent concealed weapons, and for captives, brave soldiers in bonds, who occupied the town and brought it back under Frederick's dominion. Thus Eumenes, when he was being neglected by Antigenes and Teutamus, commanders of the Argyraspids--for they did not come to his tent--lest this evil spread to others, said that he had been warned by a twofold dream to erect a tent for Alexander and to conduct all business in it. Thus he obtained the result that even his rivals were compelled to come. Polyaeus, Book IV.

Among men who have been stirred up and are powerful, too, it is advantageous to conceal what one knows. Antipater acted cautiously with the earlier army of the Naxians, who, when Alexander's death was heard, had assembled to assail his dominion. Pretending that he did not know with what intention they had come, he thanked them because they had assembled to bring aid to Alexander against the Lacedaemonians, and added that he would write this to the king. But because their service was not necessary to him at present, he urged them to depart for their homes; and by this assertion he dispelled the danger that threatened from the revolution. Frontinus, Book II, chapter 11. This has place especially when others are in danger of rioting after the example of those who desert. Agesilaus arranged for the shields of fugitives to be removed by night, lest it become known to the soldiers that there was so much perfidy and so great a multitude of deserters.

Although there is much importance in the discord of enemies, nevertheless they are not easily to be provoked, for they readily unite against a common danger. Therefore one must rather act so that they are separated, as Dionysius did when he wished to deprive the veterans of their pay. A sedition was stirred up, but he professed that he would employ the older men in guarding fortifications and composed the tumult for the present. Afterwards, when he had divided them among the garrisons, he took their pay away from them while they were separated.

It is also a wicked method of preventing seditions to break peoples by luxury, something which many kings have done. When Xerxes ordered the Babylonians to devote themselves to pleasures and lay down their arms, Croesus the Lydians, and Phalaris the Leontines, thought that they should be restrained by the same bond of pleasures. But it is not safe; for when morals have been corrupted by that manner of life, many squander their own property and are therefore compelled to undertake revolutions. In addition, they become unwarlike and poor, so that they are able to assist the prince neither by labor nor money.

A sedition has often been composed by the intervention of holy and religious men. When the inhabitants of Walcheren had obtained, with the aid of Saint Willibrord, a noble and miraculous victory against Robert the Younger, son of Baldwin, Count of Flanders, and then afterwards, in a civil and intestine war--the cause is not stated--had been divided into the parties of factions, they raged mutually against one another, so that they killed the more noble chief men of the island. No one had free opportunity of entering or leaving; no one had the ability to approach sacred buildings or sacrifices, even on the very day of Parascève, without an array of arms, an assembly of fellow tribesmen, and a band of attendants. Nor was there an end or measure to such fury and discord until, after many funerals of their own people, by common counsel and embassy, the abbot Thiofrid, the lover of Christ--these are Victor's words--was summoned from Echternach and composed the minds of the citizens by miracles, prayers, and authority, and with great labor restored peace.

[Printed page 755]

Thus writes the Reverend Lord Abbot of Echternach, whose *Flowers of the Epitaph of the Saints* our Father John Roberti, after almost 550 years, first published at Luxembourg in the year 1619 and illustrated with his most learned notes; and they append the aforesaid history, described most copiously, to the life of Thiofrid. It is worthy to be read by the heretical and Catholic inhabitants of Walcheren, for the confusion of perfidy or the confirmation of faith. What religion could do among Christians, superstition could sometimes do among the gentiles. When the Egyptians had revolted through hatred of Persian cruelty, Darius came at the time when they were mourning the dead Apis and proclaimed that he would give one hundred talents of gold to the man who found a new Apis. Marveling at the king's piety, they returned to obedience. Polyænus, Book VII.

Betrays must be met by enticing suspected men with a price and a greater hope. Thus Marcellus drew over to himself Bantiſ of Nola, who inclined toward the Carthaginians and was agitating the minds of his fellow citizens. It is a matter of the greatest skill to turn betrayal to one's own advantage. Thus Arsames, himself a seditious man, met both betrayal and sedition. A prefect of cavalry had promised that in the engagement he would go over to the other side. Arsames, after holding an inquiry about him by night, discovered the crime; and so he clothed another man in the prefect's garments and equipped his most faithful soldiers with cavalry arms. When the signal was given by the enemy, he ordered them to cross over and cut down their rear; by this stratagem he obtained a distinguished victory. Polyænus, Book VII.

It is especially important to impress hatred of a betrayer upon men's minds. Antigonus and Caesar loved betrayal but hated betrayers. Philip loved men who were going to betray, but when they had already betrayed, he hated them exceedingly. Indeed, he also hated those who were going to betray, but pretended to love them. Lysimachus rewarded Andragathus, the betrayer of Amphipolis, magnificently, but afterwards killed him by torture. For these words especially agree with such men:

May no land, no seas be able

To receive them.

Men for whom there is nowhere a place among the Danaans, and the

Dardanians themselves, moreover, are hostile and demand punishments with blood.

CHAPTER XVII

Public Peace Has Been Disturbed Not by Catholics, but by the Seditions of Sectarians

[Printed page 755]

Both my purpose and the bitterness of the times compel me to treat many matters concerning the composing of the seditions of our country. That there is so great a disturbance in the Empire, so great a distrust among the princes, and so great a mutual hostility toward the Imperial Majesty as there was not even in the most exasperated times is taught by the diets and public assemblies. The beginnings of almost all of them contain complaints about discord, contention, lawsuits, and distrust, while the negotiators have thus far sought remedies. Yet it appears marvelous to foreign nations, and posterity will scarcely believe it, that now for ninety years peace has been negotiated among princely colleagues and relatives, in the sight of emperors who are most desirous of peace, while alienation of minds and petty wars nevertheless endure--especially since war would be equally ruinous and mournful to either party, and since no one comes to those diets who does not profess that he is most desirous of peace.

I inquire into the cause of so great an evil; for just as in medicine it is necessary for the remedies to know the cause of the disease, so a certain harmful humor enclosed in this vast body of the most august Empire must be recognized. In various places and with diverse effect it disturbs the duly tempered harmony and concord of the limbs and members; some it inflames contrary to nature, some it wastes away, and some it tears apart by gnawing; and while it assails the individual parts, it infests all alike. I shall disclose in what part this evil is situated and reigns.

Accordingly, I determine as follows. The causes of all discords, hatreds, civil wars, and rebellion in the Roman Empire are the Lutheran and Calvinist preachers, by whatever name they are called and in whatever sect they live. Nor are the Anabaptists innocent; but because their audacity has once been broken, their malice now lacks force and arms. Therefore they now cover themselves with a fox's skin until they acquire a lion's and grow strong enough to carry the matter through. I ask the reader so to regard and weigh the reasons that he does not pronounce sentence from a preoccupied judgment.

The first reason. For conserving the Empire and preserving peace, the authority of the ruler is necessary; it is stronger against rebellions and contempt than all citadels and even arms. Majesty is the safeguard of empire. The preaching innovators, so far as lay in them, dissolved all its force, and attempted to bring the matter to such a point that there would be neither admiration nor fear of the highest power, the two things by which authority, which is the prop of governments, is sustained. They therefore undertook to cut the sinews of the Empire; thence audacity broke the peace in the hope of impunity, and that enticement gradually drew many men so that they now drew authority to themselves.

οὐ γὰρ πεφύκασιν αἰδοῖ πειθαρχεῖν, ἀλλὰ φόβῳ· οὐδ' ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν φαύλων διὰ τὸ αἰσχρόν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὰς τιμωρίας.

For they have not been born in such a way that they obey shame, but so that they obey fear; nor that they abstain from wicked things because of their disgracefulness, but because of punishments and penalty.

But how shall I show that the innovators blunted the edge of august authority, detracted from majesty, and befouled it with the contempt of every most worthless man? This indeed will hardly be laborious. In the volumes of Luther there are entire invectives against princes, collected even by Catholics. It is not my intention to report all of them--indeed, scarcely any--because Luther's authority has not yet been abolished from the minds of all, and esteem for legitimate power is languishing more than it ought. It is sufficient to have taught the matter by one or two examples.

In his little book *On the War against the Turks*, he denies that the emperor is the head of the Christian state and defender of the Gospel or of the faith. The Church, he says, assuredly ought to have another defender than the emperor

and kings, for they are the worst enemies of Christianity and the faith. In the little book *On Secular Power*, he says that princes are for the most part either the foremost fools or the most abominable scoundrels.

But lest we attribute these things to Luther's fervor alone, behold that most timorous man Philip. In an epistle to Lord Burchard Mithobius: "Although I have often learned with great sorrow that the minds τῶν ἀρχόντων [of rulers] are exceedingly inconstant"--he speaks of his own rulers, whose diligence in plundering monasteries he also censures. "Most princes even before this time have been much more diligent in plundering monasteries than in establishing παροικίας [parishes] and schools. But let us await the coming year, which perhaps will shake from our heroes their lethargy, games, pleasures, loves, and quarrels. Thus far some have raged against churches, others have invented corruptions of doctrine,

[Printed page 756]

contended with obscene pamphlets, invented tasteless dialogues, delighted themselves with venereal pleasures, neglected churches and schools, and contended in ambition; now Nemesis draws near an enemy who is not to be despised."

And in an epistle to Milichius, he says that cities have been deserted and betrayed by cowardly princes. What the Calvinists think about the princes of the Empire and the emperor himself I have already shown often enough: namely, that the Empire is the apocalyptic beast, the slayer of the saints; that to admire the Empire excessively and to call it August is to adore the Devil or Dragon.

But this doctrine was invented for overthrowing the Empire. Therefore the preachers endeavor to overthrow the Empire. But because that world cannot be inverted without a crash, and so great a body cannot be transferred without dissolution, so great a ruin must necessarily be preceded by many and most violent convulsions.

The second reason. Those by whose arts the power of the Empire is attacked and weakened furnish the cause of tumults and seditions. For what is anger without strength? What is the shadow of a great name? That Empire which rests upon the mere opinion of the multitude and esteem for antiquity cannot stand; power, wealth, arms, counsels, and alliances must be present, or else the first man who has dared to push the column dislocated from its base will overthrow it. But by the insidious and also open machinations, preparations, and battles of the innovators, the power of the Empire has been afflicted; and the fact that it has not yet fallen it owes to its emperors, to the Catholic princes, to certain Protestant princes as well as certain free states. It credits its preservation to no preacher.

What? Would those pitiable men disturb the Empire? As though there were no danger even to the strongest from the weak. For great frauds there is no need of a great spirit, but of an evil one. When affairs have been disturbed, Sinon as victor mingles fires. What lions and bears can do, vipers and blister beetles can do also. The acrimony of the poison compensates for weakness of strength. I prove that the preachers are implicated in this fault.

For first they attempted to divert, wear away, and ruin wealth--the sinews of war, the ornaments of peace, and arms.

For they converted the estates, possessions, and ornaments of very many churches to other uses and, as Melanchthon bears witness, were diligent in plundering monasteries. But that wealth was taken from the Empire, because old tenants who were faithful subjects of the Empire were ordered to migrate, without right and without legitimate process. Monasteries, canonries, prelatures, and bishoprics were the plunder of secular princes; names, places, and the valuation will tell to whose courts annual accounts are rendered concerning the spoil of the Lord. A double loss arose from this for the Empire. For neither were monetary subsidies sent by those despoiled, and the others, who were terrified by the example of those who had been plundered, while their fortunes hung in uncertainty and depended upon the disposition of their neighbors, were weaker for defending the state in which they saw themselves oppressed, having been deserted by the fellowship of their colleagues.

Much of its former power therefore departed in this way by the counsel of the preachers. Yet their own greed deceived them; for when they saw that they were heard with inclined ears by princes and cultivated by the people, they did not

doubt that they would be received into the dignities of the deposed prelates and would become prosperous after being begging and itinerant versifiers. But they were mistaken. When the matter came to the point, the treasury prevailed; they themselves were sprinkled with a slender little portion, lest they bark, not so that they might be satisfied.

By this convulsion, therefore, the tributes and revenues of the Empire were diminished, that is, the ornaments of peace and the supports of war. For neither can the repose of the Empire be possessed without arms, nor arms without pay, nor pay without tributes. But what system of tributes will there be if those who transferred the possessions of others to themselves have no will to contribute, while the despoiled are protected by *πενία* [poverty] and *ἀπορία* [want], divinities of ill omen?

Secondly, in so many diets and assemblies, which have now been multiplied for ninety years, so much expense has been expended upon lawsuits and contentions and upon mutual skirmishes as would have sufficed for a Turkish war. I appeal to the princes' very accounts and to the expenses made upon journeys, envoys, and diets.

Thirdly, with Luther as its author and Müntzer as its agent, the Peasants' War was kindled, in which fortresses, monasteries, and churches were overthrown, and at last the obstinate peasants were destroyed by slaughter. Whoever has not learned to reckon this among the losses does not know that fields and farmers are the foundation of the treasury.

Fourthly, Luther and his followers stirred up intestine wars; upon these was incurred expense and poured out blood with which Hungary and Thrace, even Constantinople itself, could have been acquired. To wit, after various disasters, almost all non-Catholic Germany conspired against the emperor. They record that there were eighty thousand infantry and ten thousand cavalry in the camp of the rebels, besides garrisons of towns and the remaining equipment. Why should I then relate other lesser things, such as the devastation of Brandenburg, the wars of Cologne and Alsace, and the rest? The beginnings of all those things were stirred up by the innovators while they attempted to wrest ancient possessions from the orthodox.

Nor yet does restless novelty, impatient of peace, stop here. How often has Belgium been aided with money and men? How often have the Huguenots in France been strengthened against their own kings? The fields of France and Belgium are still growing fat with the corpses of Germans. Who can wonder that the power and strength of the Empire, fighting against itself and letting blood so often, are drained away? Who can wonder that it has neither spirit nor resources against the Turks, when everything is expended at home?

Consider even the present condition: Germany must be drained by daily expenses. For behold the standards, equal eagles, and javelins threatening javelins. Adversaries intent upon an occasion have sometimes terrified Catholics by sudden expeditions; at last they conspired among themselves and entered into alliances with foreigners. And so, with the emperor approving, they impelled the Catholics mutually to bind themselves by a holy confederation necessary for protecting their affairs that remained. Movements therefore arise from both sides: war is prepared there, defense here; money is contributed even in peace; commanders for war are chosen; pay for future wars is given to centurions; provisions and equipment are procured. German felicity would have deserved congratulation if it armed itself in this manner against the enemy. Now, through fear of neighbors who, at the trumpet call of their preachers, clamor for wars and arms and promise priestly robes to the soldier, those expenses must be incurred.

The Empire therefore collapses beneath its own mass and is arrayed against itself; hence it is weak against foreigners and, its strength poured out in domestic conflicts, will be conquered by an unwarlike enemy unless caution is taken. But what is the origin of so great an evil? Whence comes so enduring a mutual hostility, sometimes making war, always threatening, never thinking rightly? From those who lie upon the goods of Catholics, for whom it is too much that bishops live, who, having been baited by the plundering of the Church, regard whatever is denied

[Printed page 757]

them as something snatched away.

The Empire of Germany was formerly strong not only by its own majesty and might, but also by the love and alliances of its neighbors. The innovators undertook to cut off these aids and altogether strip us of the assistance of allies. Faithful Italy and Spain have always furnished the strongest assistance against the Ottomans, kingdoms which scorn truces and peace with the Turks; we read that a ready force, and one especially feared by the Turks, came from Belgium; nor must there be doubt about a French force, since the kings have confirmed friendship by affinity.

What do the innovators do here? The pontiff is the beast; the Florentine, the Mantuan, and the Spaniard fornicate with the Babylonian harlot. You, Briton, burn Italy, kill, devour flesh. But what? While the pontiff, the princes of Italy, and the Spaniards in part oppose their own bodies for the Empire, in part support soldiers at their own expense, contribute money, and make vows, do you lay plots? The Lutherans accuse the Calvinists of inclination toward the Turk; they warn their princes to adhere to the Catholics rather than to the Zwinglians, because the pope wages wars for the Empire, while the Calvinists deny subsidies to Caesar and carry the Eastern Antichrist under their breast, as I proved in the book *On Syncretism, or False Peace*.

Who, therefore, disturbs the peace? Is it the man who says that the most faithful allies must be retained in friendship? Or the man who neither thinks of contributing to the war himself and seeks an enemy throughout the whole world for the defenders of the Empire?

[Printed page 757]

The third reason. Those are guilty of violating peace who have taught men to occupy the possessions of others by injury; or, if they allege some element of right and equity in that usurpation, who have entered upon possession by no judgment and no order, who flee the sentence of courts, and persuade men to possess and persevere by force or deceit. These have been the pursuits of the preachers, these their endeavors from their very cradle.

And concerning the Zwinglians, indeed, the matter is public: in the Diet of Augsburg itself they boasted of armies, alliances of foreign nations, and divisions of bishoprics, as is found in Melancthon's epistle to Philip, Prince of Hesse. But what need is there of my proof? Let the acts of the Imperial Chamber at Speyer be inspected: supplications, formal declarations of right, appeals, pending suits, and inveterate suits. Catholics complain that possessions have been snatched from them wrongfully, by force and deceit, through the ministers; they wish to try the remedies of law; they are and have been the plaintiffs; they arraign their adversaries for extortion; Caesar assigns judges of recovery. There is therefore no doubt that those men gave the beginning to the suit who drove from ancestral estates a possessor in good faith, the peaceful possessor of an undoubted inheritance.

"But the Catholics were unjust possessors; therefore the lordships had to be vindicated and transferred to us." I shall consider the question of right later. If they appeal to law, let them come under law to a formal joining of hands; let the matter be decided by law, and let them not proceed by force alone. But why were those possessors unjust who were possessors by the gift, foundation, and laws of Charlemagne, Henry, and other pious emperors and princes? There was a common interpretation of imperial laws, a common understanding of municipal laws, a common use and practice of law, and the decisions of tribunals. According to this law they were legitimate possessors, quietly and without challenge occupying dominion over their own property.

By the counsel of the innovators, right or the interpretation of right was changed, and the minds of princes were changed; with the new religion, the old form of the state ceased. By confiscation, fine, exile, and plunder, by a new and most unjust law, proceedings were taken against those whom the customary and long-enduring protections of the laws defended. The private treasury seized so many bishoprics, abbeys, colleges, monasteries, hospitals, and schools; for to the very ministers of the robberies, as to hunting dogs for sharpening their keenness, small particles from the plunder were divided.

Who moved the war? Was it the man who invoked the laws and the magistrate while he was being expelled? Or truly the man who drove an old tenant out without law? You snatch everything from its ancient owners because they did not

embrace a new opinion which fought against ancient laws and customs, and do you accuse them of violating peace? "Let them become Evangelicals," you will say, "and they may keep their own property for themselves." I do not know whether they could protect their possessions by changing their faith. This I know: it was provided by no ancient law that possessions were safe and preserved intact only for those who call themselves Evangelicals. This new law, therefore, which is opposed to all ancient rights, customs, and privileges, was the cause of the discords.

The fourth reason. Those men gave the cause of seditions and tumults whom the legitimate magistrate condemned for violating peace, for whose restraint assemblies were proclaimed, laws enacted, and judgments instituted--not those in response to whose tears and prayers these things were granted, for the relieving of whose calamities and the mitigating of whose exiles these protections were prepared.

You expelled me from my possession by your law, stripped me of my goods and annual revenues, and punished even my reputation. I lie at Caesar's feet; I implore the noble office of the judge and the assistance of the laws. What remains except that at your command Caesar should order me to be led away as a violator of public peace? I possessed by ancient law and faith; I was expelled by no law. I complain of this to Caesar, and behold, I hear that I am seditious.

What, therefore, of Caesar and the Roman Empire itself? The Pandects, the Code, and the Novels protect me; the Golden Bull of Charles IV, issued in the year 1356, protects me; the Reformation of Frederick III in the year 1442 protects me; the declaration made by Maximilian I in the year 1500 defends me.

But Charles V identifies you as the author of the discords at Worms in the year 1521, at Augsburg in the years 1521 and 1530, at Speyer in the years 1526 and 1529, and in the years 1542 and 1544, and in innumerable other places; he confirms the judgment of the Chamber and forbids plunderings and spoliations. A General Council is sought and awaited by all; meanwhile I was expelled before the Council and am not restored after the Council. Despoiled before I was accused, amid punishment and exile I await the sentence of the Council to which you too appealed. Let me be permitted to grieve over these things with myself. Why do you insult me as I lie fallen and attempt to transfer to me the fault for violated peace? You were unwilling to approach the Council, deservedly so, because you possessed without right. Invited to the Colloquy of Worms in the year 1557, you departed, overcome by the discord and mutual hatred of your own men; meanwhile each party lives upon my plunder, although opposed to the other. Am I the cause of the discord because I did not immediately die out?

The fifth reason. Let us look at the acts themselves. After they had occupied many goods of Catholics, in the year 1541, lest war arise, the Catholics were compelled to suspend the actions which they possessed against the invaders, as was established in the Decree of Regensburg--but under this law, that the hands of the Evangelicals should now stop and that they should not carry out new spoliations. But who could stop men hurrying toward other things, always with a new thirst? For what did princes not learn from those Harpies? Scenting gain from every occasion, the preachers advised that our wings be cut in such a way that they could not grow again; every fold and every designation for plundering was invented.

[Printed page 758]

For in the meantime the bishoprics of Magdeburg, Bremen, Halberstadt, Verden, Osnabrück, Minden, Lübeck, Utrecht, Cammin, Schwerin, Gdańsk, Brandenburg, Ratzeburg, Schleswig, Hamelburg, and Lebus were snatched away, and likewise both celebrated and small monasteries. Nothing else remained except that they carry everything away together with the dust. Priests were expelled and temples laid waste, contrary to the agreements and covenants and to Caesar's mandates issued at Speyer in the year 1544. Caesar therefore decreed that he would appoint commissioners because of the ecclesiastical jurisdictions and goods that had been invaded. Certainly they had not been invaded by us, but by the violators of peace.

The disaster of Germany then followed, when they openly rebelled against Caesar. We assuredly did not arm Saxony and Hesse. We neither impede reviews of the Chamber nor call Caesar's power into doubt, something repeatedly done

at the last diets by the envoys of the Correspondents. Concerning this matter, let the acts published by them be seen, and the author who wrote *On the Disturbed Condition of the Empire*.

The sixth reason. Those by whose counsel war, plots, and betrayals were made against Caesar violated the peace; but the years 1544, 1545, 1546, and those following teach that the innovators did this.

Deservedly, therefore, Catholics also wage war on their own behalf. For if the Landgrave rightly told Caesar at Frankfurt in the year 1546 that nothing else had been transacted among the Protestants except how they might both remain in their own religion and repel unjust force, who can doubt that Caesar necessarily had to wage war in order to repel unjust force from so many subjects? Who can deny that a just cause of war was given to the Catholics, when they experienced that they were stripped of goods contrary to Caesar's edicts and laws and deprived of the exercise of the ancient religion?

Did not certain princes deny Caesar the appellation of August Majesty? Otherwise, they thought it was not permissible to wage war against him. Sleidan, Book XVII. As though, truly, once you have taken away the name of authority, it is then permissible to fight against the magistrate. At the same time they stirred up both the king of France and the Swiss against Caesar, but they were mocked by the Frenchman and rejected by the Swiss.

But there is no need for me to transfer the fault for the wars to my adversaries, nor is it fitting for the innovators themselves to deny it, since the case of men who have confessed need not be pleaded. Ulrich of Württemberg implores Caesar's mercy and asks that for Christ's sake he pardon him. He does not place his protection in his own innocence, but in the fact that he has found Caesar's clemency to be certain, a clemency which Caesar is accustomed to employ toward suppliants; there was, he says, more than one proof of this fact, and indeed one produced a few years before in the case of certain men from the order of princes who perhaps had furnished Caesar with no little greater cause of offense than he himself had. And his envoys said that he openly confessed his fault and grieved vehemently over the crime committed. Sleidan, Book XVIII.

Frederick the Palatine also came to Halle to seek pardon. A little later the envoys of Ulm came to Caesar and, when as suppliants they acknowledged their fault and begged forgiveness, they were reconciled. But the envoys of Memmingen, Biberach, Ravensburg, Kempten, and Isny say that it happened partly by their own error and partly by the fault of others that they transgressed against Caesar. Indeed, the people of Strasbourg and others also seek pardon. Caesar's envoys at Ulm in the year 1547 accuse them of not only having rebelled themselves, but also of having impelled others to do the same and of having disturbed everything throughout Germany in violation of laws and right. Nor does the Landgrave, as Caesar's suppliant, deny it.

We therefore have the authors of the tumults now accused by their own judgment. But the cause of all the evils is the dissension of religion, concerning which the emperor rightly said in the year 1547: "Unless it is composed, peace cannot be established at all." Thence it followed that right was not administered. The emperor deservedly judges that the fact that for some time no justice was administered pertains to the infamy and injury of Germany. But who is the author of the injustice except the man who distrusted his cause, except the man who, when the trumpet sounded, compelled the laws to be silent?

The seventh reason. A man is guilty of violating peace if he prevents justice from being administered and prevents justice from being able to have an avenger or executor. But how greatly the sectarian ministers labored to remove from their midst all tribunals except those they themselves erected! At the beginning, in the year 1521, Luther burned the canon law, as though he were free from every fear of judgments if he burned the parchments. Then they most earnestly demanded that the Imperial Chamber not pronounce against them; they impeded reviews, by which art they evaded very many sentences.

When appeal was made to Caesar's court, they denied its jurisdiction; they wished the causes of principalities and counties to be committed to the estates of the Empire. When the matter came to the diets, they were unwilling that the

greater number of votes should prevail, but rather those to which they attributed greater soundness. Which were those? The votes of the few who call themselves the Correspondents.

What, then, must pitiable Catholics do if someone from among the Calvinists invades them? Let a Catholic flee to the Chamber? A review will be sought and will not be granted. To Caesar's tribunal? They will deny that Caesar can decree without the consent of the estates. They will rescind the sentence, as the most unconquered Emperor Matthias declares was done in the affair of Aachen. Do you appeal at a diet of the Empire to the venerable Senate of the most illustrious princes? One will have to abide not by the greater part of the votes, but by the lesser or the least.

What if that least part, which wishes itself to be sounder, judges everything in the Calvinist manner: that Catholics are Antichristians, to be burned and devoured, and delivers us to Du Plessis, who would die from joy at our punishments? What if the greater part cries that this is contrary to the law of nations, while the lesser part thinks itself sounder? It is marvelous that they could propose these things without blushing.

Will you believe this, posterity--that there were men in the Roman Empire, founded upon so many laws and ordered by so many dignities, who wished to be exempted from all laws and judgments and, by an unheard-of oligarchy, to draw to themselves the jurisdiction of all the princes and indeed of the August Emperor himself? No one has anything to hope for in such a condition if he is not among the Correspondents; no one has anything to fear if he is going to have men of his own faction as judges. But if these things continue to hasten onward in their course, what at last will this sacrosanct Empire be except a great brigandage? For where the laws have been trampled down, judgments removed, and the authority of magistrates vanquished, what will be right and lawful hereafter except every act of the superior, every title of the stronger? For what the man who conquers has himself done will be judged lawful.

CHAPTER XVIII

Civil Peace Can Scarcely Be Obtained in the Roman Empire So Long as the Preachers Disturb Ecclesiastical Peace

[Printed page 758]

My discourse concerns true peace. I judge that this can scarcely be safe and enduring in Germany, my dearest country, among the diverse members of one Empire, without suspicions and offenses and without anxious expectation

[Printed page 759]

of war, unless the importunate and furious madness of the ministers, especially the Calvinists, is restrained and reduced to measure in its calumniating and disturbing of everything. For they disturb ecclesiastical peace in such a way that they remove civil peace from the midst. There are many and most weighty reasons for proving this matter.

The first reason. True religion and piety possess sharp goads and, when aided and ruled by divine grace, are victorious even over tortures and death. Superstition too is a vehement thing and, through its own timidity, headlong; when it grows strong, it engenders heresy and magic, always restless and, if opposed, savage. "All men," says Cicero in the sixth action against Verres, "are moved by religion, and they judge that the ancestral gods whom they received from their forefathers must be diligently worshiped and retained by them." All men without exception: not only those whom true piety joins to the true and only God who is to be worshiped, but also those whom error holds in bondage and charms with the images of false divinities, whom love of their own opinions blinds so that they do not behold the truth.

The cause is that all judge temporal or eternal salvation, and most judge both, to be at stake in a religious controversy. Therefore we see that, when religion is introduced, the populace is stirred up by the slightest impulse, and that seditions already stirred are composed by the same means. Peoples roar when they see a new religion imposed upon them, as recently at Berlin. Whenever they see religion changed, they believe that Christ is snatched from them, that they are delivered into the power of the demon, and that they are consigned to eternal fires--except where they have already become accustomed to changes and huckstering and hold faith among the *adiaphora*, dependent upon the will of their princes.

The preachers abuse this inclination of peoples and their zealous conviction, and they labor to bring everyone over to their own opinion: first by blandishments, then by general edicts and a change in the exercise and rites of the Church. How greatly did the Lutherans labor in the Palatinate to expel the Catholics? By what a fine stratagem did the Calvinists cast out the Lutherans? With what great anger did the Lutherans, returning from exile, proscribe the Calvinists? How skillfully did the proscribed Calvinists at last avenge themselves upon those who had proscribed them? And these things were transacted not by disputation alone, but by the authority and power of most illustrious princes.

In these disturbances, what confidence and charity could there be either among the Lutherans toward Frederick and Casimir or among the Calvinists toward Louis? Do they not judge those princes to be the enemies of their souls through whom they are most firmly persuaded that they are despoiled of true teachers and assigned to false teachers and seducers? Let the supplications of the citizens of Heidelberg to Casimir the Administrator be seen. Can it be that the Calvinists whom Louis the Elector expelled could have loved him and wished him to be powerful and secure? They cried that by his command and forces they themselves and the truth were oppressed, and they were persuaded that by his death salvation would return to them.

The ministers on either side, both Lutherans and Calvinists, each impelled the subjects toward his own opinion; they vociferated that a contest had been instituted concerning supreme salvation, concerning eternal life and death. They

openly hated the opposing counselors and preachers, at whose instigation the princes changed religion. Would they love the prince without whom those men could do nothing? Would they love the prince who would give away the salvation of his subjects, and indeed their eternal salvation, to the desires of others? Since, therefore, from year to year and day to day the meddlesomeness and vanity of the preachers seeks a change of religion, there cannot fail to be as many causes of alienation, discord, and distrust as there are attempted changes. Luther changed religion; Melanchthon, Flacius Illyricus, Osiander, Major, and the Ubiquitarians altered it yet again after it was changed--all with disturbances and a convulsion of the parts of the Empire.

The second reason. From that restless and perverse zeal of the ministers of the new Gospel arise a grave struggle and perpetual contentions. For what praiseworthy charity effects among the orthodox, that all should desire to come to knowledge of the truth, corrupted depravity attempts among tribunician agitators, so that they may infect everyone with their own contagion. Since they cannot do this by another way, despising mild remedies, they meditate exiles, confiscations, proscriptions, and tortures. The nine children of Arminius complain in a preface to the Estates of Holland that this occurs.

Let that sect which with more than human artifice feigns gentleness and innocence be our example. With what unbridled lust, with what barbarous cruelty did it exercise tyranny? How clearly did it demonstrate what madness lay hidden beneath the fleece of a gentle animal! What comparable deed did the infamous cruelty of the Arians or Circumcellions perpetrate? And yet that heresy, relying upon a single town, not only dared to hope for dominion over the world--which is excessively to the disgrace of the German nation--but, after sending envoys in every direction, attempted it.

To me, assuredly, that Anabaptist portent appeared not so marvelous when it decreed those crimes--for it had heretics and tyrants whom it might imitate--as when it applied itself with such ardor to the propagation of its sect. Every error possesses this quality, that it is fertile; every heretic is an importunate propagator of his opinion, and they do not easily cease unless they conquer. They all strive to dominate the body from which they have been cut off. They advance their hatreds with curses and, when they can, with the sword.

Behold within the Empire the soft Calvinists, the rigid Calvinists, the Socinians, Anabaptists of diverse superstitions, pure Lutherans, altered Lutherans, Ubiquitarians, Majorists, Osiandrians, and Flacians--all zealots of their own sect. There is no one among them who does not exceedingly desire the entire Empire to pass under the laws of his heresy, who does not attempt to accomplish this as far as he can. What peace, therefore, can there be when so many sects struggle with one another daily over life, fortunes, and the soul itself? Moderation must therefore be prescribed to the preachers, and precaution must be taken lest they bear and bring up some new monster.

Yet what would you prescribe to them? What laws would you establish? In the year 1530 the Augsburg Confession was presented to the Emperor Charles V, and many copies of it were then published. But how often was that confession changed? Indeed, how often did the assembled princes and cities act so that it would not be changed? Yet nothing was accomplished: one Melanchthon was more powerful than the whole body of Protestants. And so now no one maintains it intact.

The third reason. Foreign kingdoms will perhaps be able for some time to sustain a diversity of religions without disturbances. But while this insolence of the ministers, especially the Calvinists, remains, the connection of the estates with one another and civil association in the Roman Empire cannot endure without fear of danger and without suspicion. For the preachers attempt altogether to remove the Empire from the midst under the pretext of religion.

The Roman Empire is no less within the Church than the Church is within the Empire; and if we wish to confess the truth,

the Empire in Germany exists through the Church. The principal members of the Empire possess their dignity because they are ecclesiastics. Three chancellorships of the Empire, and electorates, belong to churches. Therefore the peace of the Church is the peace of the Empire. The preachers who attempt to remove the ecclesiastical estate from the Empire therefore overthrow the Empire. But the Calvinist Puritans deny that bishops can be princes, and they proceed not only to snatch the government of their provinces from our bishops, but are also indignant with the English bishops because they obtain political dignities at the royal court.

They therefore remove the peace of the Empire, because from among so many archbishops, bishops, and abbots who are princes of the Empire by most ancient right, they acknowledge no one as a prince. They exhort their people to invade the sees of their colleagues as though they were vacant; they assert that this is not the least important head of their religion. This assuredly not only disturbs civil peace, but removes it altogether from the midst. Hence, when they wish, they will assail the emperor himself by the same art; for if those who elect him and proclaim the diets are not electors, then the election is not legitimate. Since these things are so, there is no doubt that the doctrine which labors, under the occasion of piety, to commit all the members of the Empire to a war of mutual destruction must be banished altogether from the territories of the Empire.

You will perhaps say that princes of a religion different from ours think otherwise. Deservedly so, indeed; they do not believe their own men, having often experienced them to be liars. But I do not consider what the generous spirit and prudence of the princes accomplish, but what whisperers--or, as the Lutherans call them in the history of the changed religion in the Palatinate, serpents--hiss into their ears. For what if at some time they obtain a prince upon whose youth they impose? Peace is not firm where the disposition and goodness of the prince, upon which alone it rests, are assailed by so many engines.

The fourth reason. A state cannot be undisturbed where it is administered by contrary wills and laws; but the intemperance of the preachers makes the Empire such a state. There will be perpetual spiritual war; how, therefore, can there be temporal peace if spiritual war also afflicts it? To wit, will the laws of the Church call men to the sermon, to the celebration of the mysteries, to a procession, to prayers and fasts? What will a prince do here if he hears the preacher as a *πάρεργον* [secondary matter]? To wit, he will compel men to attend the court and the hunt, to repair roads, to cut wood, and to do other things by which they are altogether called away from the church.

Here, which lord will the conscience of the oppressed obey? For if a subject neglects the prince's authority, political peace will now perish; if he postpones the law of the Church to the prince's edict, conscience will totter. Let us make the matter clear by an example. Let the prince be a Calvinist, the superintendent a Lutheran. Let the latter threaten anathemas; the former, exiles, prisons, and the sword. Let each draw a portion of the people; when the pursuits of the populace have been split in opposite directions, civil peace must perish utterly.

The prince will pronounce Lutheran doctrine impious, a diabolical heresy, and the superintendent a turbulent enemy of the truth, to be pursued, exterminated, and cut down with all one's strength. The superintendent will pronounce the prince's commands tyrannical and his deeds cruel; he will earnestly await the aid of foreign Lutheran princes. Court and Church will collide; the *ὑπερεπίσκοπος* [super-bishop] will impel men toward the Lutherans, while the magistrate's edict will compel them toward the Calvinists. The prince will not endure contempt of himself, nor indeed will the magistrate, who will be the more savage than so great a prince in proportion as his anger is more ignoble.

What remains here except that they bring forth arms, these men on behalf of the court and those on behalf of the church? If they obey the prince because religion has been commanded, it is worship not of God but of the purple, extorted from the unwilling. But what peace is there if you perceive that you are compelled to stake your life and salvation upon the prince's opinion? Therefore that is not concord of minds, but the groaning of the oppressed, execration and hatred of the victor, and a hidden contrivance of minds intent upon vengeance.

[Printed page 760]

The fifth reason. We see daily examples of the Preachers' War. For such is the constitution of the Roman Empire, such the intermixture of rights and jurisdictions, that it requires the highest concord between the ecclesiastical and political estates and can easily be torn apart by the machinations of turbulent men. Rights have been divided among different and often rival men, so that even when religion is one, peace can scarcely remain undisturbed. But now, when common rights and privileges are scattered among different religions, what convulsions of tribunals, what plagues of justice invade provinces with deadly contagion? How often are we compelled to see those disgraces of Germany?

This man possesses civil jurisdiction, that man ecclesiastical jurisdiction; another claims both. A Lutheran intrudes a Lutheran, a Calvinist a minister of his own communion; sometimes they do this by alternate turns. Hence come forcible installations, threatening convulsions, and, when the greater prelatures are at issue, bloody wars. Here there can be no concord of minds, no confederation, when with a savage and stern brow the preachers judge that every peace--indeed, any concession and inclination toward milder counsels--must be broken off as though contrary to conscience. Amid these things the most pitiable peoples, uncertain of everything, through the contest of those who rule bear an uncertain faith and a salvation held in suspense.

The sixth reason. The Calvinist ministers bind civil and ecclesiastical peace by so inseparable a bond and association that, if the matter is conducted according to their judgment, they can by no means be separated. For they adorn their kings and princes with pontifical authority and power, so that spiritual power may serve political power and political power may support spiritual power. For they endow the principate with the faculty of judging and conducting spiritual affairs and arm ecclesiastical jurisdiction with the laws and army of the age, so that they come formidable with a twofold force.

Pareus, in his preface to Hosea, after he had conferred all the offices and power of bishops upon the most illustrious Prince of Hesse, animates and incites him with these words: "Well done, DIVINE Hero; boldly perform the work of the Lord which you are performing." That is: expel the Lutherans; substitute Calvinists. For the prince was then doing this, and indeed in earnest. The Calvinists judge that their princes must act by this power, by this doubled force of both temple and court and, if there is resistance, of the camp.

Therefore those who impel civil power toward the alteration of affairs and drive it to strip its principal subjects of offices and revenues, cast them from possession, and order them to go into exile cannot preserve civil peace. For what peace can exist between the violence of those driving men out and the groaning and complaints of those who migrate? "But the people of Marburg did not move a war." Prudently, assuredly: they were not ignorant that they were weaker. The Berliners, however, did move one, whether through sudden fury or because they hoped for victory. And at some time the people of Marburg will move one too, if what the Saxon counselors report is true: that all Lutherans

[Printed page 761]

who live under Calvinists earnestly expect to be liberated by the estates of the Augsburg Confession. *Motive* 12. These are their words:

"The Protestants would enter upon slight favor--indeed, rather they would stir up execrations and groans against themselves among those who dwell among Calvinists and confidently and earnestly expect that they are shortly to be liberated by the estates of the Augsburg Confession and that Calvinism is to be abolished--if these men should perceive by hearing that the Protestants now play the same pipe with the Calvinists and concede that, as the saying goes, five is even. Once this was done, an occasion and cause would assuredly be furnished for no small disturbances and movements in the Church of God among Christians."

The Lutherans who live among Calvinists therefore earnestly await liberation, and indeed liberation by the estates of the Augsburg Confession--a liberation which cannot occur without a violation of peace. They earnestly await the abolition of Calvinism; whether that abolition can occur without war, I leave to be discussed by the counselors of the princes. Conversely, the estates of the Augsburg Confession would groan and execrate them if they entered into peace

with the Calvinists; therefore they now execrate the Calvinists and groan against them. That on account of which each thing is such is itself more such. The Lutherans living among Calvinists execrate the Lutheran estates on account of the Calvinists; therefore they execrate the Calvinists even more.

Finally, peace between Lutherans and Calvinists would furnish an occasion and cause for no small disturbances and movements. But why? Because by that peace the Lutherans would fall from their own hope and expectation and would therefore seek counsel and assistance from themselves. The matter has been brought to this point: if the preachers are left to themselves, not even mention of peace can be made without danger of war. Moreover, what should we think those men who execrate their princes and expect to be liberated from them will do if they obtain an opportunity?

Nor would I believe that the Saxon counselors say these things rashly and by conjecture concerning Lutherans living among Calvinists, but that they have discovered the matter from secret alliances and, as they now love to speak, correspondences. These are the Lutherans. Moreover, when these things are known, what should we suspect the Calvinists are contriving? Calvinist ministers so vigilant, so keen avengers of injuries, so cautious in anticipating dangers, so swift to forestall crimes, so practiced in deceiving Lutherans? This, assuredly: that they may abolish those who wait and every expectation, and that as quickly as possible, lest they delay their own security and lest there be time for aid to be brought to the confederates. Indeed, for this reason they will execute everything more savagely, lest they seem to be slow amid the dangers of their princes.

The seventh reason. The ministers who today besiege the states which they call Evangelical, especially the Zwinglian states, endeavor by design to excite hatred and contempt of the Empire. These two causes are so effective for overthrowing the state that, unless God, the founder and guardian of order and magistrates, repressed their wicked and abominable endeavors, we would long ago have had no form of the Empire in Germany. Concerning the Anabaptists this shines forth more clearly than to require demonstration, for they attempt to wrest from all magistrates the sword which those magistrates do not carry in vain.

I demonstrate the matter concerning the Calvinists. Those men attempt to attach hatred and contempt to the Empire, and altogether to overthrow it, who teach the following consequences in words, writings, and, when they can, DEEDS:

1. The Dragon, or Demon, gave the Empire his own strength and great power.
2. The Church is necessarily afflicted by the Empire.
3. The fullness of diabolism dwells in the Empire.
4. The Empire which now exists is the seven-headed beast, Apocalypse 13:3.
5. To marvel at the beast is to marvel at the success and felicity of the Empire while proclaiming it august, holy, sacrosanct, and immortal.
6. The Dragon affixes his own ornaments to the Empire.
7. To marvel excessively at the majesty and felicity of the Roman Empire is to adore the demon.
8. While the pontiff defends the Empire, he retains men in the worship of the former apocalyptic beast.
9. To adore the beast is nothing other than to wish the Empire to be sacrosanct, august, and venerable, as it formerly was under the gentiles.

But the Calvinists teach these things: Graserus in *The Royal Plague*, Benedictus Aretius on Apocalypse 13, and others.

By design, therefore, they attempt to overthrow the Roman Empire.

Therefore, unless those agitators and Gracchi are restrained, peace cannot be stable in the Roman Empire. The minor proposition is evident from their writings; I cited the places in the little book *On the Increase of Heresies*, to which I

refer the reader. If anyone denies the major proposition, I do not doubt that all will judge him either insane or supremely shameless. Yet there is no need to prove it in any other way than by experience.

For if that doctrine is not insulting toward the August Caesars, if it is not seditious and exceedingly hostile to peace and concord, come then, let someone relate those things about other states after changing the name. Let him say that the Dragon or Demon gave his great power to the people of Zurich, the people of Bern, the Briton, the man of Bouillon, and the Dutch; that the Church is necessarily afflicted by them; that the fullness of diabolism dwells in them; that to marvel at the beast is to marvel at their success and felicity. Let him preach these and the other things at Zurich, Bern, London, Sedan, and The Hague, and publish them in print. Would not instruments of torture, stirred from the entire world, rush upon him? Would they not attempt to pour the Ocean itself through broken dikes upon that man as upon a pestilential torch of the state?

I scarcely seem safe to myself, who employ these examples for the sake of teaching--although what fault of mine is here? The Calvinists say these things against the Empire; I say that the statements are seditious, because if they were uttered against the Swiss, Dutch, and British, they would be judged seditious. Therefore they are also seditious when they are uttered against the emperors, electors, and princes of the Empire. That doctrine must therefore be removed if civil and ecclesiastical peace is sought. Those who show by these statements that their affairs cannot be safe except by the ruin of the Empire must not be tolerated.

The eighth reason. What emperor, at last, or what prince at all could beasts of this kind endure? Of what profession or faith could he be? But I finish and conclude. The peace of the German state, the civil peace of the ruling nation, cannot stand unless a bridle is placed upon those disturbing ministers; or, if any peace is established, it will be brief, unsafe, untrustworthy, full of suspicions, hatreds, and enmities, and will not be far removed from war, since there is a certain perpetual expectation and preparation for war. This is for the sole reason that the Calvinist ministers, not content with present things and not tolerating the laws and common right, watch attentively for every occasion to increase their own affairs, entrap the Lutherans, and burn and devour the Catholics.

[Printed page 762]

CHAPTER XIX

Experience Teaches That Religious Dissensions Disturb the Peace of the State

[Printed page 762]

With a design not merely insignificant but also foolish, and with a most sorrowful outcome, the kings of the Egyptians had introduced various monsters of gods and opinions so that, contending with one another in perpetual dissension and battles, their subjects could never conspire together. Diodorus Siculus, Book XI. It was altogether depraved and tyrannical to wish to stabilize the scepter by the blood of subjects and, as it were, gladiatorial spectacles, and for the sake of royal majesty--which was instituted for the safety and preservation of all--to overthrow the life and safety of the people. Truly they were ἀνδροφάγοι [man-eaters], kings who devoured their people, whose diadem could not stand without the blood of their own subjects. Indeed, pitiable were the nations which were compelled to fight so that they would not conspire. So many corpses were being snatched away lest the fatal band should fall.

That the design was also foolish and proceeded from the dizzying spirit which the Lord mingled with Egypt is evident both from the nature of the matter and from the outcome. They indeed endeavored by cruel cunning to render both factions subject to the kings, but they made the kings hateful to both; and while the factions disagreed with one another in perpetual conflicts, through that training they learned to conspire against the hated kings. For since a king cannot comply with the will of all, he must offend one party. But if he favors now this one and now that, depresses the victorious and raises the defeated so that strength and spirit are always available to the combatants, who can doubt that each will judge itself injured and will judge that the king weighs the fates of his subjects not by justice but by caprice?

Accordingly, in no kingdom were massacres of kings more frequent or more foul, until Egypt itself was divided into two hostile kingdoms and was always subdued with the greatest ease, although it surpassed all kingdoms in the nature of its location, the multitude of its warriors, and the abundance of provisions. Tyre alone resisted more than all Egypt; for in Ezekiel 26:18 Egypt is given as a reward to the army of Nebuchadnezzar for the labor which it endured at Tyre. Thereafter they were easily subdued and exhausted by the Persians, Greeks, and Romans; for to have entered Egypt was to have conquered it. This is the endeavor of the Stentors of this age: always to contrive something, always to harm the other party.

Xenophon judged much more wisely in his Cyrus, whom he described as an exemplar of a good prince, *Cyropaedia*, Book VIII:

ἐλογίζετο ὥς εἰ πάντες οἱ κοινωνοὶ θεοσεβεῖς εἶεν, ἤττον ἂν αὐτοὺς ἐθέλειν περὶ τε ἀλλήλους ἀνόσιά τε ποιεῖν, ἢ περὶ αὐτόν.

Cyrus thought that, if all his associates were pious, they would be less willing to commit anything impious either against one another or against himself. Wisely indeed, and politically--indeed, even holily, if it had been granted to him to speak of the true God. For if a man judges and fears God to be the avenger of right and wrong, will he not readily restrain his hands from injury? But how will they spare their fellow citizens or kings if they judge them impious and patrons of the impious, against whom they regard wars as not only just and lawful, but commanded and holy?

And, lest I pursue every individual matter, religion first separated East and West, and then wars arising from disputes did so; and the Empire which we possess in Germany we received, upon the defection of the Greeks, by the prerogative of faith. From the time of Charlemagne there has scarcely been any stronger heresy which did not excite wars. What disasters did the Simoniacal heresy produce in the times of the Henrys? Thereafter the Albigensians and the rest, and within the memory of our great-grandfathers the Hussites--did they not afflict the Church even more?

It is better to be silent about our own evils than to renew the pain in words. The fury of the peasants was kindled and extinguished in their own blood; the war of the princes against Caesar, and their punishment; the desertion and betrayal of the free cities by their princes, as Melanchthon says; the devastation of Brandenburg; the wars of Strasbourg, Cologne, Belgium, and France; the cruelties of the Huguenots; the English and Scottish massacres; the Swedish rebellion; the devastations of Transylvania; the disasters of Hungary; and what ought to have been named first, the Zwinglian battle lines among the Swiss. We can expect nothing else, especially since Pareus, on chapter 13 of the Epistle to the Romans, and Braumbomus, in Book X of the *Flores Flaminiorum*, deny that there can be an alliance with the pope and papists: an eternal war commanded by God.

CHAPTER XX

Concord of Religions Commended to the Prince

[Printed page 762]

On this matter I treated partly in Book II, and partly it must be treated here. There I urged concord; here I treat the true and solid quieting of seditions born from discord, matters which I also urged concerning the peace of Germany. Hatred and aversion from one's neighbor are contrary to charity; from them arise other plagues and shameful acts, namely discord, contention, war, quarrel, sedition, and schism, which altogether remove peace from the midst and, when they have invaded a city, demonstrate by their own malice the goodness of peace. What is most excellent in our doctrine? Peace; I shall add, also what is most useful. Conversely, what is most disgraceful and destructive? The separation of wills. Gregory Nazianzen, on the moderation to be observed in disputations.

All those things come from the same source, namely hatred: discord is a conflict of wills, contention a conflict of words, and the rest are conflicts of things.

Discord is an altogether grave vice, for it is the disagreement of one's will from the will of one's neighbor concerning a divine good or the neighbor's good which we are bound to will and desire for him. It is an act of hatred, and indeed the primary act, when someone maliciously opposes, so far as lies in him--by his will, if he cannot by deed--that which his neighbor embraces with the best will and which he is bound to will, or even to bestow and procure, for him. Therefore the Apostle, Galatians 5:20, enumerates dissensions among the manifest works of the flesh which exclude men from the kingdom of heaven.

For whoever is found in discord is disowned by the Father, disinherited by the Son, and likewise made alien from the Holy Spirit. For he who has despised the good of the law that was given rejects the gift offered; he who has refused to observe the testament will not be able to attain the Lord's inheritance; and he who has wished to be discordant with a Christian cannot possess concord with Christ. For it is the crime of contumacy to despise what is commanded, to refuse what is prescribed, and to turn away from what has been enjoined. What do you have in common with discord, Christian? Why do you love mutual hostilities, something which could not please the author of peace? Why do you practice enmities which even the man who first invented them could not escape?

But if reason should be silent, nature itself commends concord to us most greatly and accuses dissensions. For nothing is so discordant by vice as this race--the human race--or so social by nature. Nor could human nature speak more fittingly for guarding against the vice of discord, lest it arise, or for healing it when it had arisen, than by recalling that parent whom God willed to create as one man from whom a multitude would be propagated, so that by this admonition a concordant unity might be preserved even among many.

[Printed page 763]

From a mind steeped and seething in hatreds, contention is a certain foam of boiling discord and a pestilential breath, when the man who is discordant disputes with his neighbor in order to assail the truth. Against the truth, I say; for a contest undertaken on behalf of the truth, if accompanied by modesty and a zeal for instruction, is not only praiseworthy but very often necessary, either lest justice be oppressed or lest religion be abandoned without defense.

No vice is more common today, none held in greater praise and value among our adversaries. For what are the innumerable defamatory pamphlets? What the pictures? What the other things, except contention and an assault upon truth? What else do they do than lose even the name of Christianity by disputing about religion? For who among them speaks peaceably with the divine Scriptures without contention, not striving to conquer another with empty and

childish animosity? In whose heart does peace conquer? But enough has been said concerning the contentions of heretics in the book *On the Union of the Evangelicals* and the other, *On Syncretism*.

When discord and contention grow strong, they produce wars, quarrels, seditions, and schisms. When the conflict is between princes and states, it is war; when between private persons, a quarrel; between citizens, sedition; in the Church, a schism, which almost always ends in heresy. Would that all these things needed to be explained in discourse. Would that there were such felicity in our times that we learned from books that they were evils rather than felt them in the deed itself.

The first care of a prince, or nearly so, is to protect sacred things and augment religion--not, however, so that he is the judge of controversies, but the patron of acknowledged and approved truth. For he ought not to possess the same power in the temple as in the praetorium, nor to dominate the faith of his subjects, but to persecute perfidy. Those who so form their prince that he is neither himself devoted to a definite religion nor undertakes the care of those of others place some Epicurean or Diagorean over the state. In the first place, they will never obtain what they propose to themselves, namely, that the people will love or accept an atheistic man. Thereafter this license which the prince permits will altogether disturb the peace of which we treat. For the prince's Politicism will render uncertain everything--sacred ceremonies and whatever ought to have been most certain.

Indeed, we deservedly judge pitiable those peoples whom the commands of their lords have drawn three or four times into various sects within the lifetime of one man, while the populace embraces the prince's errors partly voluntarily and partly through inducement and threats. For those whom the authority of princes alone moves or their power impels are necessarily without religion. Yet much worse is the condition of those whom a tyrant who despises the gods oppresses by the precepts of Machiavelli. A heretical prince harasses his subjects because of his error; a Machiavellian because of calculations of gain or loss. Avarice and ambition govern these; superstition governs those. No one can be secure in his religion when it depends upon so many chances; yet there is more mutability in a Machiavellian principate.

For men are generally more tenacious of superstition and heresies; but when they relate the religion of their people to their own advantages and dignity, then, if the condition or calculation of utility changes, a change of religion must follow also. For if a politician commands a Lutheran populace and himself agrees with his subjects not by faith but for the sake of his advantage, because it is expedient that a prince of Lutherans appear to be a Lutheran, everyone understands that, when the calculation of utility changes, he will change not his faith, which he does not possess, but his simulation of faith, which is moved by utility alone. Bring to such a man the hope of greater dignity and power: suddenly he will become not only a Calvinist and an atheist, but even a Turk.

Under such a prince there can be peace neither of the state nor of the Church, for no one can trust a man who refers everything to his own utility. When it is expedient for him, he will put on every form of religion; indeed, he will rage even against the associates of his own religion. Nor are peoples subject only to the danger of variety and inconstancy when true utility has twisted the prince in another direction, but also when a false appearance of it has been presented. Irreligious princes have therefore always held a kingdom to the greatest public evil and have overthrown themselves, God making foolish the wisdom of this world. Deservedly so: their subjects' souls are a source of gain to them, and God an object of mockery.

Such men are perfidious and abominable even in human society, for:

ἀκύρων γινομένων τῶν συνθηκῶν ἀναιρεῖται ἢ πρὸς ἀλλήλους χρεία τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

When covenants are rendered void, mutual intercourse among men is removed. Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, Book I, chapter 15. But those men remove all these things when they deny that there is a divine power, namely:

Οἷσιν οὔτε βωμὸς οὔτε πίστις, οὐδ' ὄρκος μένει·

For whom neither altar, faith, nor oath remains firm. Aristophanes, *Acharnians*. They neglect everything right and honorable provided that they obtain power. They will never lack a cause for abjuring an old simulation and feigning a new one; it will not be difficult to seek hiding places in perjury once they have learned to impose the appearance of justice and honesty upon their own desires and frauds.

A prince must therefore be religious, hold a true understanding concerning God, offer true worship to God, and instruct and confirm the people entrusted to him not only by protecting them with arms, ordering them by justice, and cherishing them by clemency, but also by religion, which is the supreme good of the human breast.

For why should princes not worship God when they know that a kingdom was given to them by God and can be taken away by him when he wills? For by God:

Things founded proceed,

Each in its own order; and by the Prince of things the courses

Remain fixed.

The same God is arbiter of great empires and huts; with as easy a nod he overturns marble palaces as humble cottages. Strong and weak things hang from the same thread, destined to fall if he who weighs mountains in a balance relaxes his hand. Hence kingdoms generally fall by an unexpected and unforeseen outcome, because they spurn the providence of the divine power. The creator of things willed that great things depend upon the smallest, lest anyone, elated by his own greatness, neglect small things--much less him from whom both great and small things come. Princes must therefore worship him through whom they reign and live.

Your dominion, therefore, O princes, rests upon the counsel of God alone, not upon human arts; neither caution nor anxious fear accomplishes the matter.

Many came to their fate

While they feared the fates.

The very fear of coming evil

Sent many into the greatest dangers.

God himself warns princes: "But now the Lord says: Far be this from me; but whoever glorifies me, I shall glorify him; but those who despise me will be ignoble." 1 Kings 2:30. How noble was David by worshiping God; how ignoble Jeroboam? We therefore see that all things turn out prosperously for those who worship God and adversely for those who spurn him; for even calamities themselves are converted to good for the pious, while their prosperity is for the impious a cause of miseries.

[Printed page 764]

For they are raised on high

So that they may fall with a heavier fall.

It is not only necessary for a prince to be religious and to induce his citizens by example and edicts to worship the divine power, but also fitting to government and altogether royal.

Δεῖ γὰρ τὸ ἄριστον ὑπὸ τῷ ἀρίστῳ τιμᾶσθαι, κὴ τὸ ἀγεμονεῦον ὑπὸ τῷ ἀγεμονεομένῳ.

The best--that is, the divine power--must be honored by what is best and most excellent among created things, while he who governs must be honored by those who are governed. But kings and princes are the best part of the world, through whom, even if they are evil, very many evils are nevertheless impeded, and who protect the society and safety

of the human race. They are nearest to God; for this reason they are also called gods, and deservedly gods if through them the divine Majesty is vindicated.

But if the safety of the citizens and the tranquility of the state are also truly a care to him, as they ought to be and ought especially to be, a Christian prince cannot fail to apply himself to it. Yet without religion that tranquility not only cannot exist at all, but cannot even be desired. To such an extent is this so that even impious deniers judged that fierce and rude peoples must be restrained by fear of religion; for without religion and fear of the gods they did not think that their own rights would be safe. Reason will therefore teach what a pious king and nursing father of the Church must do.

In addition, if religion is absent, the life of men is filled with foolishness, crime, and savagery; the truth of promises, the sanctity of oaths, and all fidelity in compacts and commerce are removed from the world. Lactantius, *On Anger*, chapter 8. This impiety and audacity at last rises against the very Mezentiuses and despisers of the divine power. For religion and fear of God alone guard the society of men with one another. Lactantius, *On Anger*, chapter 12.

The maxim of Maecenas to Augustus is golden, if it is transferred from superstition to true religion:

Τὸ μὲν θεῖον πάντῃ πάντως αὐτός τε σέβου κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τιμᾶν ἀνάγκασε· τοὺς δὲ δὴ ξενίζοντάς τι περὶ αὐτὸ καὶ μίσει καὶ κόλαζε, μὴ μόνον τῶν θεῶν ἕνεκα, ὧν ὁ καταφρονήσας οὐδ' ἄλλου ἂν τινος προτιμήσειεν, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ καινὰ τινα δαιμόνια οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἀντεισφέροντες πολλοὺς ἀναπειθουσιν ἀλλοτριονομεῖν· καὶ τοῦτου καὶ συνωμοσίαι καὶ συστάσεις, ἐταιρεῖαι τε γίνονται, ἅπερ ἥκιστα μοναρχίᾳ συμφέρει.

Worship the divine power in every way and at every time according to the ancestral rites, and compel others to its worship; but hate and restrain those who introduce any innovation concerning it, not only for the sake of the gods--since he who despises them will hold nothing else in high regard--but because those who introduce certain new divinities impel many toward revolution. From this arise conspiracies, seditions, and secret assemblies, things assuredly least conducive to monarchy.

If a pleasure-loving and impious man pronounced these things about the true worship of the true God, he would give counsel both prudent and holy. For nothing in human affairs is more excellent than true religion; therefore it must be defended with the greatest care.

How greatly atheists are hated, and always have been, not only by foreigners and neighbors but even by subjects and intimates who are participants in their tyranny, many ancient and recent events teach us. The entire family of Jeroboam was destroyed by King Baasha; all the lineage of Baasha by Zimri; the latter, despairing of kingdom and life, burned himself with his palace when the victor Omri approached, and Omri's family was wholly cut off. Jehu too, although his posterity reigned to the fourth generation, was at last punished in Zechariah; Shallum was killed by Menahem, Pekahiah son of Menahem by Pekah, and the latter was killed by Hoshea, who was the last of the kings of Israel.

Behold all the kings not of the Persians or Scythians but of Israel divided from Judah: every one impious, every one either killed or punished by the destruction of his posterity. They possessed faithless prefects and subjects because they had all violated faith with God. These things are sufficient for a prince; if anyone wants more, let him consult those whose commentaries on this matter survive.

These matters deservedly ought to move a prince greatly, especially because heresy is a restless thing and its assistants, the preachers, are turbulent enemies of truth. Their superstition perpetually increases until it issues into every foul thing, so that it cannot bear even itself. Hence came those monsters of errors in former times, hence the Circumcellions savage against their own blood, hence the Libertines and Anabaptists of our time. But I have treated these sufficiently in the little book *On the Increase of Heresies*.

Nor do occupations poured out upon governing the state and administering justice excuse princes, since the head of legitimate government is the piety and morals of the citizens. If they apply their mind to these as though they were secondary matters, and importunately favor or conceal those teachers who prefer to please by some novelty rather than

to edify by truth, as though these were not great injuries to the state, they entangle themselves in great calamities. Thus Constantine, a good prince, incautiously harmed the Empire and posterity; thus many in our time nourish serpents by which entire provinces, lethally poisoned, will soon fall. Did not Peucer alone, with two confessors of the Elector of Saxony, fill almost all Saxony with Calvinism without the prince's knowledge? Did not Crellius alone recently drench almost that same Saxony with the blood of citizens and nobles?

CHAPTER XXI

The Sectarians Themselves Feel the Disadvantages of Their Discords

[Printed page 764]

Concerning them, the man who endeavored even by a shameful act to urge concord sings thus:

Not if I had a hundred tongues and a hundred mouths

Could I recount the unspeakable sorrows of schism.

Deservedly, therefore, he concludes:

There is no safety in war; we all demand peace.

Indeed, while every anger conceived from inward hatred and from the heart, and every war born and waged from it, is foul and harmful, a dissension concerning religion is accustomed to be the most obstinate and furious of all. We have long perceived that it renders men utterly savage, especially in audacity, crime, and inhumanity; for they assign every crime to religion, and what the gentiles once judged barbarous in wars to the death, heretics consider holy in their disputes. Whoever does not rage is regarded as a deserter; if anyone dares to urge moderation and peace, he is accounted a fugitive. Hence:

Calvinists always practice eternal hatreds,

Nor does the fury once begun ever depart from their minds.

The fortunate keeps his arms; the unfortunate prepares them.

Wars leave nothing: now the field lies foul

With vast untilled lands; a lofty ash buries nations,

Entombed beneath the torch applied to their roofs.

But let us hear the Syncretist recount the disadvantages of the Evangelical war.

[Printed page 765]

The first disadvantage. Papists are deterred by the deadly dissensions of the Evangelicals from Evangelical doctrine as heretical, satanic, and seditious. This is perhaps a strong and opportune bridle upon heresy ranging through everything, and a great advantage for the Catholic Church. Although it is illumined by the revelation of eternal truth and does not judge the errors of those who perish to be the supports of its faith, nevertheless, in its estimation of the discord of others, it congratulates itself upon its own concord; and, having learned the wars of those who go astray, it embraces its own peace more eagerly, guards it more closely, and exacts it more severely. The goodness of our cause does not rest upon your evils, but is nevertheless made clearer and confirmed by them. We cannot approve the cause of the Evangelicals, which some part of the Evangelicals--often the principal and more numerous part--always execrates.

We acknowledge, O God, great judge and arbiter of furious contests, your benevolence toward us: you founded the Church with such solidity of faith that not only can the powers of hell not prevail against it, but you have permitted those gates to collide mutually against themselves and break their hardness, so that they may strike the walls of the Church with a lesser onset and gentler concussion. So it is, O uncreated, creative Wisdom: you blunt wave with opposing wave, so that, their fury mastered, they strike the sides of Peter's ship in such a way that they at the same time raise it. Nor is all heresy conspired into one Syncretism to be feared, because a heavenly oracle has promised victory to his Church.

Do you grieve that we regard your doctrine as satanic? Whence, then, such great angers, calumnies, execrations, killings, and massacres, if not from hell? But what will you do with Luther, who says that you are incarnate devils? What with Alberus, who says you are possessed by a demon? What with your doctors, who prosecute one another as guilty of atheism, Turkism, Manichaeism, and Borborism? Return to favor and recover your esteem in our minds. You carried the reproaches out of your own house; what we say abroad you always hear at home.

The Lutherans long ago rendered you suspected of sedition, for they accused your princes, as you yourself bear witness, of openly colluding with the Turk against the Empire. Dedicatory epistle to the *Eucharistic Controversy*. But it is not mine to treat the disturbed condition of the Empire, especially when you threaten the Lutherans with the sword. I prefer, therefore, to offer Luther--whom you call the defender of the Gospel and servant of God--as a witness against you. You must receive his testimony, since you yourself have praised the witness. Now an old man, namely at the age of sixty-one, he testified thus: "I, who already have one foot in the grave, shall carry this testimony and this boast to the tribunal of my Lord and liberator Jesus Christ: that with my whole heart I condemned and avoided the fanatics and enemies of the Sacrament--Carlstadt, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Schwenckfeld, and their disciples at Zurich or wherever in the world they may be."

The second disadvantage. What except the dissension itself placed a stumbling block before the Jews?

Long ago the refuse of various heresies brought a destructive offense to the unhappy Jews and gentiles. Their foulness rendered the entire Christian name hateful to the world from the cradle of religion. The disgraceful acts, paradoxes, sorceries, parricides, and enthusiasms of the Nicolaitans, Menandrians, Carpocratians, Marcionites, Montanists, and Manichaeans were imputed to all; and those who had proved their innocence to God burned among men under hatred for another's crime. Those stumbling blocks remain and revive among the new sectarians, and one always sins by example as by deed.

The Jews are hardened not more by your dissension than by the absurdity of your dogmas. They somehow acknowledge that God is one and continually repeat to that God, "Because he is good, because his mercy endures forever." But when they hear from you that he is the decreer, procurer, mover, impeller, and compeller toward crimes, they immediately believe the Lutherans who say that this God is the bloodthirsty Moloch, the Devil himself. Again, when they hear that amid every crime you are just, holy, and dear to God, they suspect that you are beasts. They believe Arminius, Bertius, and the rest of your doctors, who say that rigid Calvinism is infamous among all nations because of its paradoxes.

The stumbling blocks therefore come from you--not so much from dissension in error as from the error itself. For they are not offended because you do not agree in so disgraceful an opinion; rather, they are altogether indignant that a man can be found either so mad as to believe those things or so audacious as not to fear uttering them. You ought not to have erred at the beginning; complaint is late amid ruin:

τὸ πραχθὲν ἔργον ἀνυπεύθυνον.

What has been done cannot be corrected. They recognize that, having followed such diverse sects, you cannot wander together into one error. You run about groping in the darkness; how can you strike against one rock? You therefore place a stumbling block before the Jews not only by the diversity of sin, but by the very absurdity, gravity, and savagery of the crimes.

The third disadvantage. What sharpened the scimitars of the Turks and Tartars against the Christian world and drew them as far as the thresholds of Germany and Italy, except, on the one side, the horrible idol-mania of the Papists and, on the other, the sins of the Evangelicals and the fatal quarrels and conflicts allied to them? By these, fraternal charity was trampled, domestic peace disturbed, the raging Fury attracted, the minds of all estates divided and exasperated, salutary counsels dispersed, and at last the most afflicted Church betrayed to its enemies at home and abroad.

He adduces a twofold cause for Turkish strength and the victories obtained against the Empire: the “idol-mania,” as he calls it, of the Papists, and the crimes and furies of the Evangelicals. We deny the first: we are conscious of no idol-mania. We not only detest idols, but with great dangers and continual labor endeavor to exterminate them from both Indies, Africa, China, and Japan. Since you yourselves confess the other, it is not ours to deny it; for why should I make a speech for defendants who have confessed and have been convicted by their own judgment? They have an internal witness continually lashing them within their fortification: conscience. It is neither part of my purpose to speak against it, nor can they suppress it or impose silence upon it. And if that domestic torturer sometimes ceases, nevertheless the Lutherans do not allow them to rest.

Among the Lutherans--as Pareus himself complains in the preface to the *Eucharistic Controversy*--a certain courtly Stentor recently did not blush to advise in a public writing that at the diets they should join themselves with the Papists rather than with the orthodox Calvinists. He adduced two reasons. One was theological: that the Lutherans agree with the Papists in more things than with the Calvinists, whom he calls Turks. The other was civil: that the pope contributes forces for protecting the Roman Empire, while Calvinist princes openly collude with the Turk against the Empire. The latter reason deserves to be refuted in a manner very different from my pen.

What reasons the Lutherans adduce to prove so grave and dangerous a matter need not concern me. I nevertheless remember reading the answer of the German princes to the embassy of Ségur: “The audacity of your men has now become known not only to Christians but even to the emperor of the Turks. Although he desires them to rage against the Spaniard for the destruction of all Christians, nevertheless, with the truth of the matter crying aloud, he cannot approve them.” *Answer of the Protestants to the Embassy of Ségur*.

[Printed page 766]

And a little later the same princes say: “And have you ever seen one of the Calvinists who drew the sword for the Christian state, either in that naval fleet which the Roman pontiff, the Spaniard, and the Venetians prepared against the Turk, or when Malta was attacked by Dragut? Indeed, rather, they hastened to stir up the Moors so that they might cross into Spain, and to impel the Turks lest the Christian state find rest, and finally to slaughter kings by various arts.” And a little later: “Whence shall we obtain protection against the Turk if the pontifical party, which has always assisted us in this matter, is absent?” And so forth. But what is to be expected from the Calvinists both N. has said and all readily understand: either that they provoke the Turks against the Christians, and so forth.

It is not mine to inquire upon what foundation these judgments of the princes rest; I know that conspicuous places must be avoided.

A savage thunderbolt comes from a conspicuous citadel.

Meanwhile, it ought also to be permissible for me to bring into the midst, without deceit and harm, what the Calvinist ministers think. Frederick Braunbomus, in the prolegomena to the *Flores Flaminiorum*, after saying on page 15, “Even the sultan’s arms are now about to depart from the Church,” immediately adds: “Let us prepare ourselves for war--not so much the Turkish war; the sultan will never possess Hungary, because it was never among the Roman provinces under the dominion of Constantinople, Babylon, or Arabia--as for the approaching Roman war and the most bitter expedition of all.”

Selim would wish this, and the Ottomans would purchase it at a great price. O safety of Germany, how you stand upon a slippery place, by what grave hatred you are assailed! What monsters do you embrace in your bosom? What vipers do you bring up? The Turk holds Greece, has enervated Transylvania, oppressed a great part of Hungary, strikes Austria and Styria, and threatens the Margraviate of Brandenburg; and the prophet of Phaeoff forbids us to arm against an enemy so savage, so restless, so cunning in disposition, so desirous of another’s property, so hostile to the Christian name, so intent upon every opportunity to harm, playing with treaties as with knucklebones, and regarding

nothing as disgraceful which is profitable. Against this enemy, I say, he forbids us to arm, while he incites subjects against the pontiff, bishops, Catholic princes and kings, and the emperor himself. Who does not know

What he constructs by these beginnings?

If fortune follows him, the Germans will expend their strength, arms, and blood mutually upon themselves, so that, when they are worn down, scattered, discordant, and half-wounded, the victor, exulting, may impose the Turkish yoke and carry away their wealth, wives, children, and even the faith which remains, without battle and labor. I grieve that these things had to be said; yet they could not be left unspoken, so that it might become manifest to the orthodox what the Lutherans think about the Calvinists.

The fourth disadvantage. Offenses to the weak. But I also add the gravest falls and horrible deaths of the strongest, whom either Zwinglian cruelty dragged into the battle line to die or Lutheran license broke down into pleasures. Hence stumbling blocks and depraved morals, luxury, avarice, fornication, contention, drunkenness, and vices of that kind range everywhere with the greatest disgrace to the Christian name, as the adversary himself complains in the preface to First Corinthians. Hence, as the same man acknowledges in the same place, come the ambition of teachers, the levity of hearers, a most profane life, security, contempt of God, contempt of every order, and Epicurean profanity.

The fifth disadvantage. The condemnations, exiles, prisons, persecutions, and killings of so many provinces and faithful doctors and confessors, and finally the devastation of graves.

Nemesis at last pursues and apprehends the proud. Heresy is assailed by its own examples. The Lutherans were cruel against us, the Calvinists more savage; for the former tempered their savagery with drinking cups, while the latter sharpened their angers with drunkenness and lust. But now they rush mutually against themselves and say and do to one another things which shame and Christian charity forbid us to say and do. At the beginning and thereafter, every most faithful man deserted Luther: Carlstadt, Oecolampadius, Cruciger, Melancthon, and others. Zwingli fell in the civil war which he had urged. A host of diseases produced by an intemperate life overwhelmed Calvin in despair.

Thereafter, as discord increased, the Lutherans were oppressed. They were expelled from the Palatinate, Zweibrücken, Hesse, Ascania, Switzerland, Rhaetia, Holland, Zeeland, Friesland, and many counties of Germany. Now even the Brandenburgers have bitten the bridle and will gradually understand that they have no preacher except one of the Calvinist stamp. Nor are the Calvinists content with a Lutheran enemy. So long as they lived they waged civil wars most hostilely and perfidiously. Do we not still behold the battle lines of that nation fighting?

Hear those who even now serve in those camps, the nine orphaned children of Arminius, who was commander of one party, in their preface to the curators of the Academy of Leiden: "Good God," they say, "to what lengths do we not break forth? We who within the same Christian religion follow opinions different from one another decide among ourselves more harmfully with pens than with iron. Nor are our disputes confined within dissensions, hatreds, and eternal enmities. Some of us exclude others from the practice of our religion; some adjudge salvation away from others; indeed, we advance our hatreds as far as ropes and from time to time even the most exquisite punishments, while magistrates of evil zeal assent to us. The memory of this matter is still far too recent for there to be any need to reopen it. To wit, in zeal for CHRIST, how often have we shed the blood of those who wholly devoted themselves to Christ himself, applied themselves to piety and salvation, always lived most innocently, and harmed no one--although Christ poured out his own blood for them so that the blood of others would not be shed."

These are the contests of the Calvinists among themselves. All Britain swells with the same, and they would undertake some greater abomination unless they were restrained by royal power. In Holland they are carried on with so great an onset that they can scarcely be restrained by the edicts of the most illustrious Lords the Estates, as Peter Bertius, leader of the principal faction, bears witness in the *Hyperaspistes*. This man stands for Arminius, that man for Gomarus; to this man Calvin is holy, to that one a Borborite and Manichaeon. All labor for their own opinion, no one for the whole

truth; for even those who defend true things mingle in many false things, lest this be for them an unmixed good. These things the Calvinists do among themselves; what will happen to the Lutherans?

The sixth disadvantage. The bloodthirsty theologians--the Lutherans--in tragic pamphlets written not with ink but with blood represented those who were killed by Catholics in France as martyrs of the Devil, to be refuted not by the pen of theologians but by the sword of butchers, and thus inflamed the Catholics against them. That disadvantage is of such a kind that, to one who weighs the matter, it brings many advantages with it.

[Printed page 767]

For first, the Catholics possess the Lutherans as approvers of their opinion. When the magistrate commanded proceedings according to law against the Huguenots, who were guilty of many killings and sacrileges, incendiaries and cruel torturers of the orthodox, men hardened in crimes and shameful acts immediately adorned with the praise of martyrs those whose crimes were capital, lest fear of punishments deter the rest from evil-doing, whose audacity appeared likely to be of use to their desires. And when they attempted to stir and entice Lutheran arms into France as if to defend the cause of martyrs and confessors, the Lutherans in public writings and sermons did not indeed merely deny that they were martyrs, but declared that they were martyrs of the Devil. By this judgment they absolved the Catholics and condemned the Calvinists.

For this reason, when certain Lutherans through flattery called the Calvinists pious and holy martyrs of Christ, they were rejected by them with abuse. In an epistle to the Gallican Churches Danaeus complains about Osiander in this way, page 12: "For those whom this man, in his zeal to flatter you, calls pious and holy and martyrs of Christ, both he himself and certain of his associates most insultingly call martyrs of the Devil from the public pulpit." And a little later: "Indeed, brothers, this is now the cruel charity of those men toward us and their compassion for your punishments: when recently they had most savagely anathematized all of us and our churches in a certain new formula of new discord, and were therefore warned by several most illustrious princes of Germany and by very many good German men"--that is, Calvinizing men--"to abolish it, because by this means they sharpened the swords of the pontifical party against our churches, they themselves answered and joked ridiculously, indeed cruelly, that they were only accidentally the causes of our punishments." Finally he adds that this is Osiander's disposition, charity, and sincere love: that he does not fear to stir up against you the fires of most savage persecutions and flames. This, therefore, is the opinion of the Lutherans concerning the French martyrs.

Furthermore, because the cause, not the punishment, makes a martyr, it is worthwhile to inquire into the causes of the punishments, so that the name may be established. For if I state the cause for which each was killed, I shall submit the judgment concerning the designation to the reader so that he himself may determine whether they must be judged martyrs of the Devil or of Christ.

When the Swiss inflicted cruel war upon their blood relatives, they fell in battle with Zwingli their very gladiator, not as martyrs but as invaders of another's right. In the year 1562 they undertook by common counsel the crimes which they had already conceived and published at Geneva and elsewhere: to despoil the churches throughout the whole kingdom and everywhere perpetrate those deeds of which they left examples in several places. The beginning of their savagery was in Aquitaine; the fury wandered widely. At Paris, wicked men flew about with swords, rashly injuring everyone they met. Priests were slaughtered everywhere at the very altars; churches flowed with blood. Statues of the saints were shattered not from hatred of idolatry, which did not exist, but from avarice, which was immense. The bones of Francis II, king of France, were burned, so that no one could doubt with what disposition they would have treated him alive when they so raged against him dead.

But what would those men not dare, whom Poitiers saw burn the bones of Saint Hilary after they had been dug from their ancient tomb, and from whom neither the relics of Irenaeus nor those of the most celebrated bishop Martin escaped? The people of Lyon and Tours beheld with immense grief impious flames consuming sacred pledges. Why should I relate what cruelty Orléans endured from them? Neither age nor sex was spared, and this throughout the entire

kingdom upon which they bore down like a storm: old men killed amid mockery and tortures; tender youth burned with the towers in which they sought protection; men driven by torture to disclose the bones of martyrs; bells changed into cannon; baptisteries turned into sewers; wells filled with Catholics; bellies and genitals cut out. While they did these things, and attempted many more things worthy of a theater of Calvinist cruelty, they themselves were repressed and killed, and mark the Calvinist martyrologies and exceedingly inauspicious calendars. These are Calvinist martyrdoms.

But the Calvinists have no cause to be angry with the Lutherans over the designation of their martyrs; Bertius the Calvinist himself does not acknowledge those martyrs. His words in the *Hyperaspistes*, pages 172--173, are: "Nor indeed did that confession"--the Augsburg Confession--"cost your Germany less than this one, which, although it is said to have been confirmed by much Belgian blood, has nevertheless thus far been introduced into neither the state nor the churches by any authority of our nobles." First, he says it is said to have been confirmed, not that it has been confirmed, and opposes to it the Augsburg Confession. But on the following pages he relates the articles of the Belgic Confession to the Manichaeans, who formerly experienced that severity.

CHAPTER XXII

That Religious Peace Can Be Established in Germany

[Printed page 767]

I do not mean that peace which, full of syncretisms, contention, distrust, and plots, awaits an opportunity for war, but a true and genuine peace which holds the same opinion concerning God and his worship. I confess that it is a great and arduous good, indeed a rare one, but nevertheless a good which we can attain.

It is a difficult good amid so great an obstinacy among dissenters and so great an audacity among those desiring contrary things; but because it is a gift of the divine power, it is permissible to hope that at some time, even among the unworthy, that immense mercy will command peace, agitated in so many ways, to stand firm. For since our nature was made for mutual friendship and peace, and since peace is sought even by war, human society would be frustrated of its proper end if there were no way to attain peace.

Indeed, the Scriptures would exhort us to concord and peace in vain if either by nature or by our fault we were enslaved to disputes. Since the Lord declares that he leaves peace to us and gives us his peace, John 14:27, and that he acted so that in him we might have peace, John 16:33; since the Apostle so often promises and desires for us the peace of GOD--Romans 1:7 and 2:10; 1 Corinthians 1:3; 2 Corinthians 1:2; Galatians 1:3; Ephesians 1:2; Philippians 1:2; 2 Thessalonians 1:2--since, I say, peace is promised so often, who can believe that Germany alone, deprived of peace for nearly a hundred years, possesses no return to its former peace?

The disposition and nature of the German nation also avail greatly for conciliating concord. For the Germans, both by their own nature and by training and custom, are courteous and kindly, abhorrent from disputes and wars, and quiet like a tranquil sea unless stirred by the blasts of winds. Thus they have frequently lulled even the greatest discords without blood and for the most part lay down their hatreds together with their arms.

Although heresies, when they have grown strong and armed themselves with secular powers, generally rage atrociously--as did the Arian and Monothelite--Germany has nevertheless been milder toward its own entrails.

[Printed page 768]

Let us consider only France or Britain, indeed Belgium: in one year it gave more Catholic blood, more martyrs to heaven, than Germany did in almost an entire century. Germany was indeed cruel in the rebellion against Emperor Charles and in the fury of the peasants, but religion alone was not alleged for those causes. The hatreds were civil, stirred up indeed by heretical agitators who preached, but not practiced by everyone for the propagation of heresy. Why, then, should we despair of our country, which is especially a pupil of peace?

Recent examples of provinces converted in Germany also raise us to great hope. For when we see Bavaria, Franconia, Styria, great tracts around the Rhine, and the best part of Belgium rescued from the darkness of errors into the liberty of the children of God; when throughout France we see many thousands restored and established each year in possession of the ancient religion, why should we not think that the rest will agree in the same unity? We perceive peace growing daily, and shall we cast away hope for its complete increase? Dawn already glows red, the herald of full light; why should we put aside confidence in a bright day?

Almost the same conviction belongs to those who err and follow heretics through ignorance, hope, fear, or some other affection--not because they judge that truth stands among them, but because they judge it levity and inconstancy to release what they have once seized. They think that by right of return they will go back to the ancient and apostolic faith of our forefathers, and that there will be no end of wandering until they return to the path by which the primitive Church ascended to heaven.

Thus we are taught by experience that now even threats, exiles, and confiscation of goods can scarcely impel the very few Catholics to desert their ancient piety, whereas at the beginning of the tumult a single Epicurean or tribunician sermon hurled whole flocks of peoples into Lutheranism or Calvinism. The heresies ranged abroad until they became recognized; now they have lost their strength, their onset has grown languid, they have completed their circuit, and now slide backward. Consider Lutheranism.

First, who is now a Lutheran in the opinion in which the Augsburg Confession stood? The Calvinists swear that all have departed from it. But let us omit these matters. Who is a Lutheran at all? Are the Ubiquitarians? The Synergists? The Osiandrians? The Flacians? Yet I do not inquire into these distinctions. I ask about the Lutherans' strength. No one approaches them; many depart from them. They possess only one electorate, and that one strongly altered by Calvinism--so greatly, indeed, that Zwinglian operations insinuated themselves not only into the academies and the prince's council but into the very secrets of conscience; for the elector's confessors, by his own testimony, were Calvinists. *Acts of Peucer*.

They have lost the Rhenish and Bavarian Palatinates, Zweibrücken, Hesse, the congregations of Switzerland, Rhaetia, Holland, Zeeland, Friesland, and the churches of England. Their numbers are diminished in Poland, Lithuania, Sweden, most of Hungary, and Bohemia. They have lost the Catholic portion of Belgium, Bavaria, Styria, Troppau, and Franconia; in the Catholic electorates they have been compelled to abandon splendid conditions. They labor over Brandenburg and Prussia. Certain Lutheran cities, such as Hamburg and others, have now admitted Calvinist religious exercise; others gradually slide toward it. They are therefore driven into a narrow place and will shortly pass into all other things.

But since no one among them embraces Calvinism unless compelled, or assuredly very few do, it must be hoped that by far the greatest part can be brought to knowledge of the truth. So too it was formerly: heresies held their course, then fell and expired. The Simonians, Nicolaitans, Cerinthians, Ebionites, Menandrians, Basilidians, Carpocratians, Cainites, Marcionites, Valentinians, Archontics, and others almost perished within the first two centuries. The Montanists, Manichaeans, Novatians, and Donatists raged longer; most gravely of all the Arians, and the Iconoclasts who even now have revived. But the times in which they flourished must be distinguished from those in which they secretly increased or lay hidden while decreasing. The fury and tempest of them all quickly spent itself; the remnants lived longer.

The cause must be taken from the very disposition and nature of heresy. For at the beginning, adorned with borrowed ornaments of the Scriptures and whitened with a certain antimony of truth, when it prostitutes itself to a world greedy for novelty and disdainful of ancient things, it easily entices minds ignorant of virtue by the image of good; for allurements draw more men than truth. But when, the flowing color and ornaments removed, it appears in its own skin like an aged and diseased prostitute, it makes its lovers flee far away and repels them.

How numerous were the lovers who knocked at the doors of the eastern Thais! But now how many desert the decrepit woman and transfer their loves elsewhere? With what great zeal and what exquisite blandishments does she retain a few? That heresy therefore tends toward destruction and would have perished long ago had it not from time to time struck curious minds with some novelty. Hence Osiander, Major, Flacius, and the Concordists added certain new pigments to the old and wrinkled woman; they even changed names so that they might hold by some novelty those whom they could not convince by truth.

Since, therefore, a certain old age of all the heresies appears, we are not far from peace. As for the fact that some think Calvinism is growing because by the cunning counsels of courtiers they place certain heralds of that sect in Lutheran chairs and mock the goodness of certain princes, they stray greatly from the truth. For by their importunity they stir hatreds and execrations and raise sluggish peoples to hope and desire for liberty. Thus the Saxon counselors affirm that the Lutherans who live under Calvinist lords earnestly hope and expect to be liberated by the Lutheran estates; indeed, all Lutherans who live among Calvinists confidently expect Calvinism to be abolished, as the same counselors say in

Motive 12. Therefore not merely inexperienced men but practiced and prudent counselors think the end of Calvinism is at hand.

Since it is manifest that Spain, Italy, France, and Germany were once cleansed of Arians, Pelagians, Priscillianists, Albigensians, and the other heresies which widely reigned, and that the peoples returned to unity, we deservedly ought now also, after an interval of almost one hundred years, after horrible blasphemies and bloody wars, to hope for this from divine goodness.

Nor do I think that our adversaries will deny it. Certainly, if they act consistently with their faith, they will also have to believe it. For Lutherans confidently and earnestly expect that they will soon be liberated by the estates of the Augsburg Confession and that Calvinism will be abolished, as the Saxon counselors say in *Motive 12*. The same men judge that the pontiff will perish; with their enemies removed, therefore, they fashion their own peace for themselves

[Printed page 769]

and have already devoured it in hope. The Calvinists think the same things and judge that they can impose their peace upon both Lutherans and Catholics. Indeed, some do not despair that union and a synod can occur among so many heresies. Why, then, should the pious and faithful not at last expect true peace?

Peace is rightly hoped for even by the enemies of peace; nevertheless, there cannot be peace in evil or concord in error. Although some sometimes conspire in it, that peace cannot be lasting, nor the peace of all, indeed not even of many. For no falsehood lies so hidden that it is not sometime revealed; no lie is concealed either forever or from everyone; nothing is colored so plausibly that it deceives all. Deception is at last detected when it is secure.

CHAPTER XXIII

That Peace Cannot Exist in a Mixture of Religion and a Certain Political Moderation

[Printed page 769]

Zeal for peace and concord sometimes leads prudent men who love the state to prefer even a disgraceful and dangerous peace to discord, and to judge that what they see done advantageously in political matters must also be adapted to religion. While arms have been laid aside and embassies concerning peace are conducted under a truce, at the first meeting each party generally seeks what it thinks it demands by the highest right; they often even demand unjust things so that they may obtain what is equitable. Yet by negotiating, yielding, conceding, and entreating they come to the point of making peace, when each party judges what was agreed to be just or tolerable, or at least such as must be preferred to war. The same method is observed in arbitral judgments and private agreements, and I do not know whether any pacification has been established without such moderation. They demand religious concord and unity in this manner: let this be conceded to the Lutherans, that to the Calvinists, another thing to the Anabaptists; and let them in turn concede many things both to Catholics and to others; let a rigorous examination of the questions be discontinued; let there be peace in our days.

They say that in this way the world can be reduced to concord; that by a remission of their qualities contrary elements are thus tempered into firm and solid bodies; that from dissimilar sounds a most delightful harmony is thus made; and that nothing becomes food for animals unless it has departed from its native rigidity and been tempered to an alien nature. If you strike hard things against hard things on both sides, they say, all are broken; gentleness and indulgence accomplish more among the obstinate. They will concede more if the beginning is made by you. The highest right is the highest injury; all extremes, even in good things, are dangerous.

These and other things are said either by malicious plotters, by simple men, or by men slightly instructed in piety and swollen with an opinion of their civil prudence. If theologians follow them, after the example of Marcion of Pontus they will abolish the whole of Christianity in a short time. Marcion selected from every heresy all that was foul, cruel, mad, and impious and forged one monster from so many evils. If we now mingle all things into one, it will be more detestable and destructive than the Marcionite monster in proportion as the heresies from which this poison will be compounded are fouler and more pestilential. Whatever is most capital and virulent in each heresy will pour all its corruption into this *σορὸν φάρμακον* [compound drug], and this will be the supreme evil of evils, sublimated from the marrow of all evils.

Let us see the matter itself. It must be conceded to the Calvinists that God destines, incites, impels, and compels us to sins; ubiquity must be conceded to the Lutherans; to the Osiandrians, that we are just by the essential justice of God; to the Memnonist Anabaptists, Anabaptism, and to the same men fornications and adulteries in nocturnal assemblies; to the Libertines, shameful acts, and it must be said, "Not I, but God did it." I have named a few things; they themselves confess that they are infinite. What moderation, what religion will be made from these?

Musonius rightly says in Strabo, Discourse VII, that wicked men cannot nourish concord. Crooked wood does not fit straight wood, nor another crooked piece of wood; light does not agree with darkness, but as much light as approaches, so much darkness withdraws. That peace therefore cannot exist, nor that moderation which leads us away from the moderator of all things. We possess the true religion and cannot without crime pollute it with the errors of others. Shall I lie so that some Calvinist or Osiandrian may learn from my lie to speak truth? Shall I adore God as author of sin, confess an ubiquitous Christ, abjure with the Socinians the price of his blood, and deny ten articles lest they continue in their manner to trifle about purgatory, indulgences, and holy water? Shall I deny the whole Christ with Vorstius and Osiander so that by their kindness I may possess half a Christ--the whole of whom I possessed and betrayed to them?

Nor must the method observed in making treaties of kings be followed here. There, to remit one's own right, yield an estate, and relinquish things acquired by war belongs to humanity, and excessive firmness in retaining one's right is imputed to obstinacy. But when religion is disputed, it does not lie in the power of the litigants to bargain about victory; for the cause of truth is pleaded, and of that truth concerning which we possess the eternal decree of the highest and uncreated Truth. Whatever you alter from that truth is sacrilege; whatever you add is abomination. "For I testify to everyone hearing the words of the prophecy of this book: If anyone shall add to these things, God shall add upon him the plagues written in this book. And if anyone shall diminish the words of the prophecy of this book, God shall take away his part from the book of life and from the holy city and from the things written in this book." These words must be received concerning the whole economy of Christian doctrine and rule of belief as well as concerning the Apocalypse of John, since they were dictated by the same authority. Whoever changes these things corrects the Holy Spirit; whoever moderates the sentence of the supreme judge by human ingenuity denies divine wisdom.

Therefore every true Christian who seeks the account of sacred dogmas from God and does not manufacture it from himself understands sufficiently that the least voluntary departure from heavenly truth is a fall into death, since he accuses God of error when he presumes to moderate by his own teaching the doctrine delivered by God.

Nor is the peace of those who err thus served if you indulge those who err; rather, spirit is added so that they undertake greater things and, having pursued the bird, hasten more confidently toward destruction. Truth is the one goal; one does not reach it by wandering. Eternal salvation is the one end of believers; one does not attain it by denying God and agreeing with errors. You will fall into the abyss

[Printed page 770]

if you allow yourself to be moved from the summit of right doctrine; you will not be able to stand upon the slope if you did not stand at the top. You believe God in nothing if you judge him false in one thing. No reason for believing remains to you if you have either repudiated the authority of the revealer or surrendered it to the deadly peace of heretics. That is not peace but a compact with perfidy, sacrilege, impiety, and hell itself. Simulated religion is a double impiety, for a man both is impious and simulates piety.

He who covers impiety with paint therefore labors under a double evil and is consequently incurable. But experience has also taught here how useless that counsel of mixing religion is. The contests of the preachers in the federated Netherlands are known. Grotius, a learned man, politician, and jurist, interposed himself as mediator and pacificator among them; but what did Bogermannus the preacher do? He attacked Grotius the pacificator. Caspar Barlaeus attacked Bogermannus in his *τὴν Βογερμαννομαχίαν* [*Bogermannomachy*]. The whole question turns upon the fact that Sibrandus and Bogermannus accuse the Estates of Holland, who commanded mutual toleration among dissenters, of INJURED PIETY.

Sibrandus explains in what matter they injured piety. He writes that the Estates of Holland wished to be deceived by an ignorant and stupid man; that they allowed the churches to be torn apart and disturbed; that after the bishops were expelled they all transferred political power to themselves; that they patronized evasive men; maintained a heresiarch at public expense; wished to introduce the heresies of Socinus into the churches; and many similar things, which he poured out audaciously and fearlessly. These are Sibrandus's words. But Bogermannus is so far from disapproving them that he instead defines them as an Apostolic Paroxysm.

It is therefore impossible for the Rigid to agree to any moderation or mixture; and assuredly it cannot be done. Why, then, do political men judge that the eternal law must be moderated by their prudence? Because they think themselves to be without law and therefore prefer their decrees to the declarations of the creator; because they lack the faith by which alone the Majesty of him who is offended is esteemed.

The Apostle Peter calls them sects of perdition, 2 Peter 2. Who, then, is so mad as to communicate with those sects and expect salvation from a source from which only destruction can be drawn? Heretics--I speak of true heretics, not of

those who err and incautious followers of heretics--are false prophets, ravenous wolves, false Christs, thieves, and robbers, Matthew 7 and 24, John 10. They are false apostles, deceitful workers, men who love themselves, greedy, proud, blasphemous, wicked, without affection, 2 Corinthians 11, 1 Timothy 1 and 3. They are false prophets, lying teachers, slaves of corruption, unlearned and unstable, 2 Peter 2; antichrists and seducers, 1 John 2. Such they remain even if they cast away one or another error while remaining obstinate in the rest. Catholics cannot enter into association with them unless they embrace fellowship in such great crimes. I mean that association sought in the moderation of religion, by which truth is commanded to be tempered to falsehood.

Therefore we shall rather hear Saint Cyprian, Epistle 55 to Cornelius: "Let our most beloved brothers resolutely shun and avoid the words and conversations of those whose speech creeps like a cancer." Not merely conversations on any occasion for approving their error, but also the other means by which men are customarily drawn into communion with heresy. "Let no intercourse, no banquets, no conversations be mingled with such men, and let us be as separate from them as they are fugitives from the Church." Let them avoid these things when there is danger of contagion; let them seek them when there is hope of converting others.

The great Antony, as the great Athanasius testifies in his life, never granted friendly words to Manichaeans or other heretics, declaring that their friendship and discourses were the destruction of the soul. But he detested the Arians, so that he said to all: "One must not even approach near them." And Antony himself, now about to die, said: "Avoid the poisons of heretics and schismatics, and follow my hatred toward them. You yourselves know that I never had peaceful discourse with them." If we cannot, and sometimes ought not, avoid these things, let us act earnestly lest our conversation confirm them in their errors while they think themselves either approved by us or judged tolerable.

CHAPTER XXIV

That Seditions Arising from Religions Cannot Be Removed by Syncretism Is Taught from Its Nature and End

[Printed page 770]

After ninety years of dissensions, hatreds embittered by many injuries, a war made deadly by the bitterness of words and deeds--an Evangelical war--the Calvinists seek peace from a General Synod. But because faithful peace, the nursling of truth, the enemy of simulation, ignorant of frauds, execrates and flees heresies, disguise, and deceit, the same men, cast down from hope of sincere concord, pursue its handmaids, truces; construct images of false peace; and contrive syncretisms. Therefore, since I treated the Union and Synod of the Evangelicals in a separate book, I have determined now to treat Syncretism.

Syncretism is a false, simulated, insidious peace; a cunning concealment of hatreds; malice intent upon an opportunity for vengeance; fire placed beneath deceptive ash; a danger ingeniously covered; enmity flattering by a show of duty; a shadow of alliances, disciple of Machiavelli, daughter of Epicurus, plague of human society, and death of piety. Pareus has again brought forth this monster in an unhappy birth, with Heidelberg Wisdom acting as midwife, although it was pierced and cut apart by so many books and colloquies of the Lutherans and commands of princes. My intention is to propose a discussion rather than my judgment concerning it. I therefore examine the case; the states and princes to whom it pertains will pronounce sentence.

But if anyone who will read my discussion should by chance wonder why I--a member of the Society of JESUS and a pupil of sacred studies, whose whole course and every part of duty demands peace, flourishes by peace, and is weakened and broken by war--should seem less favorable to peace of any kind, I, always an adviser and author of peace, ask and entreat him to hear the reason for my purpose without offense and, having heard it, to weigh it. In this judgment I neither implore the benevolence of a friend nor refuse to undergo the judgment of an enemy; this cause stands sufficiently by its own equity.

All will understand that I oppose not peace but the most foul war which lurks beneath the name of peace; not truces, but syncretisms, the seedbeds of plots and wars. I venerate peace. Truces, as certain forerunners of peace which carry the olive branch, the insignia of their mistress Peace, I receive and embrace with my whole mind. But if those same truces, clothed in the spoils of true peace, conceal war; if beneath a peace-bearing bough they hurl a hidden death-bearing spear, I abominate them as insidious simulation, poison of concord, plague of sincerity, and the disgrace and stain of Germany--that is, of the ruling nation.

[Printed page 771]

Peace is an uncertain good even when it is earnestly sought and sincerely given, when the minds of those making the compact are allied by mutual love, not merely their fidelity bound by letters and oath, because we do not know the hearts of those with whom we wish to maintain it. If, therefore, no one is secure in true friendship, with what great care must we flee Syncretism, which includes fraud in both fact and name, and which by the very fact that it is Syncretism possesses an express profession of simulated love for a time and future hatred? For when Syncretism most cunningly feigns peace, it acts so that it may overthrow by hidden plots the enemy whom it cannot lay low openly.

The most holy and learned Augustine rightly judged concerning these things in *City of God*, Book XIX, chapter 5: "There are no more hidden plots than those which lie concealed in the simulation of duty or under some name of intimacy. For by taking precautions you can easily avoid the man who is openly an adversary. But this hidden, intestine, and domestic evil not only arises, but even overwhelms a man before he can foresee and discover it. Therefore that divine utterance, 'And a man's enemies are those of his household,' is heard with great pain of heart; for

although someone may be so strong that he bears with an even mind, or so vigilant that he guards by provident counsel against, the things which simulated friendship contrives against him, nevertheless, when he experiences those perfidious men to be the worst, if he himself is good he must be gravely tormented by their evil, whether they were always evil and pretended to be good or were changed from goodness into that malice. If, then, the house, the common refuge amid these evils of the human race, is not safe, what of the city? The greater it is, the fuller is its forum of civil and criminal suits, even if not only turbulent but often bloody seditions and civil wars are at rest. Cities are sometimes free from their outcomes, never from their dangers.”

I therefore consult the safety of all when I disclose the frauds of a few. I do not sound the trumpet, but dissuade from Syncretism; I remove suspicions and simulations as impediments to true peace, because a union and concord of minds cannot otherwise be entered. A subscription can indeed be persuaded from the credulous, commanded from the weaker, extorted from those who fear, and an agreement signed with the unwilling; peace cannot exist without the benevolence and mutual concord of minds. But if my discussion is suspect to Lutherans of the Augsburg Confession, let them inspect and consult their own consciences, to which I appeal. Does Pareus propose, obtrude, and urge Syncretism for the honor and increase of the Augsburg Confession and Lutheran religion, or for the propagation of Calvinism and destruction of Lutheranism?

Who does not know how greatly it concerns the Empire and the state that the arts of the most fraudulent men be banished and crushed? Who is so ignorant--not merely of German generosity and sincerity but of human affairs universally--as not to marvel that a man existed who arrived at such shamelessness that he did not hesitate to offer a most disgraceful, insidious, and dangerous thing to most serene and illustrious kings and princes and most ample states, and to publish a very large book as prophet of such levity, perfidy, and fraudulence? Do new Machiavellis everywhere contrive too few imitations of alliances and friendships? Has so manifold a faith produced too little perfidy, and does it produce too little every hour? Old and cunning theologian, do you think the world so destitute of its own vices that you, a teacher of deception and artisan of syncretizing, judge that examples of fraud from an infamous nation must be brought into the morals of our age? Why do you obtrude ancient and foreign crimes upon a world as though it could not perish by recent ones?

But let us grant that you obtained the Syncretism you urged. Is there doubt how much disgrace will cling to the princes of Germany if they allow themselves to be bound by your faithless and foxlike pacification? You order them συγκερητίζεσθαι [to syncretize]. If they hear you, therefore, they will be:

Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεύδονται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἄργοι.

Cretans always liars, evil beasts, idle bellies.

If anyone sees them, he will employ the old expression, ὁ κρής πρὸς τὸν κρήτα [the Cretan against the Cretan], or κρής κρήτα κρητίζονται [a Cretan and a Cretan play the Cretan], or assuredly ὁ κρής πρὸς αἰγινίτην [the Cretan against the Aeginetan], or more clearly, Ἀλώπεκι ἴσον πρὸς ἑτέραν ἰλώπεκα [a fox matched against another fox]. Do you prepare to transfer the ancient reproaches of a most foul and deceitful nation, now almost dead, to the Teutonic nobles? Are those men, in whom are German constancy and gravity, Roman majesty, and the right of the August Empire, so worthless to you that you do not fear to liken them to Cretans? You desire them to be συγκερητικευμένους [syncretized], that is, joined together by a fraudulent peace full of hatreds, so that when they assemble at the diets that maxim from the formula of trust may perish: “Among good men, affairs are conducted well.” Let the supreme law of those syncretizing then be: “With a fox, act the fox.” Let foreign nations laugh at us and say, “Behold a Cretan with a Cretan, a Cretan with an Aeginetan.”

But let us despise the sayings of foreigners. What shame can survive in so disgraceful a matter? Can peace exist even thus? What will enticements of words and lies of countenances profit those who profess Syncretism? They confess that they simulate friendship in appearance so that they may await an opportunity to harm those joined with them without danger to themselves. I would wish to see the princes themselves, or at least the faces of envoys composed for favor,

and to hear the soft words of those whose aim is to display peace in their countenance and store hatreds in their minds. For the man who syncretizes is a friend only in words; with his mouth he regulates arts of flattery, κακὰ βυσσοδομεύει [he plots evils in the depths], and in his inmost mind constructs evil.

Yet let Pareus conquer even here. Let Calvinism fill every vein of German sincerity with Cretan blood and alter nature with a Circean drug, so that they are now not Germans--faithful and generous--but rather Cretans, always liars, evil beasts, idle bellies. What alliances and commerce with foreign kings and peoples will they be able to hope for? Who will endure conversing with them? Who will either send or receive envoys whose fraudulence the titles of Syncretism show upon an open forehead? Who is so foolish as to believe men who by professed fraud contrive plots against their countrymen?

Flee these things, O kings, O princes, O states which rejoice to be named from the Gospel. It does not belong to your blood, dignity, or utility to imbue our country with the frauds of Cretans and Oxydracae. Unless you take timely precautions, there is danger that not only your faith but also your fidelity will be called into doubt, and that your colleagues and foreign princes will spurn all your promises, writings, and oaths as arts of fraudulent simulation rather than signs of a true and constant mind. Indeed, I have long heard the whispers of many who more often consider what you may at some time determine and do by the counsel of Cretan ministers than what belongs to your duty. They fear lest you someday approve those whom you hear praying so often about Syncretism and frauds. Although they judge this foreign to your disposition, they nevertheless consider it unnecessary to experience it at their own peril. But we shall treat these things individually hereafter.

[Printed page 772]

I have thus far explained the notion and nature of Syncretism; nevertheless, for the sake of those who desire a fuller explanation, I shall make the whole matter clear by an example. Holland gave us one complete in every feature of Syncretism, and all the clearer and more perfect because that Syncretism was not between Calvinists and Lutherans, who fight diametrically, but coalesced within the Calvinist nation between the Rigid and the Soft.

The matter occurred in this way. At the beginning of the introduction of Calvinism into Belgium there was a fierce dissension among the Reformers. The more Rigid then conquered, but the Soft regained strength in Arminius and his associates and in 1606, at the Synod of Gorinchem, obtained a censure of the Palatine Catechism and Belgic Confession. By such labor and the favor of the Estates they brought matters to the point that they almost depressed the others. After many colloquies and writings, both were ordered to present their opinion about entering concord and to offer counsel publicly.

The counsel of the Soft, who from the title of their published little book call themselves Remonstrants, was this:

1. Mutual charity and benevolence must be cultivated.
2. Abuse and condemnations must be suspended.
3. A synod must decide the controversies.
4. They must be permitted to defend their opinion and ordain ministers who agreed with them. They were prepared for these things.

But the Rigid, who from another writing call themselves Counter-Remonstrants, judged thus:

1. Exacerbations and dissensions could be met only by a national synod.
2. Through the postponement of a synod until the twentieth year, so many stumbling blocks had arisen.
3. All who wished to be and be called ministers of the Reformed Churches ought to submit themselves to a synod as litigants on either side.
4. If a synod could not be held, the judgment of foreign academies must be obeyed.
5. In good conscience they could choose no other path of peace; if they themselves attempted another, the other pastors would not agree and even their hearers would depart from them.
6. Neither party should be forbidden to teach or dispute concerning the matter, for by this prohibition truth would be oppressed.
7. Nevertheless, neither party should be permitted freely to propose its doctrine; for this would occur with immense scandal and offense if in one city it were taught in this manner, in another otherwise, indeed in one and the same church and chair thus before noon and the contrary after noon. From this would follow harmful confusions,

scandals, and schisms, to the devastation of the churches. 8. The adversaries, the Remonstrants or Soft, must therefore be commanded to keep their opinion on the five disputed articles within themselves and not propose or urge it in a sermon or otherwise in writing, publicly or privately; nor should they attack or refute the opinion of the Rigid or Counter-Remonstrants which opposed these articles. 9. Nevertheless, the Counter-Remonstrants must be commanded to dispute moderately against the Soft or Remonstrants and assail them. 10. Meanwhile no one who agrees with the Remonstrants must be ordained.

[Printed page 772]

At last, for the peace of their churches, the Estates made a decree in January 1614. By it they ordered men to remain quiet until the future synod, to be wise unto sobriety, to tolerate and bear others--in one word, to observe a truce; all were to possess the same right, and the Remonstrants were to suffer no trouble because of their religion. They also forbade the horrible decrees of the Rigid to be taught, such as: that some men were created by God for damnation; that a necessity of sinning was imposed upon someone; that some are invited by God to salvation although he has altogether not decreed to give them salvation; and so forth.

Behold, reader, after so many years of most bitter disputations, writings, anathemas, thunderings, and combats, Syncretism commanded by the magistrate between two battle lines of one Calvinism. Let us now see what followed, yet in such a way that we also weigh the laws of Syncretism enacted by the Rigid.

First, they especially urge a synod because they hoped to surpass by numbers those whom the Remonstrants surpassed in eloquence, industry, and the magistrate's favor.

Second, a most unjust law is proposed by the Rigid: the Soft are permitted neither publicly nor privately to propose their doctrine, defend their opinion in books or sermons, assail others, or ordain anyone from their own flock. The Rigid deny that the Soft should be tolerated any longer; they say they have been tolerated more than enough. They assert it to be unjust that they implore the protection of the nobles--the Estates--against every ecclesiastical censure.

Third, that is the true face of Syncretism: they impose silence upon the Soft, judge accusation equitable, and wish the respondent's voice cut off. They reason not foolishly: victory is easy if you contend with a mute, if the accused is denied the defense always conceded among all nations by divine right. For how will truth, weakened by so many calumnies and agitated by so many hatreds, be restored by the equity of judges and stand if it is condemned unheard and undefended? It is an altogether barbarous crime, known neither to the altars of Lyon nor of Scythia, that a man should perish like a guilty person when the protection of innocence was denied him.

Fourth, the ordination of the Soft is forbidden. By a most cunning design they procure two advantages for their sect in a few words: the pursuits of the Soft are diminished when hope of honor and gain has been removed, and, succession denied, they must be reduced to fewness. But the decree of the Estates concerning mutual toleration and moderation made the cause of the Remonstrants or Soft better, as I said. Could the hardness of the Rigid be bent by the decree? Nicholas Grevinchovius, one of the six chosen disputants, writes thus in the dedicatory epistle of his disputation on two questions:

“But just as the same purple delights men and offends bulls, so the decree turned the minds of some toward counsels of peace, but provoked and sharpened others still more for battle. I know that this decree was suspect, and indeed hateful, to some for this reason alone: that it was promulgated by the illustrious Estates, not by a synod. Others, contrary to what the king of Great Britain had advised, judged that those disputes should be quieted neither by public authority nor any moderation, but terminated in favor of one party by theological decisions and synodal anathemas. Thus from that time no less rioting occurred than before, nor did those brothers rush more sluggishly against their fellow ministers and the more moderate churches than the most hostile and sworn enemies. This very church”--Rotterdam--“in which I serve the Lord is a witness, and you, most ample lords, are eyewitnesses with how great an effort and what a mass of

invented suspicions, putrid calumnies, and most false accusations they labored at this one thing: that, the minds of the hearers being alienated, they might render our sermons less frequented and our churches deserted.”

[Printed page 773]

He then continues to explain their arts: disturbing the people by tribunician declamations; driving ignorant rural presbyters mad; preoccupying judges by the atrocity of suspicions; and leading square and simple rural presbyters by the ears. He treats these things at greater length. At last matters reached the point that the Rigid flew about freely in contempt of every decree of the Estates.

The history which Grevinchovius relates there is worthy of remembrance; I shall report it in his words: “I remember that, after hearing a most virulent sermon in a neighboring church, I sought from the presbytery a friendly conference about it with S. Gruterus, the minister of that church. But after many most bitter insults, what at last? A peremptory response: if I were a Turk or Jew, I could and ought to be admitted to a colloquy; but as a heretic more wicked than those, I was not to be heard but avoided by Paul's command.” These things after the pleasant colloquy, these things after Syncretism had been decreed. But is this the end? Is immense anger and savage madness content with a moderate disaster?

Behold another stratagem proper and natural to Syncretism. While in the sight of the Estates they debate peaceably, cover hatreds with their countenance and frauds with bland speech, call one another brothers in almost every period, syncretize most splendidly, and most cunningly feign friendship, the same men most hostilely and bitterly assail their associates and brothers. For because they saw that the Estates were more favorable toward the Remonstrants or Soft than to appear likely to obey the desire and anger of the Rigid and condemn those men undefended, that hard nation of the Rigid, ignorant of yielding and tenacious in urging its purpose, contrives their utter destruction from elsewhere. It prepares a most powerful and fervent foreign enemy against the Remonstrants, who by speech may inflame the Estates of Holland toward the destruction of their brothers, move them by authority, and almost compel them by power.

I report the history from the Remonstrants' supplicatory book: “Moreover,” they say, “since no one is ignorant what was recently written under the title of the king of Great Britain to the most powerful States General concerning the late pious and faithful servant of Jesus Christ, Lord JACOB ARMINIUS--who in those letters is disgraced with the appellation ‘enemy of God,’ and his disciples with the titles ‘sectarians, plagues, heretics, indeed atheistic sectarians whose heresy it is expedient to suppress and root out promptly and in the very blade’--the Remonstrants judge that they too are touched and injured by these words. Yet they are no more Arminians than Calvinists or Lutherans; for they profess themselves Christians, ministers of the Reformed Church, by no means infected with heresy or a sect, much less--which is horrible to say--an atheistic sect, but agreeing in the foundation of doctrine and faith with the churches of Great Britain, faithful citizens of their country, humble subjects, the most humble servants of your illustrious lordships and of his Sacred Royal Majesty, for whose safety, long life, preservation, and happy government they ardently pray to the Lord God, King of kings.

“It seemed good to the Remonstrants, with the greatest submission, to ask and entreat your illustrious lordships to grant them, with your good leave--as their innocence in this matter is best known to you--permission to enter upon some safe and honorable way of defending themselves and most humbly and submissively admonishing the said Royal Majesty concerning both Lord Arminius of pious memory, whom they confidently believe to have been and to be not an enemy but a friend of God, and themselves, as men who wish to be cleared and freed before the whole world from the gravest accusations, intolerable to any Christian person.”

A spectacle harsh even to waves and shores, but unexpected and mournful to the Remonstrants: in their own country, before their own magistrate, chosen theologians and presidents of churches dispute about faith, religion, charity, holiness, and mutual toleration; instruct one another with fraternal words; write counsels of peace to their magistrate; offer themselves to a synod and pledge to stand by its judgment. While they display these splendid things in Holland to the gaping people, they most cruelly prosecute the same men in Britain as guilty, affirming them to be sectarians,

plagues, heretics, atheistic sectarians, liable to the gravest accusations intolerable to any Christian, and judging that they must promptly be suppressed and rooted out in the very blade. They acted with such art that the king believed, with such passion that he quickly dictated a sentence and by letter urged a foreign magistrate to suppress and root them out. The outcome of the judgment, the severity of the royal sentence, and the transmarine embassy show what were the cunning and atrocity of the accusers.

Perhaps the Counter-Remonstrants were not the authors of so atrocious and perfidious an accusation carried to a transmarine tribunal, nor did the Rigid summon the deadly sentence from the island when domestic equity obstructed them. I would therefore wish them to clear themselves, or the most serene king, who alone can do so, to absolve them from suspicion. For by naming definite accusers he will show the rest to be immune, if not from communion in an approved crime, at least from the perpetration of the deed.

But it is admitted that they accused them. Those who wished their brothers to perish undefended, imposed silence, and judged them intolerable and more wicked than Turks and Jews--and this contrary to the magistrate's public decree--why is it marvelous if they reported the matter more harshly to the defender of the faith because the Estates seemed too gentle? Moreover, no one except a rigid Calvinist condemns those articles of the Remonstrants about which the controversy exists. Therefore those alone accused who alone possessed a cause for accusation. Thirdly, we ought neither to suspect, nor will his panegyrists concede, that the most prudent king judged most severely in a most grave cause upon the information of an uncertain or unknown accuser. Who, then, accused? Were they not the leaders of the Rigid, who knew the Soft most intimately and could report certain, attested, and seen things? Those men, I say, who foresaw the ruin of the colloquy and perceived themselves conquered by reason and the judgment of the Estates.

I have produced an example of Syncretism which may instruct even the rudest man. What more Cretan could be devised even in Crete itself than the Rigid displayed for us in Holland? At home they dispute fraternally, utter holy words drawn from the sanctuary of Scripture as signs of false benevolence in simulated love, compose laws of peace, and undertake a truce at the command of the Estates. Meanwhile they abuse the authority and power of a foreign king for the destruction of their associates and brothers. They hoped that those whom they could not conquer would be given over as guilty to royal favor, and that the Estates would not dare deny what they so ardently demanded: that they stake the reputation and life of a few to earn the friendship of an allied king.

[Printed page 774]

They were not ignorant that the Briton held the key of the federated provinces; that without his aid navigation was unsafe; that Zeeland and Holland were bound to him by heavy pledges; that cities were occupied by an English garrison; that many Englishmen were in Belgium; and that not a few Belgians preferred royal Majesty to the modest rank of their own Estates. The Rigid judged that all these protections of favor, power, authority, proximity, appearance, and fear must be employed against the safety of their brothers with whom they had been syncretized.

Do not expect another condition of Syncretism or hope for other alliances, Lutherans--or, if other, ones much worse in many ways. For the articles about which they dispute belong as much to you as to the Soft. They teach: first, that reprobation was not made without regard to sin; second, that Christ died for all and each; third, that grace is so given that many can nevertheless resist the Holy Spirit; fourth, they demand that whether faith and justice can be lost be demonstrated from Scripture, for they candidly profess that they doubt. They utterly deny that they have any other dispute with their brothers.

On account of the same articles you will have to sustain the same judgments against you. They will proclaim silence to you, deny that you should be tolerated, and declaim that you are more wicked than Turks and Jews. However the theologians flatter and lie with their countenance about charity, simulate fraternity in words and embrace, nevertheless a tempest stirred by the flatterers will come and, armed with royal forces, a storm will strike you. You will be sectarians, plagues, heretics, atheistic sectarians, liable to the gravest accusations intolerable to any Christian person as

soon as they become stronger; hence you must promptly, indeed in the very blade, be suppressed and rooted out lest you be able to grow into shrubs.

They will rise against you the more cruelly in proportion as they possess more causes for conquering you, and the more eagerly as the prize of victory is greater and succession to more splendid wealth is hoped for. For in you they will not allege those errors which they pursue by so distant a judgment and avenge so cruelly among the Remonstrants--errors which British courtiers scarcely understand, much less rural ignoramuses, or "square men," as Grevinchovius calls them. They judge that they possess greater reason for raging against you: namely, monstrous ubiquity, the conqueror of all articles of faith; impanation; ἄρτολατρείαν [bread-worship]; Osiandrist; Flacianism; and the other horrible and abominable portents of heresies summoned from hell.

Fraternal names will then be far away, when you are called worse than those now judged more wicked than Turks and Jews. Nor will you be able to complain; for he who admits Syncretism brings frauds into the compact. He who introduced a condition of deceiving into the counsel ought not to grieve at the outcome. Who will pity an enchanter struck by a serpent? To whom is death unexpected if he wanders carelessly around a lion's mouth? Flee the very long whales which display the faces of Sirens in the Netherlands but possess the tail of scorpions in Britain. If the deceitful fiction of one or another entices you, let the examples of the most bitter persecutions which those who took too little caution for themselves were compelled to undergo deter you. And let this be the example of Calvinist Syncretism.

CHAPTER XXV

That the Primary Aim of Syncretism Is That, Once the Peace of Religion Has Been Violated, Catholics Should Be Slaughtered

[Printed page 774]

The name of Syncretism is infamous, the thing far more foul, its danger directed against all. Its end is most cruel and most unworthy. For through this counsel of an impious conspiracy destruction is prepared for the Roman Pontiff, the August Emperor, kings, princes, Catholic states, and the whole orthodox name. By examples of ancient crimes, by the notorious deceits of truces, a most accursed thirst for Catholic blood and Catholic money, most thirsty for our blood, advances against us. It has placed before its bloody conspiracy the peace and union of the Evangelicals and a general synod, so that it might impart an appearance of honor to its brigandage; it summons all Evangelicals so that they may profess themselves helpers in obtaining the plunder. It makes a splendid entrance hall so that secretly and safely, through a laboriously painted substructure, it may carry them off to prisons, quarries, undertakers, and pyres. A bland speech? The Union and Synod of the Evangelicals. A popular devotion to peace, and a book dedicated to the desires of peacemakers; but through these fair appearances, through this chrysocola, the way leads to wounds and blood, to civil wars, to the theaters of savage superstition, to the amphitheaters of Calvinistic cruelty. For Calvinism at last, sooner or later, passes over into its own nature, and by the horror of its punishments betrays and disgraces the lies of its affected gentleness. What, then, does the adversary attempt by Syncretism and pacifications? What is the end of so great a disgrace? Let us hear the man himself.

In Chapter 12 he commands that endeavors and counsels be joined in pious Syncretism against the common enemy Antichrist. In Chapter 11 he conducts this more ardently, and prefixes this title to it: “That, while a synod and full concord are being procured, the Evangelicals meanwhile ought to unite in pious Syncretism and mutual toleration, and to stand together against the Papacy.”

Therefore that Silesian Hannibal, now about to die, seeks throughout the whole world an enemy for the Romans--an enemy for the Romans, that is, for the Pontiff, his defenders, friends, and clients. He looks about on every side for auxiliaries, even faithless and doubtful ones, and by the same labor warns us to be cautious, lest we fail to know that war has been declared, which so well-known a fetal priest has proclaimed. I propose three things in this war for princes and their counselors to consider.

The first is that by the name Antichrist and Papacy not only the Pontiff, but all clerics and laymen of the Catholic and ancient religion, are designated by that gladiatorial trainer. The second is that he treats not only of his own defense but of an attack upon Catholics and of arms to be carried against them unprovoked. The third is that the war he recommends will be the most cruel of all those that have ever shaken the human race.

The first is admitted. All define the Papacy as the pontifical kingdom. Graserus, in *The Royal Plague*, folio 54, attempts to show that the clergy are the flesh of Antichrist, and secular kings and princes his bones. Povellus says almost the same in his theses *On Antichrist*; Benedictus Aretius says it most pestilentially of all on Apocalypse 13:15. The name of the Beast is to be a son of the Roman Church, or a Catholic, or a member of the Roman Church. But two beasts are described by the Apostle John, of which they interpret the greatest and most monstrous as the Emperor or Empire, and the secondary, the servant of the first, as the Pontiff.

[Printed page 775]

Therefore this war will rage most widely against kings and the firstborn of kings who sit upon their thrones, down to the firstborn of maidservants grinding at the mill; for when the Calvinist peacemaker begins to be provoked, all are Antichristian to him. Against all, I say, barbarous savagery will advance, but first against those whom it will be most

profitable to have conquered: the Emperor, the Most Christian and Catholic kings, who are the firstborn sons of the Church and the most noble members in so divine a body. Nor do I say these things to arouse odium; no speech can be found equal to such atrocity, nor do those who teach thus care about reproach, since they account ingenious cruelty a praise to themselves. It seemed too little to them to demand in general that all be delivered to tortures and death, lest anyone trust that account would be taken of his dignity or lineage; Aretius the Calvinist expressly destines Caesar and the princes of the Empire for slaughter in his commentary on Apocalypse 13:7: “After the doctrine of Christ had been received, impious hypocrites presently snatched the title of the Church to themselves and persecuted the true commandments of Christ, which cause the successors of the imperial seat still strenuously defend.” And: “For as widely as the Roman name extends, so widely do the pious”--that is, Calvinists--“suffer persecutions.” When he wrote this, Calvinism had not yet invaded the Empire with so great a force. And on verse 1: “To marvel at the Beast is to marvel at the success and felicity of the Empire, proclaiming that august, holy, sacrosanct, and immortal thing.” And: “For the dragon is the Devil, who attaches his own ornaments to the Empire.”

But Graserus speaks far more abusively in *The Royal Plague*: he calls the Empire “the fullness of diabolism.” The same man, after calling all Catholics “bestiality” at folio 55, and then saying at folio 207 that all Catholics fornicate with the great whore and that kings are fornicators, adds: “In this order of FORNICATING KINGS, THE SPANIARD AND SPAIN hold first place.”

Nor does Pareus conceal these things, nor can he; for he orders all sects to stand against the Papacy and those whom, for the sake of insult, he calls Papists. Nor is he so stupid as not to know that the basilica of Peter is supported by the protection of many kings and peoples. He knows that their life and power prevent him from turning the rich plunder of Roman benefices into his own rewards; he knows that the common father in Christ of all orthodox kings cannot be attacked except through the sides of faithful kings. He knows that the praetorian ship of Saint Peter is surrounded by the victorious fleet of the whole Christian world, and cannot be taken and torn apart unless that fleet is scattered.

But he would especially wish given over to destruction those whom in Chapter 29 he falsely says are forcing their provinces back under the yoke of Antichrist by deceit and arms. Who are they? “Documents of this matter,” he says, “are Eastern Francia, Austria, Styria, Carinthia, Hungary, Troppau, and Donauwörth.” In its place I shall bring forward a most just expostulation concerning this injury; now it is sufficient to show against whom Pareus declares war: namely, against the Emperor, the Austrian house, the Bavarian princes, and the duke of Eastern Francia. “These things,” he says, “must be opposed more strongly and more promptly by united vows, counsels, and ACTS.” These matters indeed especially concern kings, princes, and other secular men; since I have proved the case concerning them, it is not necessary to speak of ecclesiastics, whom they hate more bitterly. Concerning these I shall be content to produce the most calumnious opinion of Calvin, Letter 2, *On the Duty of a Christian Man concerning Benefices*, etc.: “Among upright”--Calvinist--“and incorrupt judges, it would surely not be so difficult to make manifest that that whole mass of Roman wealth, from the supreme see itself down to the least chaplaincy, as they call it, was compounded from impostures, thefts, robberies, sacrileges, and the worst arts; and that you cannot touch any particle of it without binding yourself by consciousness of many crimes.”

Laws and legal principles teach how impostors, thieves, robbers, sacrilegious men, usurpers of evil arts, bound by consciousness of many crimes, are to be treated; and when these men have conquered, they will turn all those laws--established to restrain the audacity of the wicked--toward attacking the innocence of the orthodox. For what will victors not attempt, when, although they do not yet possess much and do not yet securely possess what they have scraped together, they nevertheless wish war to be decreed against distant kingdoms, against princes under another's jurisdiction, and against Caesar himself? When they grow hot with wine and anger beside the Neckar, they bear it ill if, in Eastern Francia, Austria, Styria, Hungary, Troppau, and the city of Donauwörth, the ancient truth into which those regions were first baptized is taught contrary to their will and dominion. I have said and proved that the calamity and ruin of that war are proclaimed against all; I shall now show the second point: he does not aim to preserve and defend

things acquired in whatever manner, but to enlarge his dominion, carry hostile arms against others, kill, and strip away spoils.

First, the Genevan, Helvetian, French, Belgian, British, and the now-emerging Brandenburg practice demonstrate this. Next, he thinks that war must be undertaken to propagate his perfidy, break images, and abolish Catholic ceremonies; but for one who attempts such things, defense alone is not sufficient: war must be carried forward by him, not merely sustained. But it is better to hear in his own words the Tartarean mob of civil war thundering. On Romans 13, Doubt, Proposition 7: “Christian kings and princes ought to resist pontifical tyranny, even with the sword, by obstructing and breaking it by force, removing idols, and restoring the Church to its liberty.” Everyone understands that offensive war is commanded here; or, if anyone doubts, surely the three reasons that he appends ought deservedly to remove every scruple.

The first reason: “Princes ought to be a terror to evil works and avengers unto wrath against those who do evil. But the works of Antichrist are the worst, and therefore his wickedness must be restrained with the sword.” Who would say that mere defense against crimes is commanded to a prince? Who denies that it is the magistrate's duty diligently to search for and track down brigands, thieves, and malefactors, to drag them from hiding places, and to proceed by law against those convicted and judged? But who does not see that by this reasoning not only a right and a sword are given to Calvinists against the Pontiff, Caesar, and every Catholic Estate, but vengeance is also commanded? Truly an accursed heresy, which not only permits the license of wars and robberies against fellow princes who have persisted in the ancient religion of the fathers, but also commands cruelty.

The second reason is even more cruel: “Because this is commanded to them, Apocalypse 18:6: Render to her as she herself rendered to you, and double to her the double according to her works; in the cup in which she mixed, mix double for her. Therefore they ought to destroy the kingdom of the Pope.” A just command indeed, but against Antichrist and his helpers, against whom it is directed by God; impious and cruel when punishments of malefactors are transferred to priests and Christian kings because of their perseverance in ancient piety.

In the third reason he explains more fully what he wishes to be done: “Because,” he says, “it is foretold that Christian kings and princes will hate the whore, render her desolate and naked, eat her flesh, and burn her with fire; but the prediction possesses the force of a precept, so that they should do this.” I have elsewhere exposed the injuries, calumnies, and sacrileges of the adversaries in corrupting these words of Scripture; now I wish to establish only this: according to their judgment, the war they contrive is not defensive but offensive.

[Printed page 776]

Hence Fredericus Braubomus the Calvinist, in Book 10, Chapter 5 of *The Flowers of the Flamens*, attempts throughout to prove that all Christian kings--indeed, all Calvinists--possess a divine command to overthrow the Pontiff. “Such a command,” he says, “as the private man Ehud possessed, we possess publicly.” Hence the warlike speech of Graserus in *The Royal Plague*. Hence Plessis's trumpet call to the king of Britain, in which with great shouting he demands that the king seek Italy, pierce the Pontiff with an avenging sword, furnish the world a spectacle of the hunt, trample him upon the Milvian Bridge, ruin him, drive him out, and submerge him in Avernus like a millstone. With great passion the most gentle man seeks this, and desires himself to be present, to fight, and to lick swords warm with noble blood. “I,” he says in the preface to his *Mystery of Iniquity*, “shall mingle among the first battles; amid the triumphs, when the angel gives the signal, I shall repeat, FALLEN; I shall immerse myself wholly in this holy joy; caught up close to eternity, I shall die in it.”

I pass over the cruelty of this veteran soldier fattened on Catholic blood. I do not accuse the savage joy of a mind submerged in the gore of the slain, or a joy so exultant from butchery that it severs the life of the rejoicing man, because it belongs to Calvinist piety not to glory in the hope of the sons of God, not to rejoice in heavenly consolation, not to immerse oneself in the holy joy of divine love, but to set the highest pinnacle of gladness upon the gore of the slain, to be submerged in Catholic blood, and to melt with such great pleasure at another's wounds and tortures that one

dies in one's own cruelty. This is the vow of the soldier; this is the vow of all the Calvinist ministers who have nourished that chick of Mars with blood.

I have now sufficiently explained two things: namely, that war has been decreed against all; next, that it is a war in which force is to be carried against others unprovoked, not one in which force offered is merely repelled. The third remains: namely, that if war is waged under the auspices of Pareus, it will be the most monstrous and foul of all that the world has thus far undergone, and that this savagery is the proper end of Syncretism.

Plessis's joy and pleasure can demonstrate the cruelty more clearly than my words. We have heard that there were many savage tyrants who took pleasure from the blood and pains of others and eagerly watched punishments. We recall none of so beastly and ferocious a disposition that the torments of the wretched furnished him so great a force of joy as to compel him to die; no executioner who derived from tortures applied to another's body so much gladness that the pleasure of tormenting could effect in the one what pains and the laceration of the body effected in the other, so that the immensity of savage joy would take the tormentor's life just as the magnitude of torture took the tortured man's. Plessis alone professes that he will be wholly submerged in, and will die in, that joy of executioners. Let us imagine an army of Plessises, with Pareuses as its commanders. The mind shudders to speak of the rest; I do not intend to range over what no ingenuity of executioners has hitherto discovered.

Perhaps you will ask what cause of savagery the Calvinists put forward. Most allege anger and hatred, all a false opinion, and some the pleasure that they perceive from another's torture, which is proper to cruelty. They think Catholics, whom they call Papists, are Antichristians. Some persuade themselves of this so certainly that they assert it even with perjury, as Povellus does in his theses *On Antichrist*; others doubt, as does the Most Serene King of England. Yet because they think this, they therefore judge Catholics the most filthy, foul, and savage of all men, drunk with the blood of the saints, idolaters, Baalites, and "bestiality," as they proclaim. "Under those elaborate masks"--of Catholics--says Graserus in *The Royal Plague*, "nothing other than cruel murderers, criminals, poisoners, impure fornicators, thieves, and brigands are concealed and hidden." A grave accusation: that nothing else lies hidden there, nothing of humanity, nothing of truth.

Therefore, since they have long since judged us to be such criminal masks, from that prejudgment they determine that we must be vexed by every punishment and torn by every insult. Sacred Scripture teaches us that Antichrist will try every kind of savagery against the pious. "For then there will be tribulation such as has not been since the beginning, when nations began to exist." They judge the Pontiff to be Antichrist and Catholics to be Antichristian attendants and servants; for this reason they impute to us all the cruelty that Scripture attributes to Antichrist, and one greater than was ever exercised by any tyrant. But what is said in Apocalypse 18, "Render to her double," they interpret so as to say that they have been commanded by GOD to apply to us torments twice as harsh as those by which Antichrist tortured the saints.

Although Pareus's words are more monstrous than Plessis's pleasure, let us hear them: "Nor is injustice commanded when it is commanded that double be rendered to her; rather, it is signified that no kind of vengeance against the Pope is unjust or excessive. 'Double' is understood not in relation to the punishment that he deserved, but to the evils which he formerly inflicted upon the pious and with which he afflicted the Church." How emphatically: no kind of vengeance! Nor are punishments decreed against the person of the Pontiff alone. If Plessis conquers, the lot of kings and princes will be the same, for many of them have harmed Calvinists far more than the Pontiff has--especially those by whose pious care, life, and admonition certain provinces have been led back to knowledge of the ancient faith and the true worship of God.

These things are to be expected by us if Syncretism prevails and God ceases to govern the human race. Pareus, a minister of hell, will preside over the slaughterhouse; a harsh arbiter of punishments, he will multiply the tortures to double measure. Attentive and skilled in torture, he will take care that they do not pay less than double; for if the executioners please to exceed it, Pareus will permit it, "because no kind of vengeance is excessive or unjust." Plessis

will be present, wholly submerged in holy joy. Pareus will invent what Phalaris will marvel at, what Busiris will be astonished at, what Calvinism has not yet dared or has not yet been able to do. He will dictate punishments to be applied not merely to plebeian bodies but to the majesty of kings and princes and the sanctity of bishops; and, having vigorously employed so great a mastery of slaughter, he will extinguish Catholics by tortures and the army of Plessis by the joy conceived from the tortures of Catholics.

More savage are you than grim Busiris, more savage than he
 Who roasted the false bull in a slow fire,
 And he who is said to have given the bull to the Sicilian tyrant
 And to have allied his arts with his words.

That Tuscan tyrant, about whom boys are accustomed to sing, was nothing beside the desire for Christian peace and the contrivances of Syncretism:

Indeed, he even joined dead bodies to living,
 Matching hands to hands and faces to faces,

[Printed page 777]

And thus killed them by a long death in a wretched embrace.

The Calvinist will double these things against us. What appearance will the world then have? What place will receive the fearful? How many punishments must the brave overcome? What groans? What sounds of blows? What fumes of fires hissing in wounds?

Who could disclose in relation so many
 Deaths? Who could lament the abominable slaughters?
 What such deeds are the monstrous ever said to have committed--
 Either Scinis with the Isthmian pine, or Sciron from the deep cliff,
 Or Phalaris with the bull, or Sulla with the prison,
 Or the Dutch with swords, or the Huguenots with dormice?
 O gentle horses of Diomedes! Altars of Busiris,
 You are now merciful; Cinna is now pious, and Spartacus gentle,
 When compared with Pareus.

How great will be the suffering that can produce mortal joy in a Calvinist? Although perhaps his hands have not yet been wet with Catholic blood, he has certainly dyed the pen with which he writes in our blood and bloodied his jaws with our death. These are the counsels of the tribunes of our age; these the decrees of the theologians: We cannot conquer by our cause; let us kill. "We possess publicly the divine command which Ehud the judge possessed privately against the king of the Moabites." What sort of command is this? Kill. Who will ask whether courage or deceit is used against an enemy?

Can there therefore be peace for you, O Pareus, with those whom God commands you to kill? If a law has been commanded by the supreme Lord by which our slaughter is entrusted to you, and you judge that this is so, you break off every compact and every hope of concord forever.

You will say: "I shall make peace with you, but I cannot act against the law of God; he has commanded me to kill you. I possess a public command to kill you; the supreme Emperor's authority renders private pacifications, treaties, and oaths void." Our princes now understand you sufficiently. Divine goodness has therefore bound their power and courage by the closest alliance for their own defense, lest each one perish separately through the snares of these agitators. But to expect religious peace from those for whom it is the summit of all sanctity to kill their adversaries at the first opportunity is foolish--from those, I say, who introduce into the world not only treaties customary among nations but even shameful frauds of Syncretisms; namely:

So great a task it was to destroy the Roman nation.

CHAPTER XXVI

That the Secondary Aim of Syncretism Is Twofold: the Overthrow of the Lutherans and the Servitude of Calvinist Princes

[Printed page 777]

Once the Pontiff has been killed together with his defenders, after they have devoured his flesh, burned many of them, blocked the bed of the Tiber with corpses, and brought back the times of Sulla, in which the foremost fell into the river and the highest upon their bodies, they will then turn the sword against their Lutheran fellow soldiers and, with a Cadmean battle, offer funeral rites to Roman shades. For if the simple Pope and simple Papists had to be finished off so atrociously, what will they say that double popes and double Papists deserve? For Calvinist ministers are accustomed to call the Lutherans thus, as I proved in the book concerning their union.

Next, they will possess against the Lutherans themselves the same causes for waging war which impelled them to Syncretism and conflict against Catholics. They will say that their princes ought to resist Lutheran tyranny, obstructing it even with the sword and by force and breaking idols; for Pareus thinks that the Lutherans too patronize idols, on Romans 1, Doubt 18. Thirdly, the Lutherans judge that Calvinists must be prosecuted by war; but who would believe that Calvinists will deliberate more benignly concerning their enemies, whom they have experienced to have thought about them only with the greatest cruelty? Joachim Westphal cries out that whoever is found to favor Calvinists must be exterminated from the whole world. He glories that he wrote: "Calvinists are to be refuted by the magistrate with the sword rather than with the pen." He is the author of the advice "that magistrates interdict from water and fire not merely professors of Zwinglian doctrine but also those who approve it"--so Calvin reports in his *Final Admonition to Westphal*.

For the sake of order I now touch this part lightly; in their proper place I shall produce the Lutherans themselves pleading their cause, for among all causes this is the principal one. Therefore nineteen reasons from the judgment of the Lutherans will explain the cause. Yet lest the Calvinist agitators think they can so cover and suppress the purpose of their mind that it does not issue forth among the people and become known, I shall deal briefly with them, and so gently that they cannot take offense, so truly that they cannot answer.

Come then: let there be peace; let Syncretism coalesce. You wish to provide for the Lutherans; you account it an abomination that fraternity be rent. Once we have been killed, you promise to live peacefully with them forever. If you do not knowingly and willingly deceive them, come then: as spokesman for all Lutherans, I pray and entreat this one thing. Allow them to retain their place in the Electoral March for even one month. I do not pray that they remain forever; this is too much. I demand some interval for flight and a small loan of time. Let them possess that pledge of your humanity and Syncretism; do not expel those whom you greatly desire to be so closely joined with you. If I obtain this, I shall become a herald of your moderation; if it is denied, I do not see what the Lutherans can hope for. Will you yield lands and inheritances to those whom you have begun to expel so precipitately and eagerly that by your importunity you have driven the wretched men into madness--men to whom you have not granted even a precarious possession for a time? If you proceed to oppress them by secular power, what may they expect when conquered, when even now, while fortune stands, they suffer such dire things; when even now, while the flatteries of Syncretism solicit them, they experience exiles, proscriptions, and prisons?

But what if I make plain from Pareus that not only can the Lutherans not be safe while Calvinists live, but even Calvinist kings and princes themselves cannot evade the deceits and violence of their ministers unless they serve a servitude? So great is the perversity of the Zwinglian possession that it turns the sword against its own entrails when the material for cruelty directed against foreigners is withdrawn. Pareus teaches thus on Romans 13, Proposition 2:

“Subjects--not private persons, but those established in an inferior magistracy--can by right defend themselves, the state, and the Church, or true religion, even by arms against a superior magistrate,” upon these conditions:

- I. When the superior magistrate degenerates into a tyrant.
- II. Or when he wishes by force to compel them or other subjects to manifest idolatry and blasphemies.
- III. When an atrocious injury is inflicted upon them.
- IV. If they cannot otherwise be secure in fortune, life, and conscience.
- V. That under the pretext of religion or justice they do not seek their own interest.

[Printed page 778]

VI. With ἐπιείκεια [equity] always preserved, and with the restraint of blameless protection according to the laws.

From these conditions Lutheran and Calvinist princes can fashion their arguments.

First. If a Calvinist consistory judges me a tyrant, it will think it lawful, whenever it pleases, to arm a praetor against me. But it will call me a tyrant if I tolerate and foster rigid Ubiquitarians and savage enemies of the truth--if I exterminate Calvinists.

Second. With how great a license will it establish that decree of its own: that a satrap may defend his own church against a superior magistrate? If Calvinists assemble a little church at Wittenberg or Leipzig, will a consul or satrap be able by good right to defend it by arms against the Elector? No one is ignorant how widely that statement extends--“I defend the Church; I protect the true religion”--unless he is so much a stranger in Europe that he does not know by how many religions the true faith is claimed. If a sword has been given to an inferior magistrate against a superior in that cause, they must concede that the prince of Saxony could once have been killed by Crellius.

Third. “If he wishes to compel them to manifest blasphemy.” Namely, if anyone teaches impanation and ubiquity in Lutheran fashion, and commands men to subscribe to those articles or to cease from condemning them, according to Pareus's judgment that prince can be killed by his own praetor.

Fourth. “If an atrocious injury is inflicted.” Surely it is an atrocious injury to give subjects in church, in place of heavenly bread and the saving Eucharist, excrement of which the Devil himself ought to be ashamed in hell. Beza says the Lutherans do this; see the *Defense of the Men of Pforzheim*, page 205. Therefore he judges that princes who exclude Zwinglian loaves and morsels from their dominions and protect the Lutheran Supper by their authority and arms inflict an atrocious injury.

Fifth. “If they cannot otherwise be secure in conscience.” But when will men say that they are secure in their most holy conscience? When in fortune and life? If in the best faith the Lutherans yield their ministries to them; if they abandon everything; if they are not burdensome to the occupiers of their property; if it is granted them freely to teach, rebuke adversaries, convene councils, and arm consistories. I have never doubted that Pareus himself never approved for himself what he demands that we believe: that a praetor driven mad by Zwinglianism, if he thinks that while his own prince lives he cannot be secure in conscience, has obtained the right and power of life and death over his lord.

For what if his conscience is as cauterized as Calvin's back? What if it is fanatical? What if impious? What if Calvinist? Will the life of a Lutheran prince depend to such a degree upon the conscience of a Calvinist subject? What if the latter professes that his conscience is injured because the sacraments are not given according to the Genevan rite; because he does not hear pleasant sermons which ascribe crimes to GOD; because he is forbidden to educate and initiate his children in Genevan rites? Will he procure the security of his conscience by the danger of the prince, sanctity by the blood of the magistrate, and safety by the death of those who rule him? I leave these things for magistrates to consider; I proceed to other matters. He produces five reasons to prove his proposition, by which he overturns the exception concerning the ἐπιείκεια [equity] of blameless defense.

Reason I. “Because the superior magistrate is subject to divine laws and those of his state. For it would be manifest impiety and wickedness for a magistrate, however exalted, to wish to exempt himself from the laws. This is evident because the king is commanded to read Deuteronomy, or the divine law, Deuteronomy 17; Joshua 1:8. Therefore God wishes the king to be subject to divine laws. But the law of GOD not only prohibits tyranny but also commands it to be lawfully restrained: ‘Whoever sheds man’s blood,’ etc. Likewise, the Emperor testifies in the Code that he does not wish his decrees to possess a place in judgments contrary to law, but that they ought to be void if perhaps they are recognized to depart from justice. And in Book 4 of the Code, *On the Laws of Princes*: ‘So worthy of the majesty of a ruler is the declaration that the prince professes himself bound by the laws.’ Therefore even the tyrannies and brigandage of a superior magistrate ought to be restrained by the ordinary power, which in any polity is either the inferior magistrate or the consent of the people.”

II. “Because it is no less the duty of an inferior than of a superior magistrate to defend the life and safety of subjects against atrocious injuries and the unjust force of brigands and tyrants, whether foreign or domestic.” This is proved: “Because of them too it is said: ‘He is the minister of God to you for good; he is not a terror to good works, but to evil. He does not bear the sword in vain; he is an avenger unto the wrath of God against him who does evil.’ Therefore when a superior magistrate does evil, and acts with atrocious injuries against subjects or blasphemies against God, the inferior ought to be an avenger unto wrath,” etc. Likewise, “because inferior magistrates are therefore joined to superiors, both so that they may be associates in government and so that they may moderate the latter’s excessive license. Therefore, when they restrain it, they employ the authority and sword divinely entrusted to them through a legitimate calling.”

III. “Those whose office it is to establish magistrates also have the office of restraining or removing those who advance outrageously, unless they desist from advancing against God and the state. But magistrates are established either by the consent of the people, by the senate, by electors, or by other magistrates. Therefore these act rightly when they restrain or remove those who advance outrageously.”

IV. “From a similar case: a mad magistrate is rightly removed by public authority, as Nebuchadnezzar, turned into a mad beast, was cast out from human fellowship, Daniel 4:31. But an atrocious assailant and tyrant is like a madman.”

V. “Approved examples, both sacred and profane, confirm the same. In the history of the Judges, the Israelites are often read to have risen through their judges, with God’s approval, against neighboring tyrants by whom they were cruelly treated. Hezekiah, a pious king, revolted from the Assyrian tyrant, and when attacked by him in war, defended himself against him by arms, 2 Kings 18. It does not matter that these were foreign tyrants, for domestic tyrants differ in nothing from foreign ones; indeed, they are to be restrained more because they are perjured and more harmful. Thus the people resisted the foolish King Saul when he wished to slaughter his son Jonathan, 1 Samuel 14:15. Ahikam defended the prophet Jeremiah against King Jehoiakim when he wished to kill him, Jeremiah 26:24. The centurions and princes removed the tyrant Athaliah, 2 Kings 11. The Maccabees defended themselves and the state by arms against the Macedonian tyrants. Thrasybulus drove the Thirty Tyrants from Athens. By public consent the Romans expelled kings who ruled shamefully; they often compelled consuls to abdicate the magistracy; they judged the tyrants Nero and Maximinus public enemies and removed them. The Electors deposed the idle and luxurious Wenceslaus from the Empire, putting in his place Rupert, Elector Palatine, founder of the cathedral church of this town, in the year 1400.”

Finally, Trajan is praised in Dio because, when handing the sword to the praetorian prefect, he said: “Use this for me if I command just things; against me if unjust things.”

[Printed page 779]

Since the matter itself teaches how such splendid arguments open a door to the crime and audacity of the wicked for destroying the safety of princes, I ought to say no more. What then? A prince is subject to the laws of his state? Let it be so; I do not now dispute this. Is he also subject to the law in such a way that he ought to pay penalties to the state,

and that legal proceedings ought to be taken against him as soon as he transgresses? You indeed think so: "Because," he says, "the law of God commands tyranny lawfully to be restrained: whoever sheds man's blood," etc.; "therefore a superior magistrate ought to be restrained by an inferior." If, therefore, a Lutheran prince is liable for some offense sanctioned by capital punishment, Pareus judges by force of divine law that he must be killed. For this is the tendency of the statement: "Whoever sheds man's blood, his blood too must be shed, for homicide cannot otherwise be expiated except by the blood of him who shed another's blood."

And just as it is the prince's office to suppress brigandage, blasphemies, adulteries, and much more heresies and idolatry by force and even, if necessary, by the sword, so by Pareus's counsel Calvinist nobles will proceed with the sword against Lutheran princes if they protect and defend ubiquity; if they establish idols or images in a church; if they practice Cyclopean dismemberment; if they believe what the Soft in Belgium believe, and thus seem to be sectarians, heretics, atheistic sectarians, to be promptly suppressed in the very blade. Those who think thus will never lack a legal action against their own princes, and never a design for accomplishing such great audacity.

[Printed page 779]

But what does the second argument permit a Lutheran prince against Calvinism? Indeed, what does it not permit Calvinism against a prince? "When the superior magistrate does what is evil," he says, "the inferior ought to be an avenger unto wrath." But if a Lutheran or Calvinist prince is arraigned before the consistorial tribunal of the Zwinglian ministry, it will be difficult to prevail in the cause under an unjust judge. "You do evil," they will say to the Lutheran. "You proscribe Calvinist ministers and advance Ubiquitarians, turbulent enemies of truth; you summon ancient heresies from hell; you worship a bread-made God; you hold a Cyclopean feast and tear your God with your teeth.

"Go, lictor: veil his head, scourge him within or outside the *pomerium*, hang him upon the unlucky tree. Beware of suspecting that any punishment is excessive or unjust, for they are double Papists."

He does not fear to add that inferior magistrates were joined to superiors in order to moderate the latter's excessive license; therefore, when they restrain it, they employ the authority and sword entrusted to them through a legitimate calling. If these things are true, those men are not merely helpers of princes but princes of princes--indeed, executioners of princes. For on departing from Pareus's Museum, what will a satrap swear to his prince? Namely, that he is an associate in government, a moderator of the prince's license, and that he will use his sword against him if he transgresses.

But what does it concede to the prince against these petty tyrants? Are they inviolable and sacred like tribunes of the plebs? Can they not command the prince, drag men to prison, and kill? Therefore those who hold in their hand not only the authority but also the life of the prince are exempt from his dominion. But you will say: "This is so if the prince has bound himself by crime--if he has done what is evil." Nor are they so mad as to profess that punishments must be established for good deeds and virtue; nor is it necessary for me, although they have often done this, to accuse so great an insolence on their part. I assert and confirm this: under that royal power of praetors, consuls, and satraps, the life of a Lutheran prince is not to be valued at one as. For they long ago decreed that he does evil; they judged him an enemy when they said he was a defender and patron of horrible heresies and a persecutor of truth.

They will arrogate the same right to themselves from the third argument; for whenever it pleases them to kill, they will allege that the Lutherans advance outrageously against God and the state. Nor will the censure of a consistory expose only Lutherans to the swords of petty rulers; it will not spare the Calvinists themselves.

William Ames, a champion of the more rigid Puritanism, furnished an example. I have not seen his book against the bishops of England; I shall transcribe what Nicholas Grevinchovius cites from it in his preface:

"But the rest"--those, namely, who are not Rigid Puritans but Anglo-Papists, as are the bishops of Britain--"are notable gamblers, strenuous drinkers, men who treat the duties of religion as of no importance, practiced peddlers corrupted by the perverse ambitions of the Papists, impious swearers, and, finally, vain, unjust, shameful men and all sons of Belial.

And these men not only act as commanders of the army but almost alone fill the camp; for they often make Marian mules of the simpler men whom they possess among the freeborn, while they abuse their labor to supply wood to the soldiers after the manner of camp servants. But the breasts and heads of those Euclios who still obstinately struggle against Puritanism must be purged with hellebore. Moreover, those laws through whose favor and force some ministers were driven from their goods and seats, etc., whatever they may be, incur the same reproach as the decrees of the Athenians, concerning which Xenophon complained: ἔλοντο τοῖς πονηροῖς ἀμείνον πράττειν, ἢ τοῖς χρηστοῖς [they chose that the wicked should fare better than the good]. Nor, that you may know it, are those ancient decrees or counsels of the forefathers," etc.

"Certain canons were fashioned with evil deceit in fraud of the laws, condemned by the parliamentary senate, truly criminal, which at last their authors enforce against the ministers unwillingly, not without shame, and by transferring the blame to others--if you except certain fierce and savage men who appear altogether to have cast off shame. Furthermore, most of those constitutions were deliberately enacted to disturb and ensnare the quiet of the land. This is evident even from the fact that they not only retained certain putrid relics of the Papists, but delivered them fortified by every means and surrounded by dense anathemas taking effect from the very deed, striving especially to establish those corruptions which they knew almost all good men abhorred. Thus they have now made it manifest that they do not fail to know their own vices but love them: prison-guards gaping after plunder, armed with omnipotent Vulcan, devouring rich pasture, trampling under their feet what remains of the pasture, attacking with their horns the sheep affected by disease, until they have scattered them and driven them outside; ascending the criminal ladder of Antichrist through the unequal grades of churches and ecclesiastics in jurisdiction, impelled by the Antichristian spirit while they arrogate this to themselves, that they should be accounted pastors of pastors--men whom you could rightly call Catos or dragons, in doubt which. And thus either this pretended order of bishops must be removed from the midst, or the Pope must be summoned again from hell."

These things he casts, as if from a wagon, against that order which Royal Majesty itself venerates as holy and which the nobles of the kingdom esteem.

You have heard Ames, who laid the first rudiments of his abusive speech in assailing the king himself through the bishops.

Does he doubt here that those bishops are atheists and the most criminal of men? Is it not doing evil to do those things Ames writes? Is not the innocent king not merely their defender but their restorer, patron, author, and adorer? Can or dare they do those things without the king? What, then, do we think this man would do if he employed the right of the inferior magistrate? The reasoning is complete. Those bishops do what is evil; the king established, venerates, protects, and assists them. Therefore the sword divinely entrusted to me must be directed against the king. For who, when the criminal ladder of Antichrist lay prostrate in Scotland and tottered in England, raised it and supported it by the opposition of royal power and authority, unless it was the Most Serene King James? "He does what is evil," says Ames. "Therefore it belongs to his satrap to be an avenger unto wrath," Pareus adds.

He commands madmen to be driven out. But the Calvinists think the Lutherans mad.

"Nor will Westphal effect anything by his mad tumult," etc., says Calvin in the *Final Admonition* in the same place: "to rise with a frenzied impulse"; "the man's intemperance is obstinate." The Heidelberg Consolators expressly endeavor to demonstrate that Jakob Andreae and Osiander are mad. In the program of his apology, Grynaeus thinks that the magistrate is affected by the most atrocious insult through the sides of those who teach piously. Therefore they will refer to the magistrate everything that the preachers rave and will cry that the magistrate of the Lutherans is assailed by the disease which is accustomed to be spat forth. For nothing is holy, nothing immune, which audacity driven by the evils of superstition does not break through.

[Printed page 780]

Thus far we have heard the arguments; let us see the examples. “In the history of the Judges the Israelites are often read to have risen through their judges, with God’s approval, against neighboring tyrants by whom they were cruelly treated.” Therefore an inferior magistrate can kill a superior, because domestic tyrants are to be restrained more, since they are perjured and more harmful. I seem to hear the declaration of the brigandage consistory: One judge killed a king who cruelly treated the Israelites; let one satrap kill a Lutheran prince who exterminates Calvinist ceremonies.

Hezekiah rebelled against the Assyrian king. Therefore an inferior magistrate can fight against a superior if the latter sustains the criminal ladder of Antichrist and, impelled by the Antichristian spirit, arrogates this to himself: that he should be accounted pastor of pastors, that is, head of the Church.

The centurions killed Athaliah; therefore a praetor can rightfully kill a prince. Thrasybulus drove out the Thirty Tyrants; the Romans expelled their kings and compelled their consuls to abdicate; they removed Nero and Maximinus. Why, therefore, should Calvinists not cut Lutheran princes in two--Ubiquitarians liable to the gravest crimes, intolerable to any Christian man--and introduce into their patrimonies and dominion pious men who are masters of their own mind?

Wenceslaus was stripped of the Empire because of idleness. Therefore an inferior magistrate will be able to deprive a superior of his dominion. What, then, if a Calvinist prince does not attack Lutheranism sharply enough? If he publishes more merciful edicts for Lutherans? If he seems more inclined toward the cause of the sectarians--that is, the Soft--as the Estates are? If the royal admonition has not aroused his sluggishness? Evidently a danger equal to the Pope’s threatens him: the same that threatens the Lutheran, the double Papist, and the bishops of England who ascend the criminal ladder of Antichrist so that they may be pastors of pastors.

But what need is there of more? I produce Pareus’s testimony against the author himself. He denies that Lutherans should be tolerated. “A Christian magistrate,” he says on Romans 13, “ought not to permit confusion in religion, but to protect and defend the true religion alone.” But in Pareus’s mind Rigid Calvinism alone is the true religion; therefore he ought to protect and defend it alone. And Proposition 4: “Christian princes ought by edicts and punishments to obstruct blasphemies, heresies, idols, sacrileges,” etc. “Because they obstruct the good and safety of subjects, they therefore rightly exterminate the Papacy. Because they are evil works, princes ought therefore to be a terror to them.” Let not the Lutheran prince lose confidence here unless Pareus says that the Lutherans possess blasphemies, heresies, idols, and sacrileges. For in Chapter 28 he says that paradoxes and dogmas far more horrible and false than those which they reproach to the Calvinists can be collected from the Lutherans’ own books. He says the Lutherans are called by his party Marcionites, Manichaeans, Nestorians, Eutychians, Capernaïtes, flesh-eaters, Ubiquitarians, and Flacians. Are not the Marcionites blasphemous? The Manichaeans more than heretics? The Capernaïtes and flesh-eaters idolaters, or, as the Zwinglians are accustomed to call them, ἀρτολάτραι [bread-worshippers]? Are not the Flacians sacrilegious? And the Nestorians and Eutychians most especially so? Indeed, are not all those men all these things? Therefore a prince ought to restrain them by punishments. Consequently they will effect this as soon as they have the power. For whoever opposes the consistory will fall by the sword.

These things are so clear that Pareus cannot deny them, so turbulent and seditious that he has not attempted to defend them. Yet a man was found German in tongue, Cretan in mind, who not only defends those dangerous things but, as is the custom of desperate wickedness, attacks me without provocation. He suppressed his name and betrayed his character; and although he aims at others, he nevertheless pursues me. The judgment is yours, reader.

First, Pareus speaks thus on page 316 of the *Irenicum*: “But this is the thing concerning which not only we labor, but undoubtedly all pious and prudent men understand that the greatest labor must be expended in this business: that, when at last a pious and true union of all the Evangelical Estates and theologians, however many there are within or outside the Roman Empire, has been effected, the horrible schism and deadly discord may be removed; the course of the Gospel may no longer be obstructed by the fault of the Evangelicals but everywhere be advanced so much more expeditiously; the calumnies of the Papists concerning the WAR of the fifth GOSPEL--with which they fill their

notorious pages and whole books--may be beaten back by the truth itself; finally, that the tyranny of the Roman Antichrist, whose power has thus far grown and grows daily in the Roman Empire through nothing more than our discord--where we see now this city, now that territory or province, forced again under its yoke by deceit and arms, without any distinction whether Lutherans or Calvinists were there (of which Eastern Francia, Austria, Styria, Carinthia, Hungary, Troppau, Donauwörth, etc., can serve as evidence for all)--may be opposed so much more strongly and promptly by united vows, counsels, and acts."

Here I complained, first, that Pareus accounted the Lutherans mushrooms, since, by naming a few regions that had returned to the ancient faith, he did not think it could come into their minds how many principalities had defected from Lutheranism to Calvinism.

Second, I said that his statement that they were forced by deceits and arms under the tyranny of Antichrist was an accusation; I proved this, and before me our Scherer proved it against Utzinger. Here the Anonymous answers: "Whether that change was made without deceits and arms must be gathered from history." But history has now taught that neither Julius in Eastern Francia nor the other princes employed deceits or arms. A notable defense! Pareus says that provinces were forced under the yoke by deceits and arms; Pareus's defender says that histories must be consulted

[Printed page 781]

to discover whether Pareus lies. If I wished to speak openly, I would say that he lies. But I prefer to spare ill-omened words.

Third, I said that these were tribunician and seditious harangues. He answers--as one for whom saying anything is answering--that the purpose of the *Irenicum* is not to describe the machinations of Catholics, but to warn that this is the reason for union: lest Catholics cast against them the war of the fifth Gospel, not so that harm may be done to any Estate.

So tortuously speaking a cunning must be dragged into the open. The words of Pareus both complain about the war of the fifth Gospel and then threaten war against Catholics. "Finally," he says, "that the tyranny of the Roman Antichrist," etc., "may be opposed so much more strongly and promptly by united vows, counsels, and acts."

To oppose tyranny thus is not merely to resist speeches about the war of the fifth Gospel, but to do certain other things. Eastern Francia was reformed; Pareus establishes this as an example of pontifical tyranny, complains that it was forced under the yoke, and teaches that this tyranny, exercised by the excellent Bishop Julius, must be opposed. Was he, then, to be obstructed and the religious peace violated? Why do you advise this to the Lutherans? The kingdom of Sweden, the Palatinate, margraviates, electorates, landgraviates, and other dominions defected from Lutheranism; and will the Lutherans not oppose it? Will they receive Calvinism, seven times worse than Papism?

Fourth, I said that "by united vows, counsels, and acts" was seditious and, if princes followed Pareus's counsel, would shortly inundate Germany with blood.

The defender answers: "By united vows, counsels, and ecclesiastical acts of sermons, disputations, and theological writings." He adds: "It is therefore manifest that the word 'acts' is twisted by both calumniators, as also by Contzen the Jesuit of Mainz, altogether contrary to Christian sincerity, into political and rebellious acts," etc. It is not twisted in that direction, but carried along a straight path. For, first, "by vows, counsels, and acts," or *mit Rat und Tat*, possesses this meaning: that vows and counsels precede and deeds follow. Next, sermons and writings are counsels rather than acts; therefore other acts must be sought. Third, he requires the union not merely of theologians but of all. But the acts of the Evangelical Estates are not sermons, disputations, and writings; they are also wars and threats of wars.

Fourth, Pareus treats here not of the concord of the Evangelicals but of Syncretism, as he began to do in Chapter 12 of the treatise. For he says: "That, while a synod and full concord are being procured, the Evangelicals meanwhile ought to unite in pious Syncretism and mutual toleration, and stand together against the Papacy." But Syncretism has need

not of sermons, disputations, and writings but of dissimulation and silence; for by those acts Syncretism is obstructed, not procured.

Fifth, he says tyranny must be opposed by counsels. But by whose counsels? Not merely those of theologians but also of Estates. Yet the counsels of the Evangelical Estates do not appear to concern only the contentions of theologians, but alliances, expenditure, war to be undertaken, etc. Within a few years there have been several assemblies of allied princes, and various counsels were discussed so that the pontifical party might be opposed. I now ask whether the objects of those counsels were acts, or means sought for the end. If Pareus answers that they were acts, I shall ask what sort of acts: whether there was disputation or decision there merely concerning sermons, writings, and disputations of theologians, or also concerning other matters; and whether Pareus included these matters also when he said “counsels and acts.”

Even if Pareus can be so shameless as to say that they treated only of ecclesiastical acts among themselves, his kindred nevertheless will not permit it, lest by lying against the conscience of all the Estates he become incapable of giving testimony. But Pareus approved non-ecclesiastical acts of the Evangelical Estates and understood them in this place, since he commends the alliance of the princes as holy.

Next, in the fourth motive the Saxons deny that union with the Calvinists is to be made so that the Papists can be resisted more strongly. They prove it from 2 Chronicles 19:2. Pareus asks in his response to Motive 16 whether the Lutherans not only dissuade their princes from fellowship with Calvinists but also openly counsel them in published writings that in diets and public negotiations they must seek the intimacy of the Papists but avoid association with orthodox--Calvinist--princes. He attacks these men and wishes the Lutherans in diets and public negotiations to adhere to the Calvinists, undoubtedly to agree in decrees and execute what has been resolved. Therefore he extends “acts” to all those things. And if princes follow his counsel, Europe will soon swim in blood. For that dispute will not remain within words or pamphlets.

[Printed page 781]

The second passage is in the commentary on Hosea, where he addresses the Most Illustrious Landgrave of Hesse, who was expelling Lutherans, in this way: “Well done, divine hero; perform the work of the Lord which you confidently perform.” Here I said nothing either against the Most Illustrious Landgrave or in favor of the Lutherans. I merely warned that the exhortation of that aged flatterer was not consonant with the *Irenicum*. For why do you recommend peace, Syncretism, and toleration? You flatter the Lutherans and canonize the prince who strips them of every office, so that, when the Lutherans have been expelled, he may be both a hero and a divine hero and perform the work of the Lord? They were dexterously expelled, but in such a way that no tumult arose.

They answer: in that reformation there were only three points. Three are named, but in those three and through those three Calvinism was introduced and Lutheranism expelled.

Next, they say that three or four theologians were dismissed with favor. I hear: three or four. Where, then, are the hundreds of ministers who were formerly Lutherans? In what corner was a Lutheran preacher permitted to hide unless he accepted Calvinism? Where is the Lutheran exercise of religion? What need is there of words? The thing itself--that is, the churches and cities--cries out.

The third passage is in the Commentary on Romans 13:1, where he teaches that subjects who are not private persons may defend themselves by arms against the magistrate. Here, first, the defender hidden in darkness answers that, even if this were an error, it ought not to be imputed to the whole body of Calvinism. This is true, unless it is defended by the whole body. Second, he says that these things were dictated in the schools in 1604, when those commotions did not yet exist in the Empire. Let it be so. They did not exist, but they arose from those things. Even in peace, words of sedition are dangerous. Third, he says that this defense is permitted only against the tyranny of the Pope and must not be extended to the Estates of the Empire.

But this is contrary to Pareus; for he falsely accuses provinces in Francia, Bavaria, and Austria of having been forced by deceit and arms, and says that pontifical tyranny must be opposed. Yet if that had been tyranny, it would have been exercised by princes of the Empire; therefore they would have had to be resisted. Consequently he incites the satraps of Catholics against their own princes. Therefore, although the Roman Antichrist alone is named, all the friends and clients of the Pontiff are nevertheless understood--those whom they are accustomed calumniously and seditiously to call the attendants of Antichrist. Fourth, he affirms that princes of the Reformed religion do not wish the Papistic religion to be driven from others' dominions, since responsibility for them does not rest upon those princes. I answer: Let them observe this, and the cause of dissensions will have been removed.

[Printed page 782]

The fourth passage is: "Christian kings and princes ought to resist pontifical tyranny even with the sword, obstructing and breaking it by force, removing idols, and restoring the Church to its liberty."

I most truly affirmed that here a trumpet call is sounded clearly and with full trumpets. It is the same when he said: "Princes ought to be a terror to evil works."

Pareus's defender restricts this combat to the lands under a ruler, for a Spaniard is not a terror to evil works in Poland, nor a Frenchman in Germany; otherwise horrible confusions would arise.

An excellent and most wholesome interpretation, but contrary to Pareus. For he admonishes them to oppose the tyranny of Antichrist by united vows, counsels, and acts--a tyranny which forces Francia, Bavaria, and Styria under the yoke by deceptions and arms. Therefore he teaches that the sword is to be drawn against foreign princes. Next, in the third argument he says: "Because it is foretold that Christian kings and princes will hate the whore, render her desolate and naked, eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. But the prediction possesses the force of a precept, so that they should do this."

Therefore he judges that all kings have been commanded to slaughter and devour the Pope; thus he thinks that a right against the Pope has been given to all, and exposes the Pope as though proscribed to the swords of all. Therefore Plessis too exhorts the Most Serene King of England to the Italian journey. That defense is therefore false and imposturous, and Pareus will never admit it. He himself will rather try the sword with trembling hand and cast an unwarlike weapon without inflicting a great wound. He says that, just as Ehud possessed a command against his own king, so all princes possess one against the Pope. If against the Pope, then against his flesh--that is, ecclesiastics--and his bones--that is, secular Papist princes, dukes, kings, and Caesars. For if full right of raging has been given against the Pope, if it is a just war, if the battle is commanded from heaven, then it is also against all who undertake the Pope's defense and obstruct those hastening to that dismemberment. For if slaughter against the king is commanded to you by God, war against his soldier is also commanded. So widely does that confusion of affairs extend that none of the preachers doubts that anyone whatever is a lawful executioner of the Pope and his defenders.

Yet so great is the madness of the defender that he thinks Pareus is excused by the very thing of which he is especially accused. "Let no mention be made in any word of our"--Evangelical--"princes, but in the thesis of Christian kings, princes, and magistrates, among whom surely are Caesar, the Spaniard, and all Papist imperial cities, all of whom would be no less prepared than others to resist the Pope in their own dominions if they knew him to be Antichrist." Thus he thinks it just that all should resist the Pope, whom they think advances outrageously in the dominions of all. And not only in their own dominions; for Ehud killed King Eglon in the royal upper chamber, and Pareus says that all princes possess such a command. Therefore, with Plessis, they ought even to seek Italy and stab the Pontiff in the Lateran itself. If Caesar, the Spaniard, the archdukes, the Bavarian, or the Lorrainer obstructs them, he must be killed through his own sides. Indeed, many of these men are no less diligent than the Pontiffs themselves in advancing true religion and rooting out errors.

The fifth passage: “Nor is injustice commanded when it is commanded that double be rendered to her; rather, it is signified that no kind of vengeance against the Pope can be unjust or excessive. And ‘double’ is understood not in relation to the punishment that he deserved, but to the evils which he formerly inflicted upon the pious and with which he afflicted the Church.”

I said that this cruelty pertains to all Catholics who defend the Pope. The defender denies it, saying that it pertains only to Babylon--that is, the Roman Church--and the Pope, the head of that Church. First, it is indeed excessive that so much is lawful against the Roman Church--that is, the members of the Roman Church. If by the name Roman Church he understands only the episcopate of that city, his cruelty extends less widely than if he understands the entire Roman Church--that is, all Catholics. But it must be shown that the savagery of the bloodthirsty old man pertains to every church subject to the Roman Church.

“Here,” he says in the commentary on the Apocalypse, “vengeance is commanded not privately to private persons, but publicly to pious kings and princes, into whose hearts the Lord God will put this, and whose military forces he will wish to employ to overthrow Babylon. Therefore this part of the exhortation especially pertains to them and their military forces, and the manner in which God put it into their hearts is explained: namely, because by an express command he commanded this vengeance to them.”

Therefore Evangelical kings and princes expressly received a command concerning the taking of vengeance. It is not merely against Rome; for many are more closely joined to the Pope, and many have inflicted more losses upon the innovators than the Romans have. Surely the condition of our society, of all religious houses, and especially of collegiate churches will be worse than that of Roman citizens. Therefore the precept is general--that is, a precept of Calvinism--and directed against all Catholics. But “Babylon” for Calvinists, although they disagree among themselves and with themselves, is not the single church which is at Rome and in the suburbicarian region, but the entire Papacy spread throughout the whole world.

Thus Pareus in his commentary on Apocalypse 17:4, when he interprets the words “Come out of her, my people.” For all sectarians urge that men depart not merely from the city but also from the Papacy, and Pareus especially. He says that all the faithful are admonished, not only those within the city's walls but those within the *pomeria* of Roman jurisdiction. And then: “Whenever, therefore, the Papists ask where the Church was before Luther, if the Papacy was not the Church, let us ask in turn where the Church of God was at the time of the Babylonian captivity, if Babylon was not the Church. It was, I say, in Babylon, but oppressed by captivity; thus this Church was captive and oppressed in the Papacy.”

“Come out of her.” The ancient people was commanded to depart from Babylon, first in heart, by fleeing its idols and abominations; after seventy years also in body, by returning to Judaea under Cyrus. Both departures from the new Babylon are commanded to us also: that we flee and detest its idols and abominations in heart, and also depart from Rome in our bodies as far as it is granted, shaking off the yoke of Babylonian tyranny by force of the command: “Come out of her.”

Therefore in Pareus's judgment Babylon is the Papacy. Consequently, when they are commanded to render double to Babylon, burn her, and eat her flesh, they understand the entire Papacy. They do not mean the Papacy in the abstract, and therefore they mean Papists in the concrete--that Papacy which can be scorched by fires, roasted as food for the victor, divided by the sword, and water the dry throats of executioners with its own blood. It is therefore false that Pareus is not to be understood concerning Papists, bishops, princes, and Caesar. He wishes all to possess one throat, so that they may fall quickly and without danger to the striker, although perhaps he desires them to be tenacious of life so that he may enjoy cruel pleasure by prolonging their death through savagery. For he judges that all are members of the whore, since he invents that the whore is the Papacy.

But Graser comes to Pareus's aid--whom, O brow! O hard face! Pareus's defender attempts to excuse. He denies that Caesar and secular Catholic princes are called the bones of Antichrist by Graser and the clergy his flesh, and says that

those who impose this upon Graser are calumniators. Indeed, he says that Graser teaches the contrary: namely, that the strong are to be destroyed by Antichrist, from Daniel 8:24: “And he will destroy the strong and the people of the saints.” Here I must prove from Graser's judgment that the bones are secular men and the flesh the clergy.

[Printed page 783]

First, folio 54: “I therefore still think that he”--Daniel--“throughout this whole passage, Chapter 8:24, had regard rather to that twofold family of Antichrist whose history we shall explain.”

Second, he explains it in these words: “Hear, therefore. The root *עצם*, *ghazam*, from which this word descends, signifies ‘he was endowed with strength.’ Concerning strength of this kind you must understand that it possesses the force of its solidity in itself and subsists without the support of another. Hence the noun *עצם*, *ghezem*, ‘the bone of a bone,’ is so called by the Hebrews because it alone in the body subsists by its own solidity and sustains the other parts. The Latins appear to have derived from this their ancient *ossum*. The rabbis also call the category of substance *עצום*, *ghezūmim*, so that from this signification someone could interpret the word *עצומים*, *ghezūmim*, as ‘substantial,’ ‘essential,’ or at least ‘osseous.’ Thus, therefore, he reasoned that by these *עצומים* secular men were indicated, insofar as they are of the planting of iron in the feet of the fourth Beast and subsist under the kingdom of Antichrist by their own strength, yet so that they accommodate this osseous strength to the uses of the Beast to such an extent that they sustain at the same time the spiritual Estate as though it were the succulent flesh of the Papacy.”

Third, he thinks that all the forces of Antichrist are in these bones. “Surely,” he says, “in the same verse he speaks thus concerning the kingdom of this king growing together marvelously: *בכחו ולא כחו ועצם*--‘His power will indeed become strong, but not by his own strength.’ You will find this phrase used nowhere else in the Canon. But our prophet in this passage designates by it another mystery of Antichrist no less than the former: that it is so proper and peculiar to his kingdom that outside it the phrase cannot properly be applied either to Antiochus--whatever meanwhile may be made of the type--or to any other worldly kingdom. For tell me of what kingdom, king, or empire it could truly be said that its power consisted not of its own but of another's and, as it were, borrowed forces.”

Fourth, he says that secular men possess one counsel and deliver their strength and power to the Beast.

Fifth, he says that the Pope obtained this by evil arts. These are his words: “Daniel explains this in the words cited, saying: ‘By marvelously corrupting, he will destroy, and he will possess prosperous successes in it’; for this is the proper force of the verb *hatzliach*, which our author interprets thus here. ‘For God put it into their hearts to execute his judgment, to consent, and finally to give their kingdom to the Beast,’ Apocalypse 17:17. This, namely, will be the cause of such great successes. Otherwise the sense of the prophet's words here is: He will understand so hidden, subtle, and efficacious an art of corrupting that by marvelous deceptions he will, as it were, cast down from their station even the strong, whom he could have overcome by no force. And besides, he will deceive the very people of the saints, who ought to observe his fraud, make it known to others, and thus protect the liberty of God's people.”

Sixth, he says that “the strong” are opposed to fleshly softness, folio 55: “If he had wished to commend these strong men for military fortitude, insofar as that is reckoned under virtue, he would have had to use the word *geburim*, whose proper signification this is. But if he had wished to censure the excess of this quality in the same nation--namely, tyrannical ferocity--he would have used the word *gharitzim*, whose meaning is very evident. But now, omitting those terms, for which no sufficiently cogent cause for consideration remained, he employs a word of this sort, by which simply that brute strength is indicated, in respect of which this race of his peers”--the locusts--“is opposed to their fleshly softness. And since Daniel in the same verse verbally employs this root for the sinews of external power, why do we hesitate, or what obscurity do we imagine for ourselves?”

Finally, he calls these strong men the limbs and members of Babylon, folio 56: “There is indeed another point, and one by no means to be despised, of which I had nevertheless almost forgotten: namely, that our prophet in Chapter 19:18, in the history of Babylon's ruin, finds among its ruins these strong men, these horses too and their riders, as the limbs

and members of the truncated Beast, speaking thus: ‘Come, birds of heaven, and assemble for the great supper of God, so that you may eat the flesh of kings, the flesh of tribunes, the flesh of the strong, the flesh of horses, and of those who sit upon them.’ These are the principal members of which the Beast's kingdom consisted and into which it is finally resolved. Among these, that mention of the strong possesses so much more cause for wonder because throughout the entire context of the prophecy he has nowhere previously mentioned them under this nomenclature. In Chapter 6:15, indeed, mention is made of powerful men, but there he calls them *δυνάτας*, whereas here he employs the word *ισχυρούς*, by which the Septuagint render the Hebrew in Daniel.”

[Printed page 783]

Now I ask you by justice itself, reader, to deign to judge. Is he a calumniator who, according to Graser's judgment, has said that secular princes are called the bones, limbs, and members of Babylon--the principal members of the Beast, of which its kingdom consists and into which it is also resolved? What Pareus thereby threatens against Caesar, the kings of the Spains and Gauls, and the other Catholics everyone understands, unless he is ignorant that Babylon cannot be burned and devoured unless her bones, limbs, and members are cut off, roasted, and eaten with a Cyclopean mouth. Behold for yourself the contest between two associates, of whom one most insultingly and savagely reviles Catholic princes, while the other most shamelessly denies that he said things which it is evident to everyone's eyes were said.

Hence it is evident that according to Graser and Pareus Babylon is also in Germany, because its principal members are imagined to be in Germany, and that the Anonymous calumniator turns the words of Pareus and Graser elsewhere in vain. The seventh passage: the ten kings fight with the Lamb, yet they will burn the whore. Therefore the Calvinists cannot say this concerning their own princes unless they confess that those princes delivered their power to the Beast. For whether they acted rightly is doubtful among Calvinists, as is evident from Pareus's final question on Apocalypse 17. Aretius indeed reports that they punished the woman after being bent by God to his service. Thus Attila said that he was the scourge of God; thus Alexander was divinely summoned into Asia, etc. Do they therefore wish their own princes to be like one of these? In his *Method on the Apocalypse*, Nicolas Colladon thinks that those kings were by no means converted and did not act with an upright mind. Next, he himself understands the entire Papacy.

But what need is there of our labor against the adversaries? Christoph Jungnitz, a professor of Heidelberg, sufficiently refutes all those things. Although he has not yet reached the truth, he nevertheless disproves the falsehood. Who will not concede that Christian emperors and kings fight with the Lamb and are beasts? From these things I conclude that, since the Calvinists themselves teach that those kings are impious, I am not to be accused if I say the same thing which John clearly asserts and they themselves confess.

All the things which that mask defending the darkness proposes in obscure night can be tolerated; but the things it offers in excuse of Aretius could not please Aretius himself. For, residing at Bern as an enemy of orthodoxy and a traitor to the Empire, he said and wrote things which the Swiss allied with the Empire condemned.

[Printed page 784]

First, on Apocalypse 13:1: “It is rightly called a beast on account of the Devil, who surpasses every beast in savagery and whose character is still excellently expressed in the Roman Empire, so that the Romans themselves rightly confess that they arose and were nourished by a she-wolf. Therefore the Roman Empire is a beast, just as the Babylonian, Persian, and Macedonian empires are in Daniel. But it ascends from the sea, that is, from the confusion of all nations; for the Roman Empire was born from other empires having been struck down. For just as the sea is the common receptacle of all waters and a kind of sewer of filth, so the vices of all nations were heaped together in the Roman Empire, so that, having obtained dominion of the sea, the Romans easily conquered other nations.” You will note: “The character of the Devil is still excellently expressed in the Empire.”

Second: “It has seven heads,” that is, it excels singularly in counsel and prudence; for the head is the dwelling of reason, and the number seven is the number of perfection and completeness.

Third: “Now he expresses the spirit acting in this beast, the same ornaments being set forth with which he adorned this beast. The dragon is undoubtedly the Devil. He therefore gives certain ornaments of his own to the Beast--that is, the Roman Empire. And it must carefully be observed that the dragon does not establish the Beast, but merely adorns it after it has arisen with his gifts; he does this lest we think that the Devil is the author of empires. Rather, let us know that he is their corrupter: for the magistracy is from God, but the vices of magistrates proceed from that dragon.”

Fourth: “He describes the foolishness of mortals who, marveling at the fortune of the Empire, extol and adore it more than is proper: ‘the whole earth marveled after the Beast,’ that is, the whole earth, as great as it is, was carried away into admiration of the Beast. The cause of the admiration depends upon the preceding fortune: that so deadly a wound was marvelously healed.”

Fifth: “That is to marvel at the success and felicity of the Empire, proclaiming that august, holy, sacrosanct, and immortal thing.”

Sixth: “They adored the dragon who gave power to the Beast,” that is, in its person they worship and adore the Devil. “For the dragon is the Devil, who attaches his own ornaments to the Empire.” See what it is to worship the Devil: namely, to marvel excessively at the majesty and felicity of the Roman Empire.

Seventh: “But after the doctrine of Christ had been received, impious hypocrites presently snatched the title of the Church to themselves and persecuted the true commandments of Christ, which cause the possessors of the imperial seat still strenuously defend today.”

Eighth: “Power to wage war upon and conquer the saints is given to the Beast; that is, that the condition of hypocrites should always be in a better position than that of the pious. The histories of all ages testify to this, so that today it is discovered to be clearer than daylight. For as widely as the Roman name extends, so widely do the pious suffer persecutions, in all tribes, tongues, and nations.”

Ninth, verse 8: “And they adored it.”

“He describes the character of the reformed Empire; for the Beast will then wish to be adored, as though he said that this blasphemy will not cease until the end of the world. Just as the Beast was adored when its wound was healed, so it will be adored when power to conquer God's saints has been given to it. Therefore the same impiety remains because of the success of these things; for men marvel at the success of princes and hence pass over to their party.”

Tenth: “‘This is the victory that conquers the world: our faith.’ Therefore let us console ourselves amid these punishments of the world, lest we imagine a peculiar fortune for ourselves. This is our calling: to enter the kingdom of God through tribulations and afflictions, especially under this old age of the Roman Empire. Furthermore, the governors of the Empire require another faith from their people and commend it in assemblies of magistrates, a faith which pertains in no way to the saints of God of whom John here speaks.”

Eleventh: “Next, he”--the Pontiff--“also compels men to adore the former Beast; that is, he wishes the title and name of the Roman Empire to be accounted no less sacrosanct than the name ‘Augustus’ and the venerable name of the Empire were formerly under the emperors. Under the Popes, the Roman Church remained both Catholic and adorable, and if anyone denies this, he must be a heretic.”

Twelfth: “The Pontiff retains the shadowy name of the Empire.”

So also those who invented the featherless eagle and other abominable things.

Thirteenth, on Chapter 17:13: “He says that the dragon has seven heads because to himself he seems fully prudent, cunning, and crafty; for the head is the seat of prudence and reason. Below, seven hills are attributed to him, whence it is not inaptly an image of the Pope, because at other times he held seven heads, that is, kingdoms; and he subjected the

seven-man body of the Roman Empire to his judgment.” By these words he shows, not obscurely, that by the dragon's seven heads are designated the seven electors as heads, as it were, of the other Beast--that is, of the Pope.

He took that abusive speech against the princes from Matthias Flacius Illyricus. On Chapter 12, verse 3, Flacius comments thus: “Some apply this rather to Rome and its empire, because it was constructed upon seven hills. It also held under itself the seven principal kingdoms of the world: African, Egyptian, Asian, Greek, German, Spanish, and Italian. Likewise, in more recent times and even now it had, and still has in some fashion, the same number of kingdoms under itself. It also has seven principal princes. Altogether the Spirit of the Lord appears here to have had regard to the prophecy of Daniel 7, where also the fourth Beast--namely, the Roman Empire--is depicted with ten horns, that is, kingdoms or powers; so that there can be no doubt that here, under the name of the dragon, the power of the world itself, raging against Christ and his Church, is also depicted.”

These things they set forth with round and blasphemous mouth against the Empire.

Another proposition of Pareus is that Christian princes ought by public commands and punishments to obstruct blasphemies, heresies, etc. Likewise, no mixture or confusion in religion is to be permitted, but the true religion alone is to be protected. I say that this is the sword by which both Catholics and Lutherans are slaughtered, because Calvinists abuse it for this purpose. For they call piety blasphemy and think the ancient faith a heresy. If you doubt it, read the defender of Pareus: he calls the sacrifice of the Mass and similar things idolatry.

Enter a Calvinist consistory, reader: you will not plead the cause of any one of the ancient saints so accurately that he will not depart condemned by the black pebble. Whom, then, do you think safe? Ignatius the Martyr? He acknowledged the sacrifice of the Mass in the Letter to the Smyrnaeans, as Theodoret reports in Dialogue 3, and in the Letter to the Romans. Martialis, Cyprian, and Augustine are involved in the same fault; Augustine also caused a Mass to be celebrated for his deceased mother. Justin and Irenaeus? They taught the truth of Christ's body in the Eucharist. Chrysostom? He asserted free will. Jerome? He preferred virginity to marriage. Basil the Great? But he is the patriarch of monks. The thirty-three Roman pontiffs who were martyrs? But they judged concerning other bishops. Athanasius or Hilary? They invoked the saints. Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory Nazianzen, or Gregory the Great? But they venerated relics. Ephraem, Cyril, or Ambrose? They denied that faith alone justifies.

[Printed page 785]

And what need is there of more? All these saints, and others, did all those things which the Calvinist ministers call evil works; therefore punishment is prepared for all of them, and sentence has now been pronounced. For they rage against us for no cause which we do not possess in common with the saints.

The eighth passage: “When the superior magistrate degenerates into a tyrant,” he grants the inferior power of restraint. But the Calvinists interpret tyranny according to their own affections, in the same way as when he said: “If they do evil.” Those who obeyed Pareus now gather the fruit of this matter. Indeed, he adduces so many causes against princes that a cause for deposing them can never be wanting. If a prince obstructs their desires, he will immediately hear: “In a tyrant the relation of magistracy ceases.” But if a Catholic prince reforms his dominions, he is immediately called a tyrant. Let Utzinger's most seditious pamphlet against Julius, Prince of Würzburg, be read. Therefore, according to Pareus's judgment, Julius lost his name and power when he led his subjects to the true religion; consequently he could be killed by his own satraps and his ministers hurled down.

The other examples which Pareus adduces serve this end: that no Catholic prince may be secure, as I taught in the book on peace, because all Catholic princes are fornicators with the great whore, are members and limbs of that harlot, are persecutors, and are such men as Aretius depicted.

Since, therefore, Pareus, Aretius, Graser, and others teach:

1. That the Empire is adorned by the Devil.

2. That to marvel at and adore the Beast is to adore the Devil, and consists in marveling excessively at the Empire and calling it august, etc.
3. That persecutions exist as widely as the Empire extends.
4. That the character of the Devil is excellently expressed today in the Empire.
5. That a singular hypocrisy still reigns in the Empire.
6. That the dragon is the spirit acting in the Beast.
7. That the dragon inspires a malignant disposition in the Empire.
8. That the malignant spirit is σύνεργον [a co-worker] and reigns efficaciously in the Empire.
9. That those who marvel at the Empire's success are fools.
10. That there is a threefold impiety in the Roman Empire, the thing itself speaking.
11. That the possessors of the Empire strenuously defend the cause of hypocrites.
12. That even now the Beast of the reformed Empire wishes to be adored.
13. That impiety remains because of the success of princes, and men therefore pass over to their party.
14. That the worshipers of this Beast--that is, the Empire--are vessels of wrath from eternity.
15. When they incite the Lutherans against Catholic reforming princes.
16. When they falsely say that those converted to the ancient faith of the martyrs were forced under the yoke by the tyranny of Antichrist.
17. When they say that this was done by the deceits and arms of Catholic princes.
18. When they exhort their own princes to oppose those reforms by vows, counsels, and acts.
19. When those acts are not merely sermons and writings of preachers, but deliberations and negotiations of assemblies and diets, and executions of decrees.
20. When the head of the acts and counsels of Pareus is Syncretism against the Papacy.
21. When in those counsels there is scarcely any thought of sermons.
22. When Pareus grieves that the Lutherans adhere to Catholics.
23. When they call the expulsion of Lutherans the work of the Lord.
24. When he gives arms to subject magistrates so that they may be a terror to their superior lord.
25. When he says that all princes possess a command to burn Babylon--that is, the Papacy--and eat her flesh.
26. When he affirms that by this command jurisdiction against the Pope and the Pope's followers, as members of Antichrist or Babylon, has been given.
27. When he judges all Catholics blasphemers and idolaters and affirms that his magistrates possess a public command to resist their evil works. When, I say, they teach these things:
28. It follows from them that Catholics, whether ecclesiastics or secular princes, cannot be secure for even one hour if the counsel of Pareus pleases Evangelical princes. Indeed, neither can the Lutherans, if those who call themselves Reformed put on the zeal of Pareus; nor the Reformed, if they erect the criminal ladder of Antichrist, as the Puritans cry that the king of England does; nor the Arminians, if the Gomarists thrust advocates and syndics into custody. This

is the sum: not only confidence but even the mention of peace has perished if the furies of brigandage theologians occupy the minds of princes.

CHAPTER XXVII

That Syncretism Is Not Proved by the Examples of the Fathers, Catholics, and Lutherans

[Printed page 785]

Indeed, this cause for conspiring against us is also handed down: that it appears possible from the example of many who were afterward reconciled. Why, therefore, could not the controversies of those called Evangelicals be syncretized or removed? Saint Cyprian and Stephen; Saint Basil the Great and Eusebius of Caesarea; Saint Jerome and Augustine; Saint Jerome and Rufinus; Saint Jerome and John, bishop of Jerusalem; Saint Epiphanius and Chrysostom; the orthodox and the Novatians; Catholics among themselves; the other Lutherans and the Concordists disagreed, and yet they did not break peace but admitted reconciliation. Why, then, should not we Evangelicals do so? This is the sum of Chapter 15.

This argument drawn from examples is indeed not unusual in rhetorical amplifications, but in disputations it is weak and, unless all things are equal and similar, faulty and captious.

But in this passage, since all things--both matters and persons--are plainly contrary, it is foolish and ridiculous. I confess that the Church was never so fortunate that all agreed entirely in all things; nor do we dare to hope that this will ever occur except when God will be all in all and, error having been removed, we shall behold uncreated truth in heavenly light. Nevertheless, judgment must be formed concerning the kind of dissension, the mind of those teaching contrary things, the gravity of the question, and the obscurity of the matter; likewise, whether anything was defined in councils and whether anything was always believed in the Church. For not every dissension makes a heresy, nor are the dissensions and hatreds of heretics to be estimated from the discord of the orthodox.

[Printed page 786]

Let us reconsider the examples one by one.

Cyprian and Stephen, the Roman Pontiff, disagreed concerning the baptism of heretics. Cyprian rejected it; Stephen approved it. Cyprian possessed the error, Stephen the truth. Cyprian added a small agitation to his error, for he wrote somewhat angrily about Stephen to Pompeius, bishop of Sabrata. Augustine grieves over that letter and says he cannot excuse Cyprian, in the Letter to Pompeianus and Book 5, Chapter 25, *Against the Donatists, On Baptism*. But he erred in a question that had not yet been examined with the most clarified insight; see Augustine, Book 3, Chapter 3, *Against the Donatists*. Therefore Cyprian erred, and the council moved by his authority nevertheless did not condemn those who thought differently. "It remains," he says, "that concerning this very matter we each set forth what we think, judging no one and removing no one from the right of communion if he thinks differently." Meanwhile Stephen threatened the Africans with excommunication unless they corrected the error.

But those who erred obeyed those who thought rightly, as is evident from Augustine, Book 3, Chapter 1, *Against Cresconius*; for Cyprian both died in the Catholic faith and the bishops rescinded their former opinion by a contrary decree, as Jerome testifies against the Luciferians; see also Augustine, Letter 48. Indeed, most of the Asians returned to concord. Baronius, volume 2, may be consulted.

To what purpose, therefore, is this adduced? Let the Zwinglians change their errors and sing a recantation; the Lutherans will not be difficult in receiving them, provided they think them to act sincerely. If they persevere in error, they will be judged no less heretics than those rebaptizers. But what proportion does one error have to innumerable heresies? Yet why is nothing written concerning Cyprian's changed opinion? Because Valerian immediately intensified the persecution in the year 259, while the controversy had fallen in the year 258; therefore the tyrant's violence suppressed ecclesiastical proceedings.

“A grave dissension arose,” he says, “between Basil and Eusebius of Caesarea, and hostilities burned to such a degree that Basil departed into Pontus, abandoning the Church.” Pareus recalls the deeds of the saints in bad faith and with a calumnious exaggeration. The matter stands thus. After Hermogenes died, Eusebius, still a catechumen, was elected bishop by the Caesareans; for Basil had withdrawn himself so that he would not be elected. The electors presently repented of their vote, but Eusebius prevented them from creating another bishop and by his constancy easily dispelled the danger which Julian threatened.

Meanwhile the monks who lived under Basil's care condemned the election of Eusebius. For this reason Eusebius held Basil suspect and oppressed him beyond his deserts. But Basil, so that the monks might be quiet and the Church not be rent on his account, withdrew into solitude--not while burning with hatred and hostilities, but from love of peace and quiet. We gather these things from Gregory Nazianzen's letter to Eusebius. These things occurred in the year 362. But in the year 366 they contended in acts of duty: Eusebius of his own accord sent Basil letters of entreaty and recall, and Basil, having remitted the injury, returned to Caesarea. Therefore in this passage no conflict of dogmas is observed, but virtue, modesty, and prudence in Basil; suspicion and hostility, and finally serious repentance and humility, in Eusebius. What do these things have to do with thunderbolts of condemnations, with the exiles and tortures by which the Evangelicals rage against one another, or with most bitter contests concerning heads of faith and salvation?

Saint Jerome and Augustine also disputed concerning the passage of Saint Paul, Galatians 2:11, and not without sharpness of words; but what will he establish from this? That a Syncretism of all heresies must therefore be made?

The controversy between Jerome and John was lighter than John's imprudence or malice afterward made it. For John was thought to favor Pelagius, as Augustine has it in Letter 252. He also came under suspicion as though he had been the author of the pillage committed in Bethlehem, as is clear from Innocent's letter written to him. But since the cause is doubtful, neither Jerome nor Innocent condemned him absolutely, and death forestalled full knowledge of the matter, he is not to be summoned back to a tribunal and pleading of the cause after so long a time; much less is confusion of all religions to be introduced from the deed of one bishop who offended many orthodox men and rendered himself suspect.

As for Jerome and Rufinus, I confess that the matter is very similar to those things now disputed among the Evangelicals. Jerome's innocence is sufficiently attested, and in his second *Apology* there survives an oath denying calumny: “I call Jesus the Mediator to witness that unwilling and resisting I descended to these words, and that unless you had provoked me I would always have remained silent. Finally, cease accusing, and I shall cease defending. For what edification is there for the hearers when two old men fight one another on account of heretics, especially when both wish to appear Catholic? Let us abandon the patronage of heretics, and there will be no contention between us.”

But Rufinus, after the manner of heretics, not only resisted wholesome admonitions but grew hardened. He refused the judgment of Pope Anastasius. It is evident from Augustine, Book 2, Chapter 2, *Against Pelagius*, that he was the forerunner of Pelagius. Concerning him Caelestius professes thus in the Council of Carthage: “The holy presbyter at Rome, who remained with Saint Pammachius, said this. I heard him saying that there is no propagation of sin.” Thus Caelestius cites not Pelagius but Rufinus as the author of so abominable a heresy. Yet all these things became manifest after his death, although while alive he was both condemned by Anastasius and thereafter absolved by no one. If this example effects anything, it serves to signify that in a cause of religion there can be no peace between heretics and Catholics--not that contrary heresies can be fused into one.

The dissension of the bishops Chrysostom and Epiphanius concerned fact and forum, not religion and dogmas. The condemnation of the Origenists was in question. Epiphanius judged that they should be condemned at once, as though sufficiently heard and known; Chrysostom judged that they should be heard again. Therefore Epiphanius refused to reside in the patriarchal palace and communicate with Chrysostom, with whom heretics were staying. Chrysostom thought communion lawful for himself with those whom he judged not yet heard and condemned. Hence arose the dissension, since in one hatred of heresy prevailed, in the other care for judicial process and order.

Baronius thinks the mutual prophecies a fiction: namely, that Epiphanius said to Chrysostom, “You will not die a bishop,” and Chrysostom to Epiphanius, “You will not die in your homeland.” For Epiphanius died the following year at his own home, although Chrysostom, after experiencing various exiles, was extinguished by the importunity of soldiers. I repeat again what indeed could seem tiresome but is nevertheless necessary to the cause: this little dissension contributes nothing to making a Syncretism of all who call themselves Evangelicals.

Concerning the orthodox and the Novatians, their statement is a manifest falsehood to those practiced in history.

[Printed page 787]

It is evident that the Novatians were not restrained with the severity with which they ought to have been, because they thought rightly concerning Christ against the Arians. This was the reason that in the year 326 Constantine issued a rescript on their behalf: “We have not found the Novatians to have been condemned beforehand, so that we would believe that those things which pertained to them ought by no means to be granted.” But afterward the great Emperor discovered the matter, as Eusebius reports in *Life of Constantine*, Book 3, Chapters 61 and 62. For first he reckons them among heretics; they were condemned in the Council of Constantinople; Chrysostom attacked them vehemently; Innocent expelled them from Rome; and in the year 413 Theodosius proscribed them by edicts and condemned them to deportation, as the words of the law declare. Do you now wish Lutherans to be tolerated for a little while, so that afterward you may do what was done to the Novatians?

Finally, concerning the dissensions of Catholics this must be established universally: one who pertinaciously protects an error contrary to the Catholic faith is not a Catholic. If the error belongs to the class of those in which neither party has been condemned, dissension does not remove fraternity or rend unity. But I shall speak of these things in their place.

I conclude the argument by a reversed syllogism. No heresies have ever been able to oppress the Catholic faith by conspiracy and attempted Syncretism; therefore neither will the Evangelical heresies be able to do so. No syncretization has been able to endure; therefore neither will the syncretization of the Evangelicals.

CHAPTER XXVIII

That the Lutherans Condemn Syncretism and That Catholics Ought to Be Prepared to Endure Evils

[Printed page 787]

There are many writings and decrees of the Lutherans against Syncretism with the Zwinglians. Among them the adversary especially undertook to attack one, which belongs to the Saxon preachers and counselors, whom he insultingly calls court Stentors. They advise their princes not to conspire with Calvinists against the Pontiff, Emperor, kings, and Catholic princes, but rather to join themselves to the Emperor and Catholics; and for this matter they briefly and wisely included nineteen reasons, which they call motives. Pareus snarls against their counsel in these words in Chapter 19:

“But indeed it has been discovered that another hindrance, equally insidious and pestilential, creeps through the courts of certain princes. For certain MOTIVES circulate under this title: *Motiven und Ursachen, warumb man mit den Calvinisten in Religions Sachen nichts kan oder soll wider die Papisten für einen Mann stehen*; that is, reasons why Lutheran princes can and ought neither to stand together with Calvinists in the business of religion against the Papists. This pestilential hindrance, I say, undoubtedly distracts the minds of most praiseworthy princes and cities in various ways and disturbs counsels of peace. Therefore the matter demands that we briefly examine whether those motives or reasons are true and so solid that they ought to stir up troubles among the Evangelical churches and overturn peace. There are nineteen reasons, which, retaining the term ‘motives,’ I shall report in order, and I shall openly and calmly, without any irritation, append what the orthodox answer to each.”

He also shows in the dedicatory letter to the *Eucharistic Controversies* the reasons which especially moved those counselors. In it, an old man among Polish youths, he accuses the Lutherans in this manner: “But whatever is said here about the Lutherans is said concerning our adversaries in Germany--the rigid Ubiquitarians, savage and turbulent enemies of truth, who admit no conditions of peace unless their Ubiquity and Majesty are preserved; who represent and condemn the orthodox as heretics worse than the Turks themselves; and who openly profess that one ought rather to pass over to the Papists than cultivate fraternity with the orthodox, whom they call Calvinists. From among them a certain court Stentor recently was not ashamed in a public writing to counsel his prince that in the diets he should join himself to the Papists rather than the orthodox Calvinists, adducing two reasons. One was theological: that the Lutherans agree with the Papists in more matters than with the Calvinists, whom he names. The other was civil: that the Pope contributes his strength to protect the Roman Empire, while the Calvinist princes openly act in collusion with the Turk against the Empire. The latter reason deserves to be refuted in a very different way than by my pen. If the former is true, truth itself has become a lie--unless perhaps, just as he numbers genuflection at the name of Jesus among the heads of agreement, which the orthodox account indifferent, so he numbers among them statues in churches, organs, Phrygian chasubles and stoles, flowing gowns, curled hair, dances, church dedications, and many things of that kind, which these and those possess in common. If the counsel is upright, why did Luther write that the Papacy is from the Devil--*Dass das Papsttum vom Teufel gestiftet sei*? Why does the Apostle cry: ‘Come out of her, my people’?”

They later divided the two reasons I reported into nineteen when it seemed good to explain everything individually. For neither are princes so frivolous or so neglectful of public safety and honor, nor do they employ counselors so inexperienced or so corrupted into perfidy by Calvinist money and promises, that they would bring their resources, liberty, life, and the safety of their subjects into danger for the domination of the Calvinists. Much less are they so foolish as to permit themselves to be ruled by Calvinist ministers.

Since princes profess these things without fear and dissimulation, there is no danger that at the will of a bloodthirsty Calvinist they would wish to be cruel toward their colleagues. For what prince of German blood and spirit would endure being hired for the slaughter of Catholics by a most shameful Syncretism? Who would lease his prison service to this gladiatorial trainer? What more monstrous thing could they do to incur hatred for their wickedness, or what more unworthy insult to their ancestors, than to hasten to slaughter and devour neighboring, quiet, friendly, and related princes because they practice that religion in which all those from whom they themselves received nobility, riches, and dominion were born and died?

Is anyone so savage that he would wish to contaminate himself by killing the living, whose only crime is that they follow his ancestors--from whose nobility he is highborn and from whose inheritance he is powerful? Would he employ against them the same cruelty by which, in the torments of others, he shows what he judges his own fathers to have deserved? Will you kill me, most illustrious prince? Will you devour me after I have been killed? Will you die from joy in my torments because I did not depart from the religion of your grandfathers and great-grandfathers; because I serve at the altar which your ancestors founded; because I believe what they gave me cause to believe; because I do not condemn that to which they wished their teachers and academies to swear? Behold, my blood flows to your odium and the disgrace of your family. Therefore it is necessary that either you assume a more benign disposition toward me or consign almost your whole family and antiquity to the flames.

[Printed page 788]

Concerning the free cities of the Empire, without whose strength the madness of the preachers cannot set war in motion, I judge there to be still less reason for fear. They abhor contention and blood, flourish through commerce and the exercise of arts, and cannot grow by war; for they experience that through it the fortunes of private persons are diminished and commerce halted, nor is there hope that a state enclosed among the empires and dominions of more powerful men can extend its boundaries.

Who, therefore, will sound the trumpet at the voice of tribunician madness? Who will bring it about that Europe, dashed against itself in civil war, turns the remnants of its fortunes and its mangled members into plunder for the Mohammedans? This is Pareus's undertaking. He counsels so atrociously concerning us that he judges the delay by which our slaughter is deferred to be AN EQUALLY INSIDIOUS AND PESTILENTIAL HINDRANCE. It is too much for him that the Pontiff, Caesar, kings, and Catholic princes are alive. Surely to one for whom delay is insidious and pestilential, the acceleration of death must be safe, salutary, and religious.

They recognize the gentleness of Calvin and Beza; nor do I marvel at the savagery of the court preacher about whom the *History of the Religion Changed in the Palatinate* relates that, speaking in the women's quarters concerning the fifth change, he said that if he were Caesar he would cut off the head of every Lutheran preacher.

Yet if the worse party should someday prevail; if Evangelical ministers, burning from the cautery of their patriarch, should fly about amid a column of armed men; if they should smear the books they wrote in blood with the gore of martyrs; if Calvinist-Lutheran camps should stand against us, our helper is in heaven. Our heart will not fear. We shall spend upon religion the death which we owe to nature; we shall return to Christ the life which we cannot retain. It is not wretched, not even bitter, to die for Christ. More wretched are those whose cruelty we shall undergo.

We shall possess as witness of our innocence the same man who invades our fortunes and takes away our life: the Lutheran soldier, who, although he performs an infamous service for the Calvinists, nevertheless will not be able to deny that he fights for the scales of the Devil. Nor can he be ignorant that it is a great good which embodied devils--as Luther in his *Table Talk* calls the Zwinglians--hate so bitterly and persecute so atrociously. Therefore let us all be prepared for combat and martyrdom, destined to fall happily if, by permission of eternal providence, success answers the hostile attempt. Happily destined to fall, I say, beneath whom almighty God will place his hand, so that death itself may implant us into the life for which God exalted his only-begotten Son and gave him the name which is above every name.

If we bring this pious meditation on death and blessedness to every vicissitude of the times, we shall neither fear the adversaries' threats nor tremble at the daily reports of wars and the semiannual histories which their forgers most mendaciously compose. Nor shall we be excessively raised up by the consolation which honorable men, experienced in the state, bring. For there are men neither of the lowest rank nor little practiced in the affairs of the Empire who deny that that conspiracy should be feared even if it is most successfully accomplished. They say that God will not fail the most just cause of the Catholics; that he is the avenger of justice; that efficacious means for justice against wickedness and audacity are not lacking to the lawful magistrate; that they know where the shoe pinches the adversaries; that the mortality by which they can fall is common to them and us; that iron battle lines stand on feet of clay; that immense structures turn upon a slender hinge; and that blood will follow from our wound too.

I have thus far been accustomed to approve their counsels in order to indicate that human aids and industry, since they are divine gifts, are not to be despised. Yet I gladly demonstrate a more excellent way of Christian perfection, constancy, and glory, and exhort men to seek triumphs in the heavenly Capitol more willingly by suffering than by acting bravely, by meeting death than by killing the enemy.

If we await war with this disposition, we shall obtain one of two things: either, by dying in the faith and communion of the ancient martyrs, we shall obtain the same laurel in which they rejoice, crowned eternally; or, if God grants victory to the just cause, if that great weigher of counsels and great arbiter of wars obstructs the conspiracy, we shall live in our ancestral religion without the tumult of innovators and persecution by enemies. O happy lot of the Christian soul, for which a longer life is a road to felicity and death a shortcut, and which cannot perish except by its own will!

CHAPTER XXIX

That the Civil Alliance of Certain Princes Is Not to Be Adduced in Favor of Syncretism in Religion

[Printed page 788]

They also derive Syncretism from the civil alliance of princes. If peace exists among them, why should there not also be Syncretism in religion? Why do theologians prosecute one another? Most praiseworthy cities, renowned barons, illustrious counts, and most illustrious and serene princes have entered into counsels of alliance and holy peace. Why, therefore, do we preachers fight?

In the first place, no one except an atheist and Epicurean would say that the care of piety and ceremonies must be accommodated to the laws and treaties of human compacts, and that concord and dissension in religion, sacred rites, and faith depend upon the peace or hostilities of kingdoms. What then? Will you regulate the worship of the immeasurable deity by the laws of treaties--whether forced or shameful, and certainly always unstable? If your prince joins himself to the Ottoman, will you also judge that the worship of Mohammed must be tolerated? You will certainly do so, for you tolerate those whom, when you speak from the heart, you judge worse than Jews and Turks. What will you advise the Belgians if perhaps the States General enter into a treaty with the idolatrous Indians and Chinese? Will you judge it equitable for a Calvinist table to be established at Calicut, and will you permit it to be erected? Or an altar to the Calicutan god at Amsterdam?

“They do not agree with us in the foundation,” you will say. But I taught above that you too do not agree. Yet let it stand that you think civil pacifications ought to be arbiters of religions and faith, and that the manner of belief is to be learned not from the Church but from palaces and camps. What do you think will occur if hostility dissolves the friendship of princes or injuries break it? Will you then also judge that the peace of religion, the attendant of civil compacts, has been violated by the destruction of those compacts? Will the trumpet's sound simultaneously rouse the thunderbolts of churches and the condemnations of chairs, and summon men to arms? If a battering ram strikes a wall, will the man who was formerly a brother presently be a heretic? These are impious, Epicurean, Machiavellian, and Satanic decrees.

But what, then, is that union, league, or correspondence of princes?

[Printed page 789]

Do they agree upon this: that they may assert the safety of their fatherland and dignity of the Empire, protect the authority of the supreme magistrate, contribute the necessary expenditure and arms for the needs of the Turkish war, ensure that judgments are held, and prevent the execution of adjudicated matters from being obstructed by the audacity and frauds of wicked men? If these things are their objects, there was no need of a new peace, since absolutely all princes of the Empire are bound both by the right of fidelity to Caesar to perform these things and by the promise made to their colleagues upon first entering their dominions. But that they looked toward something else everyone sees. How necessary was the alliance and confederation of the orthodox among themselves and with Catholic kingdoms and dynasties for their own blameless protection!

But who are those princes? How many Lutherans are among them? And how can Lutherans be at religious peace with those by whom they experience Lutherans being expelled daily? Indeed, defection from Lutheranism began with that alliance. Diplomas were conceived concerning the non-offense of Calvinism, and cautious proscriptions of Lutherans were instituted under the name of dismissal precisely when those treaties were being made. Thus no one can doubt by confidence in whom princes hitherto Lutheran introduce Calvinism into their dominions. Therefore that civil peace, or correspondence, produced war and destruction for Lutheranism.

Peace and defense against the Papacy are displayed to the wretched peoples; the wealth and dignities of noble churches are displayed; rewards from another's property are displayed, so that while Lutheran preachers gape eagerly after our possessions, they may unexpectedly be shaken from their own little nests. How great was the expectation among the Evangelicals when that alliance first began to grow! What pages, what pictures were thrust upon us for the terror of Catholics! They denied that the Catholic cause could stand for one or two years; they asserted that bishoprics had been distributed, prelatures given away, and monasteries described; the preachers were already inventing new titles for themselves, when behold, almost half of Lutheranism suddenly fell, and from two electorates it lost one. Can you not yet conjecture, can you not yet see and feel, O remnants of the Lutherans, that your safety is being attacked by these agreements and your quiet disturbed by Calvinist arts? Rome is put forward as the object of the treaty, and Berlin is captured. You thought that you were contributing resources and strength against the Roman Papacy, and with your own defenses you besiege and attack the Saxon Papacy, as the Calvinists call it.

He praises the cities, barons, counts, and dukes who are partners in the treaty and holy alliance; but a Calvinist praises them when he sees his own dominion enlarged and hopes by the same art to draw all men into the Genevan marshes.

These things pertain to all Lutherans, yet free cities must fear them more. But I prefer to set forth the judgment written by a senator of a noble state to the syndic of another city rather than my own.

LETTER OF SENATOR N. OF STATE N. TO N., SYNDIC OF CITY N.

Most distinguished and prudent lord, most beloved cofather, you ask me to be an adviser to my citizens that they unite themselves with the corresponding princes against the Papists. Here I hesitate greatly and greatly marvel that you advised this to your people. For I see many grave things that greatly deter me. We shall either be conquered or conquer; or certainly, worn down on both sides by equal combat, we shall make peace. If we are conquered, who does not see what "woe to the conquered" is proposed? If peace must be made after disaster, why do we not rather retain it now? But I think that we cannot be victors without disaster--indeed, that we shall perish by victory itself. Hear my consideration of the individual outcomes.

First, war must be prepared if we enter the treaty. In that whole business direction belongs to the princes, counts, and nobles. They will conduct the levies; we shall contribute the money, either for our own share or as a loan for others. The soldier must be sustained in our territory, stipends given from our treasury, supplies from our granary; for you know whence these things are usually sought.

Second, journeys will be unsafe, commerce interrupted, and fields deserted. For if Prince N. sends even a thousand horsemen into our territory for forage, he will make us poor in one week. Hence scarcity at home, fear abroad, contempt for the mechanical arts; there is danger that the citizens' hunger may stir up a tumult.

Third, if the Imperial Majesty should also command arms to be laid down and proscribe the contumacious, the goods of our citizens would be yielded to the fisc not merely throughout all Germany but throughout Gaul, Italy, and Belgium; persons would be seized, and extreme destruction and even internal seditions would have to be feared.

Fourth, when war is waged, since we are not nobles, barons, or counts, not only will the whole administration belong to others and we shall be accounted as peasants, but our cities will also be in their power. Everything must be given to men holding arms, and with the army they have collected by our money they will be able, if they wish, to compel us to concede whatever they desire. You will answer that those who love treaties and equity will not do this. Perhaps they will not; nevertheless, I fear that they may. Next, it is not for us to bring matters to the point that we hold a precarious liberty by another's kindness and mercy rather than defend it by our prudence and counsels and by the ancient law of imperial favors. It is not the act of a senator faithfully counseling his fatherland to bring it about that, whenever a neighboring prince wishes, he can subject the city--to suspend liberty from another's judgment and nod rather than fortify it by domestic counsels and defenses. I do not judge even that city free whose fortune a more powerful neighbor

carries from his belt. Certainly, while the war that will be waged at our expense endures, one noble centurion will possess more power than our senate and people.

Fifth, if the war is prolonged, how shall we sustain the expense for five or six years, with the fields devastated, the citizens vexed, the treasury exhausted, and commerce removed, when now we cannot bear even one winter? Do not our citizens' spirits fall if they hear that the Frankfurt fairs were less profitable? What do you think will occur if all of them are abolished?

Sixth, if we are conquered--which a wise man ought to fear as much as he hopes for victory--the condition of all conquered by adverse fortune will indeed be wretched, but that of cities most wretched. For princes have relatives, kinsmen by marriage, friends, intercessors on the adverse side; they will arrange marriages with the victors; they will cast the cause of the war upon their counselors; this one's youth, that one's old age, another's merits, and some men's ancestors will receive pardon. But the cities

[Printed page 790]

which are free by the favor of Caesar alone--who will protect them? Liberty will be diminished by a single word, expenses demanded back, new magistrates established, and much exacted. The reconciled princes themselves will be appointed executors; we, I say, will be demanded by the victor as plunder.

Seventh, you will say that we shall conquer. If this were an oracle, not a man's conjecture, it could perhaps move a soldier to battle; nevertheless, it ought not to induce a senator of the city of N. to undertake war. For I think victory must be feared: first because it will bring no advantage, next because it will bring extreme dangers. Furthermore, what benefit will our city derive if Prince N. conquers Prince N., expels him, and occupies his dominion? You know that I speak of those upon whose border we dwell. Will some prefecture sprinkle us, so that some remnants appear to have flowed down to us from his great fortune? First, even if he did this, its annual revenue would nevertheless not compensate for the expense we incurred. Next, he will scarcely do it; so many centurions, nobles, barons, counts, and princes through whom he conquered will surround him that we peasants--or, if you prefer, city nobles--will not even possess access. Shall we buy uncertain hope at a certain cost?

Who does not know how great a danger we too, even as victors, will undergo? For I call it a danger because, though free now before the war, as victors we shall be in the power of a stronger man. You know that we are sustained by commerce not merely from the regions of two princes but from their fields, pastures, and forests; we cannot place a foot outside without being in the territory of one or the other. Yet our liberty is safe because that ecclesiastical prince is peaceful and will not permit the other to become more powerful by the accession of our city. Thus their hostility is our safety. If by our labor the secular prince expels the ecclesiastic, he will also place us under the yoke whenever he wishes. And, believe me, a time will come when he wishes it.

Melanchthon once complained in a letter to Milichius that the cities had been both deserted and betrayed by idle princes; and he hoped that they would therefore be more moderate and seek more upright counsels for making peace. The wretched princes could betray and desert the cities; will prosperous princes not wish to rule them when they possess the power?

Eighth, examples terrify me. For since we and most cities profess Luther's doctrine, while the princes profess the Calvinist, there is no doubt that they will wish to have conquered for themselves and to introduce the Genevan exercise of religion. Thus, scattered among powerful Calvinists, we shall be a few Lutheran cities. First, therefore, little by little our citizens and youths will imbibe love of Calvinism through proximity and commerce; syndics, secretaries, and some senators will favor Zwinglianism--for even now there are men who sell themselves to the Calvinists and sell their opinions. Then they will also seek the exercise of their religion and will extort it through great intercessors. We have recently seen it effected in a famous emporium that the city should lie open even to foreigners and foreign Calvinists.

Next, disputes are accustomed to arise among neighbors. Who will administer justice to the weaker or execute by deed a just sentence? Third, at this very time, when they need our aid, solicit our money, and greatly fear their adversaries, do they grant us anything? Consider not Cologne, which because it is Catholic they judged must be afflicted, but the cities of our--that is, Lutheran--faith. Have they not begun, by introducing foreigners from Gaul and Belgium, to oppress and constrain those cities by others? See the new towns established upon the Main and Rhine for draining the most ancient cities, so that they may transfer the commerce, wealth, and life of the ancient cities into their own lands. Do you doubt that they will do this when they see themselves able, when you see them attempt it while they cannot? I believe they will not desire to possess wealthy cities which they now labor at such expense and odium to transfer! "They will not do it," you say. I prefer to take care that they cannot rather than await their mercy when they can.

You possess the protocols of proceedings; you are not a stranger in your state. Weigh what they have done; from the rules of prudence you will more easily judge what they will do.

This is the sum: we shall have to sustain the weight of war; its outcome is uncertain, its calamity most certain. If we are conquered, we shall be the victor's plunder; we shall be betrayed, as Philip says was formerly done, by idle princes. If we conquer, we shall become an accession to the plunder for men more powerful than ourselves. Therefore, since in this confederation either destruction or servitude is proposed to us--both a great evil, but more pitiable because it is proposed that it be purchased with our own money--we shall pass over ancient things and protect our liberty by fidelity toward Caesar, quiet toward our equals, and humanity toward our neighbors. Farewell, and impart counsels thus to your citizens, lest your fidelity toward the state appear to have wavered in doubtful times. I have said what belongs to my judgment.

Thus he writes; and I suspect that these are the reasons why most cities have withdrawn from that imaginary treaty or await an opportunity for honorable withdrawal. But I willingly pass over such matters, although not altogether foreign to my undertaking, since they were nevertheless not proposed for my consideration.

CHAPTER XXX

That for Peace It Is Necessary to Restrain the Insolence of Intellectuals

[Printed page 790]

What wind is to the ocean, the inconstancy of frivolous intellects is to the Church: the source of heresies. Gusts stir a tranquil sea and make it infamous for shipwrecks; the blast of winds increases a kindled fire without limit and renders useless the labors of those extinguishing it. Heresies are so called by a Greek word, from the meaning of choice, which a man employs either in establishing or in embracing them. Tertullian, Book *Against Heretics*, chapter 5: “Therefore, because they introduce a thing by their own judgment, they choose it.” Hence they insert Aristotle, who instituted dialectic for them--an artificer dexterous in building up and destroying, constrained in opinions, harsh in conjectures, a producer of contentions in arguments, troublesome even to itself, retracting everything lest it should have treated anything at all. Hence those fables and interminable genealogies, unfruitful questions, and discourses creeping like a cancer, from which the Apostle, restraining us, expressly testifies that philosophy must be guarded against. Colossians 2. Hence the rejection of that simplicity by which the Lord is sought. Hence the novel assertors of fate and those who introduce a Stoic, Platonic, and Epicurean Christianity.

It belongs to princes to avert so great an evil. If this is removed, heresies will now cease to exist. For we have no need of curiosity after Christ Jesus, nor of inquiry after the Gospel; when we believe it, we desire to believe nothing beyond it. For this we believe first: that there is nothing which we ought to believe beyond it. Tertullian, *Against Heresies*. And so Tertullian already long ago complained that philosophers were the patriarchs of heretics, that a novel apparatus was prepared from the seed of philosophers, and that heresies were animated from their intellects. This entire evil arises from curiosity and

[Printed page 791]

the display of knowledge, while men prefer to be masters of their own inventions rather than disciples of truth; they move everything and hold nothing, full of new questions and empty of faith. Hence the succession of contentions, the rise of novelties, the enormity of shameful opinions, and the cruelty of civil wars. For since nothing is so firmly constructed by any intellect that an equally keen intellect cannot be found on the opposite side, a perpetual contest concerning the glory of memory, dexterity, and acuteness necessarily arises, so that religion has now become a battle of intellects, not a sincere devotion to the worship of the deity.

The exercise could be tolerated if it spent its labor upon childish rudiments, was tormented among the thorn-brakes of dialectic, played in physics, or constructed admiration of itself from mathematics. But now to seek the glory of intellect at the peril of souls, to draw the state into partnership in contention, and to mingle scholastic dust with citizens' blood--as it is impious and cruel, so it is most customary in our age.

“But he possesses a great and perspicacious intellect, worthy for many to follow.” Would that he possessed a good disposition rather than a great intellect, if he does not possess both, so that there may be both a good will and a perspicacious understanding. If the intellect is quick, take care that it is not changeable, cunning, and inconstant. If it is swift, let it be directed toward virtue: he who runs swiftly easily rushes headlong. If it is acute, it is therefore fragile: sharp things are easily broken. And there is a certain deceptive acuteness--odious, sophistical, hostile to wisdom, and dangerous to religion. Certain most acute and excellent intellects, says Augustine, Letter 1 to Macedonius, err all the more greatly in proportion as they run forward more confidently, as though by their own powers, and have not simply and truthfully sought God to show them the way. If those great intellects indulge themselves, they presently swell and cease to be sound; and what they have once rashly said, they always defend, until at last they consume themselves by their own labor.

But they think it right and lawful that liberty of prophesying be conceded to them. Vorstius alleges this, Socinus this, and the other plagues this. And they allege it not so that they may instruct men in religion, but so that they may disturb them. In Clement, *Stromata* 1, they are ζηλωταὶ τεχνυδρίων, ἐριδαντές καὶ ἱμαντελικτές: “zealots of petty arts, contentious men, and stitchers of tortuous lawsuits.” That liberty always desires more than is lawful; therefore its untamed license must be restrained, otherwise nothing of the faith except its name will be retained.

It is of no consequence to relate examples: our age, the mother of monstrous heresies, is itself an example. Luther, employing undue liberty at the beginning, innovated the explanation of Scripture--that is, the instruments of faith. Not a thousand Cyprians, not a thousand Augustines, not a thousand others, whether by the authority of their sanctity or the splendor of their learning, recalled the man, obstinate in his own imagination, from innovation: to interpolate the Scriptures, to receive them with a new understanding, to thrust monstrous dogmas upon the world. Why should the same thing not be lawful for Zwingli which was assigned to Luther as praise? Once the die has been cast, once they have crossed the Rubicon, bringing an abominable war upon Mother Church, each rests upon his own authority in explanations of Scripture and is wise by his own intellect. He is not held by the judgment of the whole Church, which he comes to attack; he does not revere antiquity, which he ascribes to Antichrist. Therefore he is free and of his own right; he trusts himself alone; he alone is himself the author of his own religion. And we see it occur that new masters arise in individual years because individuals teach according to their own judgment. Nor can those who have departed from the first heretics be reproved by those whom they deserted, for the latter left the matrix and original Church of the faith. If deserters from the camp placed the military oath beneath their fear, what wonder is it if they are not faithful even to the enemies from whom they remember that they received rewards for perfidy? And so daily desertions occur to new heresies, or to old ones interpolated and brought upon the stage in a new form, because the vanity of the world loves to become renowned through new inventions. Nor is there any end of innovating, renewing, and disguising, because the license of fabricating possesses not only impunity but even glory, and, if it draws tumults after it, enormous profit.

I produce witnesses--not indeed weighty ones, but, since no one lies to his own disgrace, trustworthy at least in this cause. They are the preachers from the Eisleben conventicle, who complain in the preface to the Mansfeld Confession that many and various corruptions of Christian doctrine and sects of heretics everywhere enter their churches unexpectedly--partly creeping in insidiously, partly breaking in boldly and violently; that the devil stirs up on every side the intellects of proud and fanatical men, who infect the flock of God with most pestilential errors and false dogmas, by which both our bodies and souls are driven headlong into eternal destruction. And they prophesy not vainly: if this business of Satan succeeds, the condition of the Church will be much worse than it ever was before, as Christ teaches us beautifully and clearly in the parable in Luke 11. But they deny that it is so very astonishing that the opinions and sects of fanatical men are accumulated daily, and they adduce eight causes, among which this one is placed second:

“Secondly,” they say, “sects must increase because almost all princes and magistrates neglect their office in this matter, but confirm the insolence of intellects by permitting anyone, according to his own judgment, the license to fabricate any false opinion whatever.” Hence, they say, it has come about that the matter has now reached such a point that many at this time consider it a disgrace and ignominy to oppose false brethren and authors of sects by voice or writings. Indeed, even if some sincere doctors still remain, not yet infected by the poison of fanatical opinions, nevertheless they are feeble, fearful, and of a spirit somewhat too abject to be willing to incur danger for the cause of truth.

Thus they speak--with a true complaint, but an empty and indeed a foolish one. A true one, certainly: for those against whom they assembled their synod have invaded--the Anabaptists, Servetians, Stancarians, Antinomians, Schwenckfeldians, Sacramentarians, Osiandrians, defenders of free will, assertors of works toward salvation, and Adiaphorists. Among them they also placed the Jesuits, by a novel injury, since the Jesuits' religion is that of the ancient Fathers, not the new opinion of fanatics. They could have named many more of their own, such as the Flacians,

Ubiquitarians, and other monsters; still others were afterward added from the Concordian Pandora. Therefore they are divided and vary because individuals depend upon themselves; each man, for himself alone, is authentic concerning his own inspiration of the Spirit.

[Printed page 792]

The complaint is empty because princes and magistrates of non-Catholic men, by either punishing the insolence of fanatical intellects or prohibiting it so that there be no need of punishment, would themselves destroy their own profession. The patriarchs of the Lutherans permitted themselves every license of interpreting the Scriptures; now the princes cry out against their rivals and accuse the magistrates because they do not restrain the fanatics, although the magistrate doubts which men are to be judged fanatics. The accusation is reciprocal: the Sacramentarians and Osiandrians call the Mansfelders not only fanatics, but madmen and lunatics. Yet grant that the Anabaptists, Servetians, Antinomians, and the rest are fanatics, as they truly are: what will the magistrate teach, or what will he forbid? Namely, that no one according to his own judgment should possess the license to fabricate any false opinion whatever. A just command, a most equitable law. But by what standard will the magistrate examine those opinions? For they concern the interpretation of Scripture; it is not for the magistrate to judge what agrees with the mind of Scripture and what is alien to it. Or, if causes of religion also pertain to his tribunal, who will provide magistrates who all agree upon one interpretation? Will the Heidelberg and Tübingen praetors ratify the same opinion? Whatever unsound intellects rave, they boast with great vehemence that it was drawn from the most limpid fountains of Scripture. What will the prince's office do here? Command another interpretation? But which one? That which is in Luther's tomes, or in Calvin's papers? What does a fanatical intellect do here?

I care neither for Calvin nor for great Luther;

Each pleases when true; each lies fallen when false.

And why should I care for him, when he did not care for his predecessors? Let the man impose laws upon me who taught me by his own example that the free power of prophesying--that is, of interpreting the Scriptures--is constrained by no law. Let him restrain me within his own orbit who

Traverses pathless regions of perfidy,

Trodden before by the sole of none.

Therefore this complaint is empty, for those who fabricate novelties do what they learned from their predecessors. Unless they did it, they would not be heretics. And so this complaint is also foolish. For those counselors bore through the ship in which they sail and begin to sink themselves, lest the συμπλέοντες, those who are in the same ship, escape. They too are innovators, and indeed ought especially to be restrained. For what portents will arise, and to what outcome, unless the magistrate opposes them with armed force brought to bear?

They teach in the chapter on good works, from Luther, page 194: "The statement is slippery and vain when one thus declares: Faith indeed ought not to rest upon works and merits, but nevertheless it is necessary to possess good works, as things necessary for salvation. This entire statement is nothing. For if they are necessary for salvation, salvation cannot come without them, and therefore we are not saved by faith alone. But this is false and dissents from all Scripture." They then proceed to devote labor to monsters: that it is not good when it is said, "Good works are necessary for salvation." Indeed, they are neither a preserving cause nor a condition without which salvation cannot occur. But if good works are not even a condition without which salvation cannot occur, who doubts that a man may promise salvation to himself and his followers even if they have never conceived any good work? Who does not see that princes, if they love the distinction between good and honorable things in their provinces, must drive away those monsters--not now of intellects but of deliriums?

But I omit these things. Cato was accustomed earnestly to admonish the magistrate to punish offenders severely in the state, perceiving that nothing was more ruinous in the state than license. He thought it so intolerable in a polity that he

judged a magistrate who could restrain it but did not do so ought to be stoned. If this maxim ought to possess force anywhere, it seems to possess a place especially in the license of teaching, writing, and painting, since evil things are sometimes taught with greater destruction than they are done. What license effects is shown by so many thousands of errors--and errors most pestilential in the state.

I shall seek an example from a neighboring place. There is a law which prohibits defamatory pamphlets under the penalty of death. So little regard is paid to that law at the Frankfurt fairs that everywhere through the crossroads and ships wicked men fly about as vendors of such pamphlets. And, to pass over the rest in silence, fifteen defamatory pictures were brought to me at the most recent fair--and yet those were not the only ones--in which the reputation of Catholic princes and estates, and indeed of the most august Emperor himself, is traduced. For in them the Pontiff is depicted with a demon, the cardinals with a fool; all the bishops' ornaments are boiled in a kettle; the Emperor, kings, and princes, prostrate on the ground, adore the Babylonian harlot; the Prince of Parma is brought onto the stage after death; the Belgian Truce is mocked together with the image of the Catholic King; a griffin subdues Aachen, Düren, and Wesel and overturns Mülheim; the Truce dies before its day; the Spaniards and the Archduke are mocked; Spinola rides upon the seven-headed Apocalyptic beast and hangs terrible over the Jülich provinces; a Babylonian tower is built at Cologne; the most serene Duke of Neuburg, prostrate, adores the devil in the Pontiff. Everything capable of producing hatred, envy, and contempt of Catholics is brought forward on various sheets; the name of none but the Hollanders and confederates remains untouched. Condemned sheets publish judgment concerning the Roman Empire and the whole world. No one is immune from abusive sheets because there is now a reward for audacity, abusive speech, and wickedness; license entices, slanderers are purchased for a price, and those men rejoice who prefer to have injured lions with humble poison and to fasten hidden bites upon them, because, if they professed their hatreds and were enemies openly, when defeated by greater power they would lose both vengeance and credibility. Therefore this combative audacity, innovating curiosity, and defaming shamelessness must be bridled if we wish to introduce some semblance of peace--indeed, if we wish to approach a negotiation concerning peace.

CHAPTER XXXI

That Arbiters Free from Passions Must Be Chosen in a Negotiation for Peace

[Printed page 792]

We approach nearer to peace--which would that we might attain. We must treat of peacemakers, for we see that in civil contentions, or in regard to foreign wars, authors of peace who are devoted to neither party are interposed. And certainly a negotiation for peace is better completed through outsiders. For, since they are free from the passions of anger and hatred, which losses and injuries have exasperated among those who have waged mutual wars, they estimate the matter by reason and equity alone and are inclined toward concord because they hold the causes of discord far away. Indeed, the outcome has taught all too often that peaceful conversations and conferences instituted for the sake of contracting treaties have made the beginnings of a more atrocious war, and that disappointed hope of peace has sharpened hatreds. This is especially accustomed to occur when those who still bear hostile dispositions come to mutual conferences to make peace. For there everything is suspect: a slight word, an easy gesture, the order of sitting disturbs peace. Man, a suspicious animal, snatches everything toward the worse when he presumes that the disposition is hostile; the very sight and conversation of an enemy strike the distressed spirit and rouse fires not yet lulled. Therefore political writers instruct men to negotiate peace through intermediaries,

[Printed page 793]

or to commit the business to arbiters with full power. But in a cause of religion Catholics have perpetually appealed to arbiters against heretics. Unless this is done, I see no end of controversies. Those who refuse either arbiters or judgment distrust their own cause. He who admits no judge is indeed victor when he himself is judge; but to conquer thus and to be judge in one's own cause is, in the judgment of all men, to lose the cause.

But what arbiters, what judges do you name? Those whom you will not be able to reject without shame. If you reject them, your conscience will accuse you of being conquered: judges who are ἀδεκάστους [incorruptible], who neither possess nor hope for favors from either party; judges whom God has placed above fear and human passions; judges acquainted with the cause and most tenacious of equity,

Brave men and tenacious of purpose,

Whom neither the ardor of citizens commanding wicked things,

Nor the countenance of a threatening tyrant

Shakes from their firm mind.

Such men, I say, eager to die for justice and for religion, against whom, if you make an exception, you will have betrayed your cause.

Who, therefore, are arbiters or judges so great and of such a kind?

They are the assemblies of the holy Fathers, the councils of confessors, and the councils of the ancient martyrs. I bring forward men who deserved excellently of religion, who died in their piety, who either suffered the supreme punishments for truth or were prepared to suffer them. Their sincerity in teaching was so divine that they were unwilling either to conceal truth for the price of the whole world or to dissemble their faith; their constancy was free from fear to such a degree that no threats, no loss of possessions, and no proposed atrocity of torments could induce them to cease from assailing and expelling falsehood. Whoever refuses witnesses so holy and judges so incorruptible now professes himself condemned by his own judgment. This, therefore, I establish: that those judges ought to be refused neither by plaintiff nor defendant.

The adversaries themselves will also grant me the second point: that they cannot name anyone by whose judgment they are willing to stand. Or certainly, if they so will, come now--let that which they assert themselves to will be done. Let them name the man by whose judgment they dare to stand; let them name one, but someone other than each man himself.

In Holy Scripture we read: "Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him unto righteousness," Genesis 15:6, Romans 4:3, Galatians 3:6. The interpretation of this is various. A certain man interprets it thus: the work, or τὸ believing, was imputed to him unto righteousness, because God accepted it as though he had fulfilled the whole law. Thus Bertius and others. Certain men say: Christ's merit was imputed to him unto righteousness; others: God's essential righteousness was imputed to him unto righteousness; others: the habit of faith was imputed to him unto righteousness; others: faith alone was imputed to him unto righteousness, so that no merits of works came into justification; others: faith was imputed to him unto righteousness, so that not even works were a condition without which it could not occur. And these interpreters so dissent among themselves that they attack one another as heretics, atheists, Socinians, and Antichristians.

They all assert that Scripture, the sense and words of Scripture, and the analogy of faith stand on their own side, and that the others either do not understand the meaning of the Holy Spirit or corrupt it. No beginning has yet been given to peace. No one admits a judge except a man whom he knows to be bound to his own sect and hired for his own errors. Therefore, unless they wish to consume their lifetime in quarrels, let them seek arbiters who will judge sincerely without passions.

Let the Bishop of Hippo come forward and expound Paul and reconcile the dissenters: "What faith, unless that which the Apostle defined most fully in another place, saying: Neither circumcision avails anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which works through love?" Let him come and teach that faith alone is not righteousness but the foundation and beginning of justification. "Man begins from faith," he says, "but because the demons too believe, it is necessary to add hope and charity," Sermon 16 on the Words of the Apostle; and Sermon 22 on the Words of the Apostle: "The house of God is founded by believing, raised up by hoping, and perfected by loving." Let Ambrose, Augustine's teacher, come, Sermon 29 on Psalm 118: "Faith is the beginning of the Christian; the fullness is righteousness." Let Cyril come from Egypt, Book 4 on John, chapter 9: "Faith will be the gate and the way into life."

The Calvinists teach that faith cannot perish and that righteousness is not destroyed by any crimes; the Lutherans deny it. Why do they fight hand to hand concerning Scriptures which the former deny, the latter overthrow, and neither believe? Let them hear the ancients; let them hear the judgment from the holy martyrs; let them learn truth from the ancient Church. Let the Calvinists see that they err and depart far from the sense of the word; let them read against themselves *The Orthodox Consensus of the Church in This Doctrine*, produced by Peter Bertius, the most eloquent of the Calvinists, Book *On the Perseverance of the Saints*, etc., page 89. There let them read Ignatius, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, Theodoret, Cyprian, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, Prosper of Aquitaine, Gregory, Bernard, and the Acts of the School of Paris in the year 1354. He adds to these even heretical witnesses. Bertius, a milder Calvinist, wrote these things against his own rigid Hollanders and Bremeners. If he examines the other heads of doctrine by the same reasoning, and tests novel interpretations by the judgments of the ancients, he will proceed by a straight road to the orthodox faith.

If they consider these things, they will easily rescind what was wrongly judged and hold their own interpretations suspect. For if they understand that this was the perpetual doctrine of the Church of Christ, and that it was never dealt with so unhappily that these doctrines did not always possess a place in it--the words are Bertius's--what arrogance could be so obstinate as to judge that the whole Church until now read Scripture without a true understanding, while they alone were endowed with that knowledge which until now had been unknown to the world?

Therefore we direct this prescription: if Jesus Christ sent the Apostles to preach, no other preachers ought to be received than those whom Christ appointed, because no other knows the Father except the Son and he to whom the

Son has revealed Him; nor does He seem to have revealed to others the interpretation of Scripture which He revealed to the Apostles whom He sent to preach. But what they preached--that is, what Christ revealed to them--I will here also prescribe ought to be proved in no other way than through those same churches which the Apostles themselves founded by themselves preaching to them, both, as men say, by living voice and afterward through epistles. If these things are so, it follows that every doctrine which conspires with those apostolic churches, the matrices and originals of the faith, must be accounted truth, as without doubt holding that which the churches received from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God; but that every remaining doctrine which savors against the truth of the churches, the Apostles, Christ, and God must be prejudged as falsehood. These are the words of Tertullian, *On the Prescription Against Heretics*, chapter 21. Therefore, he who superinduces another meaning of the Lord's words and of apostolic preaching, contrary to the interpretation of the matrix and original churches,

[Printed page 794]

introduces a doctrine prejudged as falsehood. He who refuses those churches as arbiters of his interpretation rejects the truth of the Apostles, Christ, and God.

"But we appeal to God's judgment," they say. "We do not regard human arbitrations. The truth contained in the canonical Scriptures is unmoved; we embrace it. The judgments of men are often those of persons who favor unjustly, often of those who envy maliciously, often of those who are deceived; they are always mutable, never infallible. We appeal to God's tribunal; we follow God's word. It is wicked, after the deity's judgment has been abandoned as though doubtful, to seek truth from a creature; after the declaration of God, who is infallibly true and immutably good, to transfer the arbitration to a human tribunal is sacrilege. For there either passion or ignorance frequently oppresses truth, and imperious wickedness condemns innocence when it has been deprived of assistance. To summon God into court is more than sacrilege. Therefore the Church ought not to judge concerning our interpretations."

These things are said with the best right; but a great injury is done when they are twisted back against us, as though anyone were of so barbarous an insanity as not to know that God is immutably good and true, while the judgments of men are either fallacious through ignorance or injurious through wickedness. And even if this matter could have been doubtful, their most atrocious calumny would have removed the doubt.

For who has appealed from the heavenly tribunal to the censures of men? Who has examined God's pronouncements upon the balance of a created understanding? The matter at issue is not the truth of the divine law, concerning which he who doubts is unbelieving and he who examines is sacrilegious. It is holy to us without controversy and approved without examination. We bring men's thoughts into judgment; we inquire what they teach concerning the divine law: judges not of the law, but of deeds and sayings.

[Printed page 794]

The adversaries' accusation is grave, but it possesses much insult and no reason. It is judged unbecoming even in their own conventicles, and it has been so refuted and convicted by the orthodox that it is an indication of a ruined cause to flee to the ruins of old defenses and chant worn-out trifles again. The state of our cause is this:

The question is not whether Scripture is true, but whether Scripture too has said what the innovators say. Whether Scripture says that which no one believed it to have said a hundred years ago. Whether the Holy Spirit formerly regarded no Church, so as to lead it into the truth which the innovators boast. Whether meanwhile, until Luther and Calvin apostatized, Christ willed all the churches to understand the Scriptures in one way and believe in another; whether He willed the faithful sometimes to die for one faith other than that which He Himself had preached and written through Himself and the Apostles. Whether, in the interpretation of Scripture, so many and such great churches, various in such diverse places and languages, so near to the age of the Apostles, and testifying to truth by the blood of so many martyrs, not only erred but even erred into one faith and into the same understanding of Scripture. Whether the error truly reigned for so long. Whether among the innovators an interpretation of Scripture so varying, a

reading so manifold, and versions of so many chapters at variance conspire into one truth--and from what corner, amid such vast darkness, the light of truth shines forth.

Who is so ignorant of law and custom that he does not know that, when a dispute is instituted before a judge, the equity of the laws is not examined, nor is the purpose to overthrow the laws, but to decide controversies according to the prescription of the laws?

Germany labors and is worn down by many lawsuits of many years; and in the numerous mass of laws, a pretext for overthrowing justice is never lacking to inequity, while a swift outcome and an undamaged victory are rare even for a just cause. Yet amid so great difficulty, delay, and variety of judgments, who is there who accuses the laws, advises that customary law be abolished, or overturns the law itself? All defend themselves by law and contend that the whole apparatus of law supports their own case--not only private persons and those who are dragged into the city by law, but much more also the lords of affairs, who are besieged by troops of jurisconsults and counselors. They are entangled in more lawsuits the better they are furnished against lawsuits. These are prosecuted with so much anger, so much violence of contests, and so much cunning of intellects that legal disputes frequently issue into wars and civil slaughter.

At the present day an enormous lawsuit concerning the right to the dominions of Jülich is pending; books have been published on both sides. Three most noble princes each claim the entire inheritance for himself and exclude the others from the whole. No prudent man doubts what must be done in this place: war must be avoided. For the lawsuit will not be settled by it, since whoever succumbs in battle will say that he was overcome not by right but by force or stratagem. There can be no end of lawsuits unless it is determined by the authority of a lawful judge what the laws command. By explaining the mind of so many laws and constitutions, he will display his judgment and by his own decision disentangle the controversy which the multitude of laws entangled. Those who refuse his arbitration distrust their own cause, and on both sides the boast of laws is vain if the soul of the law--that is, the judge's sentence--is fled.

The condition of our dispute is the same, but on a more complete right. We place in the midst the immutable law of God, the word of eternal truth, and the Lord's judgment nowhere at war with itself.

We each say that it pronounces in our favor; we assert that our adversaries are condemned by it; we have persisted in the same clamor for nearly a hundred years. In individual years new competitors arise and arrogate to themselves the understanding of Scripture and the defense of truth, so that we must vindicate our possession of the faith as many times as, by a new assault and by fanatical intellects sent in, the robber of Tartarus either disturbs or invades it. Hence it is not difficult to know on whose side the true understanding of Scripture stands: on the side, certainly, of him who not only contends with an empty voice that he possesses the mind of Scripture, but also comes to join issue according to law. He not only says, "The truth is mine," but even submits the matter to a judge. Indeed, he demonstrates that it was adjudicated long ago.

If you should claim a farm from your neighbor and say:

By law the farm which you possess is mine,

but he should answer: "Not at all; for the law which you produce does not award the farm to you, but confirms it to me--or certainly, if it seems so to you, let us be brought before a court. Come into court." But you should proceed: "I alone understand the law; by law the farm is mine; I reject a judge; surrender the farm." Who would endure you, so importunately injurious concerning farms, small fields, and rainwater-drips? Yet in the business of salvation, in the highest matter of all, you desire this to possess force: that you assume judgment over all interpreters for yourself, that your interpretation be ἀνυπεύθυνος [not answerable], and exempt from every censure. Moreover, you even slander the innocent, whom, when you see them appeal from your deliriums to the ancient Fathers and judges of the Church, you feign by an unspeakable lie to subject divine truth to human arbitrations and to summon God into court. But I conclude thus:

[Printed page 795]

When the interpretation of divine Scripture is disputed, it belongs to a good conscience to appeal to the ancient Fathers and councils, but to avowed wickedness to rest upon oneself alone. Since the Lutherans admit neither Calvinists as judges, and the Calvinists judge Lutherans unworthy of judgment, this cause cannot be referred except to the ancient Fathers, known from the monuments of ancient writers, and decided from the prejudgments of the Church's councils.

For who will judge? John Francis Astaspis, against Pouchain for John Palmer, page 263, judges the Lutherans unworthy: "For even if Melanchthon was fainthearted and fearful, even if he changed his opinion, even if certain of his colleagues and disciples resisted those Ubiquitarians in the school at Wittenberg for some time, lest they make the Saxon churches infamous by this new dogma, it does not therefore follow that there are no contests and quarrels among those men. They are rendered unworthy to deliberate alone concerning the establishment of peace among the German churches, or alone to arrogate to themselves judgment and condemnation concerning the dissensions of others. For how will those who cannot repress their own contentions heal the dissensions of others? How will those who clash among themselves with such animosity and harshness of insults be fit to lead others dissenting concerning graver matters to concord, much less to condemn them? To each of them, not without cause--indeed, most opportunely--that familiar proverb can be objected: 'Physician, heal yourself'; and, 'Hypocrite, first take the beam out of your own eye before you attempt to pluck the mote from another's eye.'"

But if Palmer deservedly and rightly judges the Lutherans unworthy, because of the shameful marks of ingratitude, to sit alone as a tribunal for judging all men--as Palmer himself says and Astaspis proves--for, he says, "Those who have shown themselves so ungrateful toward their parents that they have either brought an atrocious and indecent insult upon them, or arisen as slanderers against them, or finally defamed them by public judgment, are rightly pronounced infamous and unworthy of their paternal inheritance," thus Justinian, *Novels* 111, § *Justas*; but the Lutherans, he says on page 270, "deserve to be numbered among the ungrateful and infamous who inflict those indignities upon their teachers"--Melanchthon and others. And not only the word of God, but even the philosophy of the pagans, teaches that teachers and doctors--especially theologians, who spiritually beget us in Christ--must be honored in the place of parents. If, because of contempt for Melanchthon, the Lutherans are infamous in the judgment of the Calvinists and ought not to be admitted to judgment, what will be done in general with all the innovators, who sinned not by contempt for one fainthearted and changeable little man, but who defame all antiquity, the teachers of the churches, the bishops of the world, armies of martyrs, and the teachers of all men by voice, writings, conventicles, and judgments?

But I omit these things, to which their importunity drew me away. I return and admonish again: it is a most pestilential imposture, a diabolical calumny, by which they hold the souls of the unskilled in their net, when they accuse us--because we appeal to the ancient teachers of the Church concerning the interpretation of Scripture--of fleeing from the word of God to the judgments of men and subjecting the Scriptures to be judged by human arbitration. For if anyone changes or mutilates one iota or one apex from the Lord's words, or adds to them, we say anathema to him. We inquire only concerning the understanding. The Lord said: "This is my body." We understand and believe what He Himself said: namely, that this is Christ's body. The Calvinists deny that this which the Lord said was His body is the body of Christ; they assert that it is a figure or symbol of the body. We say that it is the body delivered for us and the blood poured out for us. We know that figures and symbols are not the price of our redemption. They proceed and persist in fastening figures upon the Lord's testament.

What end is there of contending? Let us hear uncorrupted judges, pronouncing sincerely concerning a known cause and defendants not known to them: judges, I say, who do not seek to inquire and pronounce whether the Lord truly said, "This is my body," for in this they declare that they agree with us; but let them define that which is disputed--whether we or they rightly understand the Lord's most true words. But if they refuse to stand by the judgment of others, let them do so openly and abstain from calumny. For we do not judge the word of God, but summon their versions, interpretations, corruptions, and deliriums before the tribunals of the ancient Church. Here we

plant our foot; here we conquer, because they abandon their recognizance, because through calumny they flee the encounter and reject the examination of their errors, convicted by the testimony of their own conscience.

CHAPTER XXXII

That Meanwhile, While Peace Is Being Negotiated, the Lies and Calumnies of Preachers Must Be Restrained

[Printed page 795]

The restraint of slanderers is a thing altogether necessary and worthy of the cares of princes. For those poisons of tongues not only oppose the restoration of peace, but even break off a negotiation for peace after it has begun, and not rarely ruin peace itself after it has been well composed and confirmed. Deservedly, therefore, in the year 1613, at the Diet of Regensburg, the orthodox princes and estates proposed to the Imperial Majesty, among their other grievances, the insane license of reviling and slandering by which the race of preachers protects its desperate cause. For after they had demonstrated that the Augsburg Confession was gradually being annihilated and would at last be entirely destroyed amid so great a diversity of religions, and that all men appeared to have conspired for the destruction of the Catholic religion, they finally add:

“The very license of slandering and accusing has now prevailed to such a degree in the pulpits of the other party that they do not hesitate to rend with insults even the Roman Pontiff, who deserved far better of them and of the whole Empire, particularly at the time of the recent Hungarian war. What is done concerning Catholic princes, and how not only they themselves but also other estates professing the Augsburg Confession who desire to live peacefully with Catholics are everywhere traduced and dishonored by defamatory pamphlets, it is not worth the labor to demonstrate at length. Nevertheless they hope that Caesar will at length consider lawful means both of restraining this license and of preserving concord in the Empire,” etc.

These are the words of our princes. Nor are the artificers of calumnies themselves ignorant of them, since they dare to insert them into their histories in the same words. Would that princes of the other religion possessed power great enough to confine and tame θηριώδη [beastlike] and savage breasts by fear of the laws. But those men break all the rights and bonds of the laws; inflamed with envy, hatred, and anger, they fly about and nevertheless accomplish nothing else than to reveal to the world the malevolence planted in their spirits and to become the destruction of their own state. For Holy Scripture teaches us that license to slander is the sign of a city about to perish:

[Printed page 796]

Jeremiah 6:6: “This is the city of visitation; calumny is in its midst.” Ezekiel 18:22: “He who has slandered and done violence to his brother--behold, he is dead in his iniquity.” But Amos 3: “Make it heard in the houses of Ashdod and in the houses of the land of Egypt, and say: Assemble upon the mountains of Samaria, and see the many insanities in its midst and those suffering calumny in its inner rooms. And they did not know to do what is right, says the Lord, storing up iniquity and plunder in their houses. Therefore thus says the Lord God: The land will be afflicted and surrounded, and your strength will be drawn away from it, and your houses will be plundered.” For the safety of that state is laid aside and lamented not only when vices reign freely, but when they also vex innocence with impunity and oppress virtue, in which men have degenerated so far from what is right that evil is called good and good evil.

But this is the single pursuit of the new-evangelical ministry: since they cannot prevail by truth, they hold the unskilled by slandering the adverse party. They know that the bite of calumny is incurable and, though it does not deserve belief, nevertheless generates an opinion by which the greatest part of mankind is led. Although that which is boasted in an old saying is false:

Νικᾷ γὰρ αἰεὶ διαβολὴ τὰ κρείττονα.

Calumny always conquers the better things.

For truth often conquers. Yet the other saying is true:

Οὐδὲν διαβολῆς ἐστὶν ἐπιπονώτερον.

Nothing is more intolerable than calumny.

The sword indeed cuts, according to Democritus, but calumny separates friends. Yet I appeal to those men in vain: like an asp, they possess poison in their tongue, and their single hope of victory; and, if they can hear the truth, they owe every success of novelty and every increase of heresy to their lies. Therefore they will not permit these arms to be wrested from their hands unless their princes and magistrates, lovers of true and sincere peace, reduce them to the orbit of modesty by force and fear. Unless they attend especially to this, not only will pear tree grow old upon pear tree and fig tree upon fig tree in their dominions, but they will also lose every assurance and hope of peace. For he who slanders renders the man whose reputation he detracts hateful, and himself too hateful to all. What a basilisk touches, it kills and poisons; the man whom a slanderer destroys he renders execrable even to others.

We seek peace, a synod, treaties, and friendship; but amid so great a license and impunity of fabrication, amid so great an atrocity of calumnies, we cannot negotiate with the preachers. Nothing of fidelity, nothing of humanity, much less of religion, can exist in professed informers and sycophants. For behold, we have disputed together for so many years, and in each year they fabricate new, horrible, and unheard-of crimes concerning us; with these they fill sheets, pictures, books, and the ears of the peoples. What kind of conscience so laboriously traduces another's innocence? What kind of religion is it which needs to be supported by such unspeakable lies? Catholics deservedly detest them when they observe that they slander not only beyond belief but also beyond measure.

I shall make the matter clear by examples. In Poland they fabricated unspeakable and foul things concerning certain priests of our Society and published in writing that, examined before the eyes of the city of Kraków, they had been subjected to the supreme punishment. They lied that the same crimes had been expiated publicly at Antwerp by others. The most serene King of Poland, the bishop and governor of Kraków, and the senate and bishop of Antwerp refuted the manifest lies by their testimony. They lie about other things at Vienna, Styria, and Bavaria; princes and states defend innocence among foreigners by public attestations. For in those places where the crimes are said to have been committed and punished by the gallows, wheel, and fires in the sight of all, there is no need of a defense, since so many thousands of men recognize the heretical lust for lying and detest it equally with heresy. I pass over lesser and daily things; from these greater ones I draw my argument.

Nothing can be negotiated with men who do not fear to scatter so many and such false things, either in the polity or in religion, since all familiarity and every conversation possess no less danger than if you were associating with a scorpion, viper, or basilisk. I am not ignorant of their excuse: that they fabricate those things for the sake of defending religion and conquering their adversaries. But if religion is true, it ought to rest upon its own integrity, not upon detraction from another's piety. I know that otherwise they cannot maintain their cause; but it is better to lose it than conquer through so many crimes.

In the year 1613 a disputation was instituted at Durlach between Catholics and adversaries. The ministers, with the *μεγαληγορία* [boastful grandiloquence] customary to them and confident speech, boasted that they would prove certain pronouncements of their opinion from the sole, clear Scripture. When they came to the matter, they brought glosses and petty arguments in place of the sole, clear Scripture. The history was published in Latin and French. But what did the evangelical historian do? Contrary to the conscience and testimonies of two most illustrious men, contrary to the preachers' own programs and theses, he lies about the event in these words, *Mercurius Gallobelgicus*, volume 9, book 4:

“At the beginning of July, a colloquy between the Protestants and Pontificians was instituted at Durlach, to which the brother of the Duke of Lorraine also had gone with two Jesuits so that he might attend the colloquy. But since the Jesuits, obtaining the ancient position, chanted their old song again and contended that the Pope must be chosen as

judge and that the dispute must be conducted from the Fathers and indeed in the French language; whereas the Protestants, appealing to Holy Scripture, said that the disputation must be conducted from it alone and indeed in the Latin language, in the customary manner; the Jesuits, unwilling to accept that condition, returned by the road on which they had arrived and departed to their own party with the matter unaccomplished.”

These are the words of Gothard Artus, a man of such prostituted shamelessness that, after princes testified and the preachers themselves moreover disclosed in writings that the matter stood otherwise--not only the Jesuits but even the most serene Vaudémont himself demanded the proof of dogmas from Scripture alone, as had been promised, and the preachers confessed that they could not do this--he nevertheless has not yet deleted the lies detected by the writings of so many Lutherans and Calvinists and even by Pareus's oration. There can be no negotiation for peace with such men, who, as soon as they have been conquered, possess at hand some scoundrel sold to lies, by whose pen they overthrow the truth of history, who dares to swear that it is not light at midday.

But I now cease to marvel at these things, since I have read the foulest calumnies since the birth of mankind against the most reverend and illustrious Cardinal Bellarmine. Impiety never formerly dared anything similar; innocence suffered nothing of this kind. The arch-sycophants of the Evangelicals have reached the summit; they have conquered all the ancient informers, slanderers, revilers, abusive speakers, and detractors; now in the Bellarminian calumny they have conquered themselves. Therefore, unless such men are excluded from conferences or constrained by the laws

[Printed page 797]

and punishments of princes, peace cannot exist. For let us suppose a colloquy appointed in some city on the Rhine: what disposition can Catholics possess when they know that the Gdańsk slanderer is prepared to attack any celebrated truth by a public lie? When they must fear lest, meanwhile, while they themselves devote themselves to prayer, reading, doctrine, and disputation, sheets fly throughout all Germany in which they are said to have died, to be carried through the air encircled by flames by the devil, to fill cities with enormous wailing, and to render their hearers lifeless? For since they have fabricated these things against Bellarmine, without precedent, from the fullness of diabolism, they will not easily be milder toward us: that example has made them more instructed, impunity more audacious, and practice more prompt.

But lest we be moved excessively by reputation--although whoever neglects it is cruel--what of the fact that we cannot even live among them without the greatest peril? Certainly with no less peril than men formerly lived among informers at Rome in the time of Tiberius, Claudius, and Domitian. For at the slanderous lie of one or two men, if strength should belong to the adverse party, we must perish without a defense. The history which the same purveyor of lies relates teaches this, volume 10, book 3:

“Meanwhile, when a report had become widespread that the Jesuits at Münster had performed a comedy concerning the ruined Maurice--namely, representing his person on the stage as suddenly vanishing, as it were, while fighting with Spinola, while he concealed himself under a table and thus escaped the impending danger, his soldiers being altogether routed and at last put to flight by Spinola's soldiers--the Nassauers, moved by this occasion, converted the comedy into a tragedy a little afterward. For immediately seven troops of the confederates' cavalry, together with no small body of infantry, flying into the neighborhood to seek him, crawled through various places; and when they did not find Maurice, after all chests and boxes had been shaken out, they carried away with them whatever goods they could seize, while the peasants lamented their lost possessions in vain.”

These are the words of that same Artus. That comedy was never written, never performed, never seen; nor did any scoundrel so shameless arise who dared to say that he had seen it. But a report became widespread: that report was false. But report is a swift evil and one which acquires strength by going. The report arose from the preachers or their satellites, certainly from those who both hate Catholics and loved the resources of Catholics excessively; they will also render account to God for the plundering of the wretched. But this is not the time to complain of these things; it was done recently at the Diet of Regensburg by the Catholic estates.

Now I assert this: that with the unpunished license of the ministers, we cannot hope for peace. An inequitable condition of peace indeed! If you delay an irritable and bilious minister for a little while, he will immediately lie that you made a comedy about Maurice; he himself, the artificer, in order to convert it into a tragedy, will bring seven troops of cavalry with infantry, plunder the neighboring regions and harmless inhabitants. Behold how much evil comes to you from one tongue! What viper, what basilisk, by prolonged ravaging, brought so much devastation as one tongue of a slanderer, by a few and false words and while absent? It was rightly said long ago:

Οὐδὲν θηρίον κακουργότερον τῆς διαβολῆς.

No beast is more harmful than calumny.

Good God, what will happen to the entire Catholic name if armed princes believe their ministers when they lie for our blood? If those princes are able to do what the ministers wish? If the fortunes and life of the orthodox depend upon the worst of all things--the tongue of a preacher?

Calumnies do not touch private persons alone; they rise with the same audacity against kings and princes, and not only Catholics but even those who desire to live peacefully with Catholics. Above I cited calumnies, insults, and defamatory pamphlets. In them an eagle is fabricated without feathers and Caesar sleeping; the Pontiff is Antichrist, and all ecclesiastical and Catholic princes are Antichristian; the King of Spain is compared to a griffin; Spinola rides upon the seven-headed beast of the Apocalypse; no Catholic and none of the friends of Catholics is immune. I am not ignorant that the States of Holland prohibited these things, but the rage of the ministers strives toward what is forbidden. They have spurned God's command prohibiting calumny; it is not astonishing if they condemn the magistrate. For what authority would not be cheap to those who mock eternal Majesty as though it did not impute crimes?

Therefore, every law being set aside, not only do they defile the fairs with abusive speech, defamatory pamphlets, and pictures, but they twist the news which they print each week to the insult of Catholic princes, as in issue 52 of the journal of the year 1615, where the King of Spain and his ambassador are rendered suspect as though they were privy to the Somerset conspiracy; and in the journal of the year 1616, on the twenty-second day, it is reported that a persecution of religion has begun in Austria, whereby Caesar is traduced as a persecutor. In the other reports such is the course and malignity of the narration that the cause of Catholics is burdened with suspicions and contempt. Therefore, if they seek peace, let them remove from the midst the perpetual material of wars and nursery of discords--namely, the abusive speech of the preachers--or at least so bridle it that it does not ravage with the liberty which it has possessed until now.

CHAPTER XXXIII

That Colloquies Rightly Instituted Conduce to Peace

[Printed page 797]

“Peace has not been established by so many conversations,” you will say. “Why, therefore, do you summon us to disputations? What else will follow from them than exacerbations and the proclamation of itself as victor by each party?” I am not ignorant that many disputations have been causes of greater discords, that fire has been stirred with a sword, and that hornets have been exasperated by mutual agitation. Indeed, in the book *On the Synod and Union of the Evangelicals* I demonstrated by evident arguments that they cannot return to concord through mutual colloquies. Now I shall show only this: that colloquies instituted between the orthodox and those who err make some progress toward peace. For I do not affirm that they suffice; rather, I seek all supports for peace, not only those by which we may possess it but also those by which I trust that we may approach peace.

First, in Acts 6:9 the Libertines, Cyrenians, Alexandrians, Cilicians, and Asians disputed with Stephen and could not resist the wisdom and spirit which spoke. There were, therefore, continual disputations with unbelievers by which the Church grew and error diminished.

Next, in chapter 9:22, Paul grew much stronger and confounded the Jews who dwelt at Damascus, affirming that this is the Christ. We are taught in Acts 17:2 and 17:18 that this was the custom. For at Thessalonica and Athens, and indeed in the very assembly of the Areopagus, Paul disputes. Likewise at Corinth, after entering the synagogue, he spoke with confidence for three months, disputing and persuading concerning the kingdom of God.

[Printed page 798]

Acts 19:8--9: he disputes daily in the school of a certain Tyrannus, not only with the disciples but with those who came to be taught. Indeed, Paul as a prisoner disputes before Felix and Drusilla concerning justice, chastity, and the future judgment, so that he beholds Felix, his judge, trembling. At Rome too, in his own hired lodging, he disputes for the whole two years and, though himself a prisoner, sets the multitudes free into the liberty of faith; for the word of God is not bound.

Nor did the Church abandon its custom afterward. To omit ancient matters, how many colloquies were held in Africa in Augustine's time? Augustine himself disputed against heretics not only in writings but in collated discourses. “At the same time,” he says in *Retractions*, book 1, “during my presbyterate I disputed against a certain Fortunatus, a presbyter of the Manichaeans, who had lived at Hippo for a very long time and had seduced so many that on their account he was pleased to dwell there. This disputation, while we argued, was taken down by notaries as though acts were being drawn up, for it possesses both a day and a consul.” The outcome was that which Augustine himself relates: “On the following day Fortunatus finally conceded that he found nothing to say against us. He certainly did not become a Catholic, but nevertheless departed from Hippo.”

He also conferred with the Donatists for three days; he reduced their long disputation into narrow compass and called it the *Breviculus of the Conference*. He not only advised a conference with Fortunius, bishop of the Donatists, but even prescribed its manner and method in Letter 163 to Eleutherius and Glorius.

He also consented to institute a colloquy with Pascentius, a count of the Arian heresy, but on the condition that the words of the disputants be taken down by notaries. After the count rejected the condition, Augustine deservedly refused the colloquy at first: for the count wished his words to be spoken, but did not wish them to be held against him. Nevertheless, overcome by charity, Augustine undertook it.

Concerning the most renowned disputation, Possidius writes thus in chapter 13 of the *Life of Augustine*: “And concerning all these things done for the peace of the Church, the Lord both gave Augustine the palm here and reserved with Himself the crown of righteousness; and, with Christ aiding, from day to day the unity of peace and the brotherhood of the Church of God were more and more increased and multiplied. This was accomplished especially through the conference which was afterward held at Carthage by all the Catholic bishops with those same bishops of the Donatists, with the most glorious and religious Emperor Honorius assisting. To accomplish it, he had also sent from his own side to Africa the tribune and notary Marcellinus as judge. In that controversy they were refuted in every way and convicted of error by the Catholics; they were marked by the sentence of the cognitor and, after their appeal, were justly condemned among heretics by the response of the most pious king. For this reason more than the customary number of their bishops, together with their clerics and peoples, entered into communion; and, holding Catholic peace, they endured many persecutions from them, even to the amputation of limbs and death.”

Then, after that most celebrated conference, some did not cease to say that those bishops had not been permitted to say before the authority which heard the cause everything on behalf of their own parties. Augustine afterward imposed silence upon Emeritus, the principal defender of the sect, at Caesarea, a city of Mauretania. He also confuted Maximinus when he came into Africa with the Goths, and he disputed with the Pelagians very frequently, so that a conjecture concerning the other ages may be formed even from that one age. Nor does it belong to my undertaking to demonstrate by examples a practice now employed for so many ages in the Church, but to show how greatly those men err who condemn conferences of this kind universally because the inquiry into truth is often impeded more by clamors and quarrels than it is advanced. This generally happens when victory is sought by shameless ambition, not an understanding of things--when the interlocutors wish to seem learned, not to learn.

The reason why exact disputations, perfected according to the dialectical norm, are necessary is that many stubbornly resist acknowledged truth and yield only when manifestly convicted. Rightly did the most holy prelate Augustine, most practiced in eristic writings and conferences, say in *The City of God*, book 2, chapter 1: “If the weak perception of human custom did not dare to resist the reasoning of perspicuous truth, but subjected its infirmity to salutary doctrine as to medicine until it was healed by divine aid when the faith of piety obtained it, there would be no need of lengthy discourse for convicting anyone's error of empty opinion by those who think rightly and explain what they think in sufficient words. But now, since that disease of foolish spirits is greater and fouler, by which they defend their irrational movements as though they were reason and truth--even after all the reason which is owed by man to man has been fully rendered, whether through excessive blindness, by which even manifest things are not discerned, or through most obstinate perversity, by which even those things which are discerned are not endured--it generally becomes necessary to speak more copiously. We must offer clear things to be seen, as though to those not looking at them; but, in a certain manner, to be touched by those groping and to be encountered by those struggling.”

For this reason the adversaries must be convicted seriously and ἀναντιρρήτως, irrefragably, so that they themselves may be compelled to behold their own effrontery and shamelessness.

Next, although sectaries who hunt for glory from colloquies are rarely converted, nevertheless they defend less spiritedly those things concerning which they begin to doubt. Third, by the agitation itself the innermost elements of their errors, the discords and conflicts of the sects, and especially the calumnies which they customarily fabricate against absent Catholics, are thoroughly known. Fourth, their contumacy is uncovered. For who among them, from the first disputant down to Plessis in the royal court and Heilbronner at Neuburg, so yielded his hands to truth and glory to God that he was not ashamed to be convicted while disputing, but rather rejoiced to have been better instructed by truth? Did not an unformed clamor of perversity explode a matter well introduced for discussion? Or, if the prerogative against truth was denied to clamor, did not the pretense of illness abandon the disputation? A plainly childish thing: to feign so sudden and so savage an illness that you cannot point out ten or twenty passages in another's book which you had previously copied out and weighed! Yet in this manner they concluded two of the most noble colloquies of our

time: Plessis in Gaul, leader of the cuirassiers, and Jacob Heilbronner in Germany, pope of the Lutherans. For each preferred to cut short public disgrace by feigning illness rather than hear his own faults and learn truth.

CHAPTER XXXIV

That Writings Undertaken Concerning Controversies, Although Eristic, Are Nevertheless Useful for Peace

[Printed page 798]

The multitude of writers and contenders causes many of the more prudent to call into

[Printed page 799]

controversy whether it is expedient at all to write books concerning matters of faith. But those who doubt concerning this matter are not to be heard, much less those who judge that writings must be abolished universally. Indeed, to such a degree that to prohibit Catholics' writings on behalf of the faith is the same as to betray the faith. Certainly the Apostle Paul composed most of his epistles against sectaries: to the Romans and Galatians concerning justification, law, and predestination; to the Corinthians concerning various errors of the pseudo-apostles. He also admonishes the Philippians to beware of dogs and evil workers; the Colossians, lest anyone deceive them through sublimity of speech or empty philosophy. He instructs the Thessalonians against those who said that the final day was at hand. The whole Epistle to the Hebrews consists in an attack upon Judaizers. John, James, and Peter also treat controversies in their Catholic Epistles, so that those who dare to blame the accepted custom of writing concerning controversies assume judgment for themselves concerning the Apostles and the Holy Spirit.

Let the books of the ancients--few of many which have come into our hands--be inspected: they are for the greatest part eristic and pursue heresies. There is no need to teach this; the pages themselves cry out. If it is burdensome for anyone to approach the authors, let him consult the indexes of Tertullian, Cyprian, Athanasius, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and others. This, therefore, has always been done in the Church: that heresies creeping secretly or raging bitterly should be removed with every care. Because this can be done most easily by writings, writings must be employed, since they most easily come to the knowledge of others, are composed with deliberation, and can be retained for a very long time--especially since the colloquies themselves are customarily written down by notaries, so that not only those present may be instructed, but those far distant may attend the disputation most tranquilly and judge the matter.

Why should Catholics not labor diligently at this, lest truth lack its defense, when the sectaries' bloody presses and rage in writing have caused so great a slaughter of unskilled men? The adversaries confuse everything with insults, epigrams, and defamatory pamphlets; atrocious and infamous things are scattered concerning the Pontiff, Caesar, and all Catholic princes. Is it fitting for us to be silent toward all these things? Shall we not beware of betraying a good cause by our silence, rendering the adversaries' calumnies secure, and adding a spur to those running through hope of impunity? I indeed judge that not all must be answered. Augustine speaks truly in *The City of God*, book 2, chapter 1: "And yet what end will there be of disputing and measure of speaking, if we always think that those who answer must be answered?"

"For either they cannot understand what is said, or they are so hard through perversity of mind that even if they understand, they do not obey. They answer, as it is written, and speak iniquity; and they are indefatigably vain. If we wished to refute their contrary sayings as many times as, with an obstinate face, they have resolved not to care what they say provided that in some manner they contradict our disputations, you see how infinite, laborious, and unfruitful it would be." Therefore it is not necessary to answer all, but some must always be met, lest victorious ignorance triumph over truth.

How greatly the writings of Catholics obstruct their malice, the adversaries' hatreds and laws sufficiently show. For what things do they not fabricate against Bellarmine and the whole Society? All these things tend toward this: that

when they have made those who announce the Gospel hated, they may also render truth itself contemptible. But now they rage even more furiously, since they perceive themselves to be known and refuted more clearly day by day. For they thrust forward so many defamatory pamphlets and pictures at each fair that recently the nobles of Holland had to restrain the wicked men by public edict. For there, in particular, is the workshop of enormous insults and maleficent sheets, either because more men there delight in such things, or because the license for crimes is greater in that place than in other provinces, or finally because they think that such things do not displease many leading men; and artisans prepared for everything through greed for profit do not refuse their labor.

Others indeed judge writings necessary, but moderate and familiar ones. Thus they do not even suffer those against whom anathema was pronounced long ago to be called heretics, nor do they admit a harsher word.

I judge that moderation and humanity contribute greatly to the matter, both in other things and especially in sacred disputations, and that they must be applied everywhere; yet in such a way that matters are weighed according to their own moment and gravity, that heresies are not tolerated, and that they are not estimated as light matters or philosophical controversies. For if that opinion prevails, a commingling of all religions will soon follow. Therefore errors must not only be convicted but also distinguished. Nor do I approve a shepherd who, when he has seen a wolf killing, does not dare to call it by its own name. But if a wolf covered with soft wool enters the folds, he is a traitor to the sheep who does not warn that destruction lies hidden beneath a lamb's skin. The soldier who fears to call an enemy by name, from whom he sees that his throat is sought, is cowardly. Therefore, according to the example of the holy Apostles--and among them John, who drank charity most fully from the Lord's breast--heretics must be uncovered, named, fled, and detested; nor must "hail" be said to them. I speak of heretics, not of those who through ignorance or infirmity are followers of another's error and do not cast off that in which they were entangled by the first fraud because they have not yet received another and better thing to hold. To these not only humanity and courtesy but also mercy must be expended, because truth is found with the greatest difficulty by those seeking it, and there are innumerable causes why it is not sought.

"But Tertullian disapproves colloquies and writings with heretics, and many others have called colloquies pernicious and writings useless." I answer that colloquies are useful if they are free, moderate, conducted in syllogistic form without evasion, and if a judgment is also added which the arbiters present pronounce. Writings too must be tested by the same rule, and sectaries must be pressed to dispute at close quarters concerning the opinion of Catholics, not to attack their own dreams and adversaries whom they themselves fabricate. Thus those Belgian writings also contribute to peace, and many thousands who lacked an opportunity for conversation have now returned to the Catholic Church through the circulation of writings.

CHAPTER XXXV

That a General Council Is the Most Certain and Compendious Way to Peace Is Shown from the Scriptures

[Printed page 799]

Thus far I have produced the aids of peace and those things without which peace cannot be composed, referring all of them to honorable, firm, and salutary concord. Now I come to that which alone suffices for peace, which has frequently

[Printed page 800]

brought peace to a world in tumult, and which has left none in quarrels and destruction except the ignorant and extremely unskilled, or the inflexibly contumacious who obstinately reject it: namely, a General Council of the whole Christian world. Thus Holy Scripture teaches us when it signifies that such a council cannot err and that the voice of the council is the voice of the Holy Spirit. For in Acts 15 the Fathers of the first council say, “It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us.” Nor was the Holy Spirit so present to their constitutions that He deserted the churches of later men; nor did subsequent times require the aid of the Holy Spirit less than the earliest. Therefore, if infallible truth is in councils legitimately congregated, provided that they are general, just as it is in the Scriptures, certainly it is necessary that he who believes the Scriptures also place faith in the canons of a council, since the Scriptures commend in councils the authority of truth and the truth of authority.

They are accustomed to object that this was a synod of the Apostles and therefore was directed, under the leadership of the Holy Spirit, according to the norm of truth and without suspicion of error, but that in their successors certainty and constancy in governing the Church were weakened. Men of this kind are malicious appraisers of divine goodness, which remains with its Church even to the consummation of the age and which would in vain command that doctors and pastors be heard if they can all err simultaneously at some time. When they extend the grace of God to forty or fifty years, they confine it within a very short space. They dream that the Church ceased long ago. For if the firmness of those who teach is removed, if it can define nothing, there is therefore no authority which can either condemn heresy or confirm the orthodox. Wickedness seeks an exception against every judgment so that, when it has rendered every sentence of the judge uncertain, it may fly about without fear of condemnation and ravage with impunity.

Next, “He Himself gave some indeed as Apostles, some as prophets, others as evangelists, and others as pastors and doctors, for the consummation of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edification of the body of Christ,” etc., “so that we may no longer be children, wavering and carried about by every wind of doctrine, in the wickedness of men, in cunning for the circumvention of error. But doing the truth in charity, let us grow in all things in Him who is the head, Christ, from whom the whole body, compacted and joined together through every joint of supply according to operation in the measure of each member, makes increase of the body unto its own edification in charity.” Ephesians 4:11 ff.

Those words of the Holy Spirit assert the Church's authority in deciding controversies so clearly and forcefully that, to one considering them, it appears more manifest than the noonday light that they were spoken against heresies.

For He describes God's charity, rich toward all, and His most persuasive providence in the government and defense of the Church. He gave Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and doctors, not for the use of a few years, so as to withdraw them from the other ages, but for the stability of perpetual time; for the consummation of the saints--not only those who served the Lord in apostolic times, but also those whom the temptations and dangers of the final ages were to await. And He expressly adds the time: “for the work of the ministry,” which certainly will not cease while the world stands. “For the edification of the body of Christ”: the body of Christ is the Church; it is built in all ages. God

will place the finishing hand upon it when the burning heavens are dissolved and the earth and the works that are in it are burned. Therefore power and authority must persevere until that day because the work of the ministry is performed without cessation; without authority it would come to rest. Edification still continues. Therefore the knowledge and industry of an architect are required. Thus the labor and power of the builders did not cease in the Apostles, since the building in their successors is tested by the same rule.

But they build toward this end: “that we may all meet in the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ.” That, namely, we may καταντήσωμεν, arrive, at the unity of faith--which cannot occur if there is now no authority to protect unity; if those ancients possessed certain authors of their religion, while our faith rests upon uncertain conjectures. How shall we meet “unto a perfect man”--that is, grow in the knowledge of God and charity so that we attain the perfect and stable age of faith and are constant and immutable in the manner of men--if there is no certainty in the Church's judgment upon which our confidence may rest? How shall we come “unto the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ” if Christ's fullness is taken away from us? For the Apostle speaks of Christ as He grows to maturity in us and attains fullness in the Church. Therefore the measure of Christ's age or stature (ἡλικίας) is twofold: the first is that by which He Himself as an adult attained the fullness of a body assuming its increases in the human manner; the other is the measure of fullness by which the Church grows until that mystical body is full and perfect. We must grow unto that measure, and, as we grow, the body of Christ must be increased until it puts on πλήρωμα, fullness, consummation, and perfection complete in every respect.

For this reason doctors and bishops of our souls have been given to us. If certain truth is not in their universal body, the body of Christ has perished and the Lord could not maintain His purpose, for the body has been cut away from its head so that it could not attain its fullness. Individual members on this side and that die and are torn from the body; but the life of the universal body is perpetual from God's promise and guardianship of the faith. Therefore the universal Church will never be separated from Christ nor fall into lethal errors; consequently, infallible authority exists in it. Those who concede this will also grant that it exists in a General Council. For where will that constant truth be found except in a legitimately congregated council, since they do not admit it in the Pontiff?

But what will occur when we have grown unto a perfect man? “That we may no longer be children, wavering and carried about by every wind of doctrine, in the wickedness of men, in cunning for the circumvention of error.” But if there is now no authority of judging in the Church which God willed to be certain, all must necessarily waver and be carried about in many matters. For even if all General Councils, together with the Roman Pontiffs, define that this or that Scripture must be understood now in this or that way, since they could err no less than individual men, their definition will bring nothing certain, but the Church will waver in perpetual ἐποχῇ [suspension of judgment].

How explicitly does the Spirit of God hand down to us that perpetual life of truth in the Church, growth of faith, increase of charity, and inseparable conjunction with Christ? “But doing the truth in charity, let us grow in all things in Him who is the head, Christ, from whom the

[Printed page 801]

whole body, compacted and joined together through every joint of supply, according to operation in the measure of each member, makes increase of the body unto its own edification in charity.” How do we grow in Him in all things if at some time the whole Church falls from Him, a teacher of errors and alien to truth? How shall we grow in all things if there is no certain food in any supply of the Church? If every nourishment whatsoever, even though judged salutary by the Christian universality, can be poisonous and lethal?

Finally, if the Church is a body compacted, συναρμοιζόμενον ἢ συμβιβασζόμενον, fitly and articulately joined together through every joint, or διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς, through every contact--not only so that the spouse, the Church, is closely joined to the Lord its head, but expressly διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας, through every joint of supply; for Christ, as though the soul, diffuses strength and grace into all the limbs and members by vital operation. For this is

κατ' ἐνέργειαν, from the power by which Christ operates within. If by its nature each member grows and the whole body increases from that supply of nourishment and powers; if it effects its own edification in charity, which it cannot effect unless it coheres with the rest of the body; and if the rest of the body cannot possess the contact of supply unless compacted and joined together from its own head: it is certainly concluded that the Church perpetually coheres with Christ in this manner and therefore can never depart from the faith, and consequently possesses infallible truth in decrees of faith.

Nor does a General Council now possess less authority than that council in which Peter, the pastor of the Church, presided with the Apostles. For authority is found nowhere else. But if that Church possessed certain doctrine and ours doubtful doctrine, our Church is not one body and one spirit with it. It does not live from Christ but is the Church's corpse. For every Church whose authority is uncertain is not engrafted into Christ.

I hear the heretic speaking against me, though with a lighter murmur than was his custom.

First, that he acknowledges infallible authority in the Church, but one which belongs to the Scripture which the Church employs, not to the Church. Next, that the Church of which the Apostle speaks is a certain hidden Church.

These things are not now uttered by most men with their former grandiloquence, nor do they produce them ληροδῶς [foolishly] in their customary manner, since recently even the Calvinists of Dordrecht denied against Tectander that Scripture was sufficient, and the initiates of Durlach spontaneously confessed that they could not show their faith from Scripture. Especially because certain men, whom I have treated elsewhere, concede that the sacred writers sometimes knowingly and willingly departed from truth. If these things are true, it is necessary that nothing be clear, but that it be preferable ἐπέχειν, to withhold assent in the Academic manner, rather than rashly give assent to things unknown and uncertain.

But I omit these matters, although they suffice for refuting errors. I ask this: who can pronounce judgment with infallible authority in the explanation of the Scriptures? If there is no one, then this body is not compacted and joined together from its head, nor does Christ impart to the Church, κατ' ἐνέργειαν [according to operation], as the Apostle speaks, the vegetative power of spiritual grace. Nor will anything certain be possessed in many articles of faith.

Among the primary and capital decrees of the Calvinist faith is this: that faith and righteousness remain amid all crimes. The Lutherans deny this; the mild Calvinists, Bertius, and the more learned Hollanders doubt it--indeed, they speak while doubting in such a way as to show that they think the contrary. Scripture does not decide the matter by its judgment because each side is accustomed to cite it for its own cause. Nor is Scripture an evident expositor of its own opinion; for why does the evidence of Scripture concerning this matter which I have cited not shine upon the Lutherans and mild Calvinists? Next, they say that they concede the interpretation of Scripture. Who among us ever removed the interpretation of Scripture? Certainly no one. "For we all freely confess that the Scriptures need interpretation," thus Whitaker; indeed, he expressly adds: "Those who understand the grammatical sense of Scripture nevertheless ought to hear an explanation of Scripture so that they may understand better."

When a dispute arises in controversial articles, by what authority will this interpretation be settled? By none except that of the Church, which taught us that the Scriptures were given to us. But the Church is accustomed to disclose their mind to us through Christ's vicar and a General Council, which represents that sacred state. Without its testimony, although the truth of Scripture is most certain, it is nevertheless unknown to us. For whence do you know that this Scripture is divine--a fact of which the Chinese and cannibals are ignorant--unless because the Church taught you so? Even if they read the Bible in their own language, they would nevertheless not know certainly that it is the divine voice. Therefore let the hypocrisy depart by which men withdraw from the word of God while praising the word of God, and a hiding place is prepared for all heresies.

For what if the first-rank Calvinists deny that the Apocalypse is Scripture, and the Lutherans with them, while later Calvinists concede it? What Scripture says, "The Apocalypse is a divine book"? Yet this must be believed; therefore it

must be proposed by a firm authority incapable of being deceived and deceiving. For that which is believed from authority becomes credible only from the truthfulness of the reporter; but whatever proceeds from an author of uncertain fidelity can deservedly seem suspect to the hearer. Therefore, if the Church, the user and commender of the Scriptures, errs in proposing them, to whom can it be certain that the documents which it exhibits are of good faith? Therefore, if the Church is deceived, the Scripture which bestows upon it the praise of perpetual infallibility is false; nor am I bound to believe a Scripture whose authority I knew only through the Church as witness.

The other laborious and dark refuge, in which they labor in vain to hide themselves in opaque night: they say that the invisible Church does not err. But the Apostle instituted his discourse concerning that Church in

[Printed page 802]

which Apostles, evangelists, pastors, and doctors are heard, and to which there is access, so that by adhering to it we may not waver or be carried about. Therefore this answer falls back into a refuted fallacy. For if the Church is not visible, it cannot pronounce judgment, nor can its decree be heard when it is unknown whether it exists at all.

Next, how ridiculous it is--if laughter can possess a place in so grave a matter--that the Church which hands down the sacred Bible to us, in which we possess faith and which we do not suspect of deceit, should be invisible! Whence do you recognize the donor if it was invisible when it gave? The Apostle speaks of the Church which obtained the minds of the gentiles, whose nursing fathers are kings, which, placed upon a mountain, cannot lie hidden, and which the nations admire even when they do not follow it.

“This was accomplished,” says Augustine in the book *On the Usefulness of Believing*, “by divine providence, through the predictions of the prophets, through the humanity and doctrine of Christ, through the journeys of the Apostles, through the insults, crosses, blood, and deaths of the martyrs, through the praiseworthy life of the saints, and, amid all these things, through miracles worthy of such great matters and virtues according to the opportunity of the times. Therefore, when we behold so great aid of God and so great progress and fruit, shall we doubt to place ourselves in the bosom of that Church which, from the Apostolic See through the successions of bishops--even while heretics bark around it in vain, condemned partly by the judgment of the people itself, partly by the gravity of councils, and partly even by the majesty of miracles--has obtained the summit of authority even to the confession of the human race? To be unwilling to grant it primacy is surely either the act of supreme impiety or of headlong arrogance. For if there is no certain way to wisdom and salvation for souls unless faith prepares them beforehand for reason, what else is it to be ungrateful to divine assistance and aid than to wish to resist authority prepared by so great a labor? And if every discipline, although cheap and easy, requires a doctor or master so that it can be perceived, what is fuller of rash pride than to be unwilling both to know the books of the divine mysteries from their interpreters and to condemn them unknown?”

Deservedly will men be unwilling to know them if all the interpreters can err simultaneously; nor is the foundation certain if the whole building can be constructed in sand outside it.

CHAPTER XXXVI

That It Is the Custom of the Church to Assemble Councils against Heresies, and That the Holy Fathers Think Thus

[Printed page 802]

I have shown that some authority must necessarily exist in the Church, living and judging clearly and distinctly between the parties. Catholics acknowledge the Pontiff as that judge, whether he judges in a General Council or even without a council--which I do not now dispute. For since heretics hate the Pontiff and are exasperated against him in many ways, I do not wish to name him as judge in vain, for they will immediately demand the Apostles. Therefore I propose a General Council. If its authority is not infallible, there is absolutely no authority which can render the interpretations of Scripture certain for us. From this, I have shown, it follows that darkness and doubts are thoroughly introduced into the Christian religion, the possession of faith is tossed in astonishing ways, and a far greater confusion arises than in the ἀταξία [disorder] of empires, when the equity of laws is agitated by the cunning of crafty men and the integrity and fear of judgments have been removed.

Moreover, the authority even of provincial councils is enormous in the Church, and the practice has always prevailed that assemblies of bishops be gathered to form morals rightly and to break heresies. They seek their beginning from the deed of Christ the Lord, who, after summoning the Apostles, questioned them concerning the sum of the faith: "Whom do men say the Son of Man to be?" And, "Whom do you say that I am?" The Apostles too, in Acts 1, 6, and 15, governed the Church and rooted out errors after a council was assembled.

For the end of councils is the preservation of faith and morals. The Catholic Church of Christ itself, the diligent and cautious guardian of the dogmas committed to it, never changes anything in them, diminishes nothing, adds nothing; it does not amputate necessary things, append superfluous ones, lose its own, or usurp things belonging to another. But with every industry it attends to this one thing: that by treating ancient things faithfully and wisely, if any were formed and begun in antiquity, it may refine and polish them; if any have already been expressed and unfolded, it may consolidate and strengthen them; if any have already been confirmed and defined, it may guard them. Finally, what other cause has there ever been for the decrees of councils than that what was formerly believed simply should afterward be believed more diligently; that what was formerly preached more gently should afterward be preached more urgently; and that what was formerly cultivated more securely should afterward be cultivated more solicitously? This, I say, and nothing besides, has the Catholic Church--stirred by the novelties of heretics--always accomplished by the decrees of its councils: that what it had first received from its forefathers by customary tradition, it should thereafter consign to posterity by the chirograph of Scripture, comprehending a great sum of matters in a few letters and, generally for the light of understanding, designating not a new sense of faith by the propriety of a new appellation.

Such, therefore, was the solicitude of the bishops after the Apostles that, because they were impeded by the bitterness of persecution and it was not lawful to hold a General Council, they nevertheless met together frequently. Thus Pope Victor, in the year 198 under the emperor Severus, proclaimed a council, and at nearly the same time the Pontic, Gallic, Osroene, and Asian councils were celebrated. In 217, the African council was proclaimed by Agrippinus of Carthage. In 242, the Labesitan council under the pontificate of Fabian; likewise, in 149, the Arabian. In 253, the Roman council while the see was vacant, and the first Carthaginian under Cornelius in 254. Then, under the same pontiff, the first and second Roman councils, likewise an Italian and another Carthaginian. While Pope Stephen governed the Church, the council called the First African was held, likewise the Iconian, the Synadan, and three Carthaginian councils. Under Pope Dionysius, one at Rome and two at Antioch; under Marcellinus, the Cirtense and Sinuessan; under Marcellus, the Eliberitan and two assemblies of the Donatists held at Carthage; under Miltiades, the

Roman; under Sylvester, the First Council of Arles, the Ancyran, the Neocaesarean, the Roman, two Alexandrian, the Laodicean, another Roman, and finally the General Council of Nicaea.

Who would not marvel that at that time, when pagan fury raged openly and manifestly and heresies sprouted everywhere, there was so great a spirit in those brave heroes of the Church that, as though in the highest peace, they gathered assemblies of bishops, expounded the norm of faith, and cut off heretics? I am not ignorant that there were more synods within that period; I speak of those of which either all or some acts survive. Nor did I wish to pass over even condemned conventicles and those of heretics, for by their own preposterous emulation they demonstrate to us the custom of the Church. There is no need to mention subsequent times. They possessed seventeen General Councils and hundreds of provincial ones, so that the Church should deservedly embrace the aid which it has always employed, and with such felicity that condemned heresies perished so completely that almost no memory of them now survives except in the books of Catholics by which they are refuted.

Here it is pleasing to attend to what the most learned Pammelius comments upon chapter 13 of Tertullian against the Psychics.

These are the words of Tertullian: “Throughout those regions of Greece, councils from all the churches are held in fixed places, through which all the higher matters are treated in common and the very representation of the whole Christian name is celebrated with great veneration.” These are the words from Pammelius's commentary: “And thus this passage contributes greatly to the authority of councils. We are accustomed to confirm it especially by the same Scriptures by which we confirm the authority of the Church: Matthew 28 and Luke 21; likewise that passage in Matthew 18: ‘Where two or three have been gathered in my name, there am I in their midst.’ Next, this too contributes to the same point: that in the Apostles' Council at Jerusalem, Acts 15, James expressly wrote back in these words: ‘It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us.’ Blessed Irenaeus in book 3, chapter

[Printed page 803]

12, makes so much of this that from the words of that synod he proves the one God against Marcion.

“But if anyone desires to know the first synods after Christ down to the times of Tertullian, he will find first the synods of the Apostles celebrated at Jerusalem: Acts 1, in the election of Matthias; Acts 2, at Pentecost; Acts 6, in the election of the seven deacons; Acts 15, the council already cited; and finally that concerning which Galatians 2 speaks, when Peter was ordained to the apostolate of the circumcision, but Paul among the gentiles. To these add the council in which the Canons of the Apostles and the Apostolic Constitutions, afterward collected by Blessed Clement of Rome, were published. Likewise that in which James, the brother of the Lord, was elected bishop of Jerusalem, according to what Clement of Alexandria writes in book 6 of the *Hypotyposes*, cited by Eusebius in book 2, chapter 1.

“Next you have the Antiochene council of Acts 13, where Blessed Paul and Barnabas were separated from one another, and the Ephesian, to which Paul summoned all the presbyters and bishops of the Ephesians and, as far as appears, of all Asia, Acts 20. To these the Corinthian council seems to be added, in which--according to what Blessed Augustine asserts in the letter to Casulanus--according to his promise which he had spoken in 1 Corinthians 11, ‘I shall arrange the remaining things when I come,’ Paul established many things concerning the rite of the Eucharist.

“Moreover, since Apostolic Canon 37 establishes that assemblies of bishops concerning dogmas of religion and ecclesiastical controversies be held twice in each year, there is no doubt that frequent synods were already celebrated in the individual provinces. That their statutes were sent to Rome long ago through Pope Damasus to Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, is established from his letter which Blessed Isidore of Seville prefixed to his canons of councils. He says that none of his predecessors from Blessed Peter onward omitted to send something of their statutes. Although it seems to us that he alludes to the decretal letters of the Roman Pontiffs, which were generally written in Roman councils, we nevertheless leave the judgment free to the reader, referring him to the books which Francis Torres composed on their authority.

“Yet the Roman councils under Clement cannot be passed over--which Anacletus mentions in Letter 1--nor those under Alexander I, Sixtus I, and Telesphorus, since they mention them in their decretals. Certainly, under Victor, Eusebius enumerates almost innumerable councils concerning the day of Passover in *History*, book 5, chapter 20 or 22, and after him Nicephorus in book 4, chapter 30; and expressly the Roman council with Victor presiding and that of the Gauls under Blessed Irenaeus in the West; likewise one at Caesarea in Palestine, one in Pontus through Osroene, and the Corinthian or Achaean council. To these it is permissible to add the Alexandrian, which Victor himself mentions in Decretal 1, and that of Asia, in which Nicephorus, book 4, final chapter, writes that even the Asians--who had defined the contrary in their own synods--yielded to Pope Victor and published the same decree. And these seem to me the councils which the author here commemorates as held throughout the regions of Greece. Moreover, Eusebius in chapter 23 of the same book, and Nicephorus after him, from Apollinaris's first book against Montanus, mention many assemblies of Asia in which Montanus with his followers was expelled from communion.”

Although they ought deservedly to hear the Pontiff--since he who deserts his chair is not in the Church; since the Roman faith is apostolic; since it is the matrix and principal Church and the chair of Peter; since priestly unity arose from it; since perfidy cannot possess access to it; since he who communicates with him communicates with the Catholic Church, and he who does not communicate with him cannot communicate with it--contempt for him is itself also the beginning of schisms and heresies. For these reasons, I say, which I report from Cyprian, although those who err ought deservedly to hear their pastor, I nevertheless prefer to propose a council to them, if perhaps, when it has been read or heard, hatred of the name may obstruct the learning of the faith less.

Moreover, all the holy Fathers and the councils themselves are witnesses of this matter. For all General Councils attributed infallible judgment to themselves, even the Nicene and others which are received by the innovators. If their authority was uncertain, it was also a fault and a pernicious error. But Bellarmine gives the authorities of the holy Fathers in book 2, chapter 3, where he can be consulted concerning this matter.

CHAPTER XXXVII

That the Sectaries Themselves Think a Council the Most Advantageous Way to Peace

[Printed page 803]

I willingly employ this kind of argument, both because it possesses some force for confirming Catholics and because it possesses very great force for convicting adversaries. Certainly that cause is good which an adversary is compelled to advance to his own detriment; victory is ready when it is voluntarily offered from the enemy's camp. Their own supreme commander concedes what we have already proved, although with one hand he recalls what he gave with the first.

“We certainly concede freely,” he says in *Institutes*, book 4, chapter 9, §13, “that if a dispute concerning some dogma arises, there is no better or more certain remedy than for a synod of true bishops to assemble, where the disputed dogma may be examined. For a definition of this kind, upon which the pastors of the churches have agreed communally after invoking the Spirit of Christ, will possess far more weight than if each separately handed down to the people at home what he had conceived, or a few men privately composed it. Next, when the bishops have been collected into one place, they deliberate in common more advantageously what and in what form they must teach, lest diversity produce a stumbling block. Third, Paul prescribes this method in judging doctrines. For when he attributes judgment to individual churches, he shows what the order of proceeding should be in graver causes: namely, that the churches should undertake a common examination among themselves.

“And thus the very sense of piety instructs us that if anyone disturbs the Church with an unusual dogma, and the matter reaches the point that there is danger of a graver dissension, the churches should first assemble, examine the proposed question, and finally, after a just discussion has been held, bring forward a definition taken from Scripture, which may both remove doubt among the people and stop the mouth of wicked and covetous men, lest they dare to proceed further. Thus, when Arius arose, the Nicene Synod was assembled, which by its authority both broke the criminal efforts of the impious man, restored peace to the churches which he had vexed, and asserted the eternal divinity of Christ against his sacrilegious mouth. Then, when Eunomius and Macedonius stirred up new tumults, their insanity was met with a similar remedy through the Constantinopolitan Synod. Nestorius's impiety was routed by the Council of Ephesus. Finally, from the beginning this was the ordinary method in the Church for preserving unity whenever Satan began to contrive anything.” Thus far Calvin.

He then adds: “But let us remember that not all ages or places possess Athanasiuses, Basils, Cyrils, and similar defenders of true doctrine, whom the Lord then raised up. Indeed, let us consider what happened at the second Synod of Ephesus, where the Eutychian heresy prevailed: Flavian, a man of holy memory, was cast into exile with certain pious men,” etc. Yet the Church was not there: I confess it. But I deny that this is perpetual--that an interpretation of Scripture which has been received by the votes of a council is true

[Printed page 804]

and certain.

Completely beyond reason, he both establishes a council and concedes that it is a remedy for error: let them bring forward a definition from Scripture, remove doubt among the people, and stop the mouth of the wicked, but nevertheless let them possess no certain interpretation of Scripture. And let it be lawful for Arius and all the rest to resist most freely, since there is no certainty in those asserting and all can err no less than individuals. But let us accept what he grants: there is no more certain or better remedy than a council. Let us defer to another place how greatly he errs when he renders uncertain that remedy which he acknowledges to be unsurpassed in goodness and certainty.

Next, Pareus, the man with whom I am dealing, is a substantial witness for me. He praises the purpose of the Lutheran princes whom he hates when they seek a General Council, and he wrote a pacific book *On the Synod and Union of the Evangelicals*. For he thinks the controversies between the Lutherans and Calvinists, which are many and great, can be removed by a synod; and he loves a synod so ruinously that, while it is being convened, he embraces Syncretism, the mask of a synod, with both arms. Therefore we possess the matter accomplished. But because the Hollanders are accustomed to mingle in the business of all kingdoms, I would do them injury unless I also summoned them here. Thus the counsel of the Remonstrants which they were ordered to explain is comprehended in these words:

“According to this apostolic counsel of mutual toleration, noble and powerful lords, we show in the state of the controversy which we exhibit here under the individual disputed heads by what method--in our judgment, at least--peace could be cultivated in the Church of God through mutual concord. For this purpose we humbly ask you to direct your minds promptly, since we cannot devise a more advantageous remedy than that some tolerate others, at least at this time and until the spirits now disturbed beyond measure and perhaps too alienated from one another, gradually calmed and mutually joined to one another, may weigh and examine the whole business more exactly through a verbal colloquy in a free synodal ecclesiastical assembly, empty of prejudgments, to be celebrated at the proper time by the authority, protection, judgment, and governance of your noble powers; and until we may all be led to one opinion, or, if necessary, it may be judged which opinion is nearer to the truth of Holy Scripture and to the edification which is according to piety, so that an order may afterward be instituted,” etc.

But the Contra-Remonstrants urge a council far more strongly.

These are their words: “After long and mature deliberations, with all possible and customary methods weighed, we could not discern in the fear of the Lord that any more advantageous way could be chosen or undertaken by which these difficulties might be thoroughly composed with dexterity than that, at the first possible time, by the authority of all the most illustrious and powerful Lords States General, a National Synod be convoked and celebrated in which the controversies may be fully disclosed, examined, and judged from the word of God; and in which thereafter an order of mutual toleration and association may be sanctioned by common opinion, so that through it at last some general method of peace and concord may be established, and timely opposition may be made to dissensions, exacerbations, stumbling blocks, schisms, and similar difficulties that may thereafter arise.

“This is the method always employed from the very times of the Apostles, and exhibited and indicated to us by the Holy Spirit Himself as the most advantageous and especially accommodated to this purpose, as appears from Acts of the Apostles 15. Even after the times of the Apostles the Christian churches were preserved in this manner during many and most grave persecutions. All pious magistrates and Christian churches afterward followed their examples in similar difficulties, with great edification and benefit to the churches, and found this method most useful, as can be proved from the thread and sequence of ecclesiastical history.

“On the contrary, whenever other ways were brought forward--whether of ambiguous and two-edged toleration, of silence proclaimed on each side, or of lulling controversies which had arisen in doctrine--it was always learned by experience that difficulties could not be removed in this manner, but after incrustation of this kind quarrels always afterward erupted again with greater disquiet and harm to the churches. If the churches of these regions had been left free and permitted to hold a national assembly of this kind at the proper times, difficulties of this kind could not so easily have arisen in the churches, nor have spread thus far or taken increase, but could without any labor have been either guarded against and forestalled in this manner or, if they had arisen, immediately lulled and removed from the midst. Instances of ἀταξία [disorder], dissolution, and difficulty would not be found everywhere in the churches and their government, as though daily. The Reformed religion would not have made so little progress in these regions nor suffer so much harm daily, as all the pious are compelled to see with the highest grief and sorrow of spirit.

“Therefore the Reformed churches in these regions suffer so great a loss from no other thing as from the delay of the National Synod, which has now been deferred beyond even the twentieth year, with the greatest loss--incapable of

being expressed by any words--to the Reformed religion and the churches in these regions, and with no slight weakening of the condition of this state. It greatly concerns its preservation that in the doctrine of the Reformed religion and the government of the churches in these regions some certain and general tenor be established and preserved, which certainly cannot occur without the aid of National Synods of this kind.

“It is added that such is now the constitution of the churches in these regions that difficulties have arisen not only from those five articles exhibited by the Remonstrants, but that various, diverse, and new dogmas concerning the principal heads of our Christian religion are moreover defended and proposed by various pastors of the churches, both openly from the pulpit and in books published into the light. Such are the dogmas concerning the full satisfaction of Jesus Christ for our sins; concerning the justification of man before God; concerning saving faith; concerning original sin; concerning certainty of salvation; concerning the perfection of man in this life; and finally concerning many other matters which we judge to fight diametrically against the word of God and the catholic doctrine of all the Reformed churches, as this may be seen, among other things, from the declaration published in print by Adolphus Venator, residing at Alkmaar. Thus those five articles do not contain either all or the principal heads concerning which dispute is conducted today among the ministers of the churches in these regions. Therefore it is especially necessary that controversies of this kind be removed in good time by the aid of a National Synod, and that similar others be forestalled, lest on their account the common churches of these regions be torn apart and rent by schism.”

[Printed page 805]

CHAPTER XXXVIII

That the Sectaries of Our Time Cannot Possess a General Council

[Printed page 805]

In the book *On the Union and Synod of the Evangelicals*, chapter 8 and those following, I demonstrated by most certain arguments that a synod cannot be instituted between Calvinists and Lutherans. I possess as consenting witnesses not only all the Lutherans but also a good part of the Calvinists, and even Pareus himself παλινφδοῦντα, recanting and refuting himself. He confessed that hope of a synod was far away and referred peace and the synod to the deceits of the Cretans and Aeginetans. In the *Postcolloquy* I also taught that a synod would possess no utility, whether it were instituted among Calvinists alone or Lutherans alone, because the authority of that synod is merely human. Those whom its decrees displease will always be able to deny that they are true; they will be permitted to cry out: “The oracles of God must not be subjected to the censure of men.” Those who have now learned from Calvin to condemn and condemn so many hundreds of ancient synods will place their own interpretation and private inspiration before all Calvinist councils.

Why, therefore, do I produce the opinions of the Calvinists now in favor of a synod and now against a synod? Why do they themselves speak now in favor of a synod and now against one? You ought to have sought the reason for their disagreement with themselves, and then to have asked me why I objected to them this domestic conflict.

Now I shall state both reasons. They reject a synod, for they do not wish to be pressed by the authority of the ancient synods. They understand that they must abandon their opinions, despair of the profits of contentious sermons, and undergo shipwreck of reputation unless they attack the ancient councils. If they defended the ancient synods, they would neither overturn the Scriptures by their own intellect nor adulterate them by perfidy. For they would receive the reading and understanding of Scripture from the most weighty judgment--from the senate of the Church assembled in the Holy Spirit; they would not cancel and explain it according to their own most frivolous opinions. They see that Scripture is fertile according to the faculty of each nature and has been so disposed by God's will as to supply material even to heretics. They prefer to employ that fertility to their own destruction rather than be led to salvation by another's teaching. That is not the fault of Scripture; for although those same Scriptures seem to have supplied materials to heresies, when rightly understood they nevertheless refute those same heresies born from their corruption.

Therefore, since in a dispute concerning the Scriptures they rest upon their own intellect and judgment alone, and borrow an interpretation agreeable to their morals either from ancient and most condemned heresies or deform it by a new contrivance from their own inspiration, they must necessarily dissent from all the ancient churches and therefore hate the authority by which they are refuted.

Let the Calvinists, rigid and mild, who recently fought in the arena in Holland, well matched, be an example to us. And when you hear that the mild have been matched with the rigid, do not fear that they will presently succumb voluntarily without combat. That softness is tough and tenacious; it does not easily lie open to a wound; it receives the violence of rigidity dexterously and permits what is inclined to ruin to be broken by its own assault.

This horrendous proposition belongs to the rigid--in the formulated state of the controversy which they offered to the Estates: “That he who once truly believes, even if with deliberate mind he lapses into great and atrocious sins, is nevertheless so preserved by Jesus Christ, and will be preserved hereafter, by the force of the eternal decree of election and from that ἀνεμποδίστου [unhindered] and irresistible power of God, that he can never lose it totally and finally; and consequently is then outside every danger and fear of condemnation; and that this is indeed the sole foundation of the consolation of the children of God.”

These things, so filthy and impious that even the Gnostics and Carpocrates ought to be ashamed of them, would not be said unless the Scriptures were wrongly understood, unless not only the creeds and the doctrine handed down through the Apostles, Christ's companions, were utterly overturned, but the decrees of all councils were rejected. Therefore all ancient things must altogether be overthrown if these new things are to be established.

Thus they must flee and reject the ancient synods in order to maintain novel heresies; but in turn, when pressed from another side, they are compelled to betake themselves to the aids they spurned. Thus Calvin in *Institutes*, book 4, chapter 9, §1, professes that he venerates the ancient councils "from his heart"--and would that he said that "from his heart" from his heart. For they embrace the first four General Councils--the Nicene, First Constantinopolitan, Ephesian, and Chalcedonian--not from their heart but from necessity, on account of Servetus and the Antitrinitarians. They were compelled to receive the fifth and sixth synods on account of the Lutherans, the Ubiquitarians, strenuous enemies who produce a confusion of the natures in Christ.

But perhaps they will hear their own councils. They will not. An example from the same Belgium: they objected to the Remonstrants the judgment of the professors of Leiden against the Remonstrants. The authority of the Academy of Leiden is weighty in Batavia. But what did the Remonstrants say? "Why should Gomarus's judgment against us possess more force than Arminius's for us? Or what does it accomplish to produce such a judgment in this place, which can neither demonstrate truth firmly nor introduce unity of consensus with the Reformed churches?" Will they not oppose this wall against all the conventicles of their own men by which those things are not approved? "What does it accomplish to produce their judgments? For they are human and can neither display truth firmly nor produce unity of consensus." And next: "Are the brethren perhaps intent upon showing that certain articles have been defined otherwise in the Academy of Leiden than we now profess? But what does this have to do with the matter?" And a little afterward: "It would not be right for either a man or any assembly to prejudge for us in this cause."

Thus, if you regard the matter, they will hear no councils at all. To all they will answer: "What does it accomplish to produce these things? But what does this have to do with the matter, if it has been defined otherwise in the councils of our men? No man, no assembly, ought to prejudge for us. It suffices for us to have discharged our consciences for the defense of truth and liberty in the Church." Thus they think inconstantly and alternate their opinions. They flee the ancient councils because, if they acknowledge them, they perceive themselves condemned. They employ those same councils against new heresies. They desire new councils from their own men so that they may afflict brethren who think otherwise; they refuse new councils of their own men by which their own causes might be prejudged. In one word: when councils oppose them, they are defective; if they favor them, they are approved. They long ago made a Lesbian rule from Scripture, twisting it to their own opinions. They greatly desire to drag councils with the same impulse. Hence, therefore, the foulest tossing about of opinions; hence those many things which men who refuse to understand rightly must interpret badly.

But in adducing their opinions to prove truth against them, I possess the Apostle as my author.

[Printed page 806]

He instructed the idolatrous Athenians toward faith from their own poets, Acts 17, and proved from them a truth which those authors of things rightly said either did not know or held down in unrighteousness. The ancient Fathers imitated the Apostle: Justin Martyr, Theophilus of Antioch, Tatian, Clement of Alexandria, Minucius Felix, Blessed Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, Origen, Eusebius, and Augustine; especially Tertullian, who judges that heresies should be attacked by the same method. "In this place," he says, "it will be lawful for me to seek arguments even from the party of other heretics. That kind of proof is firm which is taken even from an adversary, so that truth may be proved by the very enemies of truth."

But these things too must be confirmed by a Belgian example. The Contra-Remonstrants, or the Rigid, seriously sought a synod from the Estates. The Remonstrants, or Mild, seem to have possessed the same desire, as they state in the writing concerning the method of conciliating peace exhibited to the Estates. But when they came to the matter,

they declared that they wished for no synod and conceded all power to the Estates. Concerning this, Caspar Barlaeus writes thus in *Bogermannus ἐλεγχόμενῳ* [*Refuted*]:

“Therefore Bogermannus cuts off every hope of toleration unless provision is made by a lawful judgment--that is, unless this entire controversy which has hitherto been agitated and is still agitated has been decided by a synod. But what kind of synod? I shall explain: one which the Estates of Holland permit to be convoked and celebrated; for which they make provision concerning place and time, as well as costs and the expense of meals; to which they delegate one or another spectator from their own number, who may be aware of the matters conducted there--lest they think the betrayal of the fatherland to the Spaniard is being discussed; finally, whose decrees they hold most ratified by their own seal and put into effect against the refractory as swiftly as they can and ἐμπρακτέως [in deed]. The remaining matters must belong to the synod and the theologians.

“Men delegated to it by the classes or ecclesiastical magistracy will assemble: men especially fit for disputing and for refuting μετὰ ἀντιλέγοντας [those who speak against them], possessing testimony that they are sound in doctrine, free from every stain of suspicion, and taught by experience in ecclesiastical affairs pertaining to these things, ἐσθλά τε καὶ τὰ σχέτλια [both good things and wretched things]. The Fathers will sit. Some president will lead the words; and in a long oration he will relate the labors and griefs of the Church struggling with so many monsters of errors, and will give thanks to God that the sun has now shone by which it is lawful to deliberate, in the customary manner, concerning a salutary remedy for these evils and to condemn the heretical opinions of the adversaries by common votes together and at once. He will likewise exhort the brethren to counsels of moderation, to serious examination of the articles, and to judge holily and without προσωποληψίας, partiality, and to the other things which contribute to formalities.

“The Remonstrants will be summoned according to custom; they will be accused of ἑτεροδοξίας [heterodoxy], because by private authority, without consulting a synod, they dared to depart from the received formulas of the catechism and Belgian confession and to contradict the summary of sound words. If they possess anything by which they can defend themselves, they will be ordered to propose it briefly and syllogistically, so that, if what they say is true, it may be approved by the judgment of the synod; if false, they may subject themselves to the spirits of the prophets and comply with their decree unless they wish to be held as heathens and publicans.

“It will be disputed sharply whether the articles contravene the Scriptures and truth as it is in the churches and as it is taught in the churches. These men will deny it; those will affirm it. Finally, after the Remonstrants have been ordered to leave and walk about outside, it will be deliberated what must be done. Since the opinions and judgments of the Fathers will differ, counters will be sent around; and, after the votes have been collected, a decree will be made approximately in this form:

“‘The Synod has decreed and judged, and even now decrees and judges, that those five articles of the Remonstrants, both by reason of themselves and by reason of their consequences, are not orthodox but contradict the received doctrine of these churches, and therefore are by no means to be tolerated in doctors and pastors. But for all those among the Remonstrants who are willing to preserve a profound silence concerning them and promise solemnly that they will contradict the orthodox opinion in nothing, let there be mercy on account of their wives and children. But those who wish to defend the aforesaid articles tooth and nail and profess them by voice and writings shall be removed from the ministry, and let another receive their inheritance. But those who have attacked the Church in books hitherto published into the light and have blasphemed its doctrine, unless they are willing παλινῳδεῖν [to recant] and humbly beg pardon before the same synod for the fault of their deed, shall be struck by the thunderbolt of excommunication.’

“With this decree they will go to the Estates and request its ratification--not because doing so is necessary, but because it is conducive. If the Estates approve that moderate decree of the synod, they will hear themselves called fathers of the fatherland, nursing fathers of the Church, Constantines, Theodosiuses, and most Christian princes, because they have satisfied Bogermannus's wishes, Sibrandus's expectation, and the desires of so many pious men by which they are now tormented. But if they refuse and say that judgment of all those matters is owed to them, and rescind the decree of the

synod itself after convicting it of multiple nullity, the Fathers will return to their old theme: peace is despaired of, there is no hope of toleration; nor will the Estates be held as they wish to be held--lovers of religion and haters of heresies--but, on the contrary, their favorers and promoters.”

This is the very αὐτοσύνοδον [synod-itself], the most exact Idea of that synod by whose lawful judgment Bogermannus wishes these controversies to be completed. Plato would call it αὐτοσύνοδον; barbarous philosophers, “Synodeity.” But those who constrain the Estates by this law of a synod and ecclesiastical judgment have not resolved to make an end of raising tumults before they have carried off a triumph concerning the Remonstrants' articles. Let them take care lest, while they seek to strike a fragile thing with a tooth, they break it against a solid one and, by inflating excessively, produce a rupture. It sometimes happens that he who, by refusing lawful conditions of peace, wishes the enemy utterly routed loses his cause, although by conceding something to the other he could himself have been preserved. But these things are θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κεῖται: placed in the knees of the gods.

CHAPTER XXXIX

It Is Shown Further That the Innovators Can Possess Neither a Synod nor Peace

[Printed page 806]

At length they have attempted a synod; but in it nothing was conducted, not only according to the ancients, but not even according to those things which they themselves had said. I showed, however, that this assembly is not a council in chapter 56 of the *Coronis*.

It is certain that God constituted the ecclesiastical state with such providence and ἀυταρχεία [sovereignty] that in it he established an infallible norm for recognizing truth and detecting errors, and gave a judge for terminating suits and controversies. For that city is in no way worthy of the name of a state in which the inhabitants join issue concerning a right in such a manner that, after many expenses and long lawsuits, they remain uncertain concerning their cause; in which there is no one who pronounces judgment in such a manner that one party can know itself victorious and the other defeated. But all the assemblies of the Innovators are such states: without a norm, without a judge of the truth. Therefore they are not Churches of Christ.

They all vaunted Scripture, but they all employed it for themselves against the opposing party. And now the Gomarists, or the Rigid, in Holland confess that the matter cannot be composed from the Scriptures alone. For Scripture has not hitherto pronounced judgment among the litigants in such a manner that either party has confessed itself to have lost its cause.

[Printed page 807]

It remains for them to sanction concord by a synod. But they themselves sufficiently confess that not even this way is suitable for removing controversies and hatreds. For although Dudley Carleton, ambassador of the King of Britain to the Estates, counsels a synod in the name of his king and shows that there is no judge except a synod, he nevertheless did not persuade the Arminians.

I indeed demonstrated in the thesis that a synod cannot exist, in the book *On the Synod of the Evangelicals, Syncretism, and the Peace of Germany*. Nevertheless, the Rigid pretend that they possess hope; for that reason they have summoned from Germany, Britain, and Switzerland demagogues of their own stamp, in order to overwhelm the Arminians.

But the Arminians object in reply that it cannot exist and is not useful. I shall readily show that their opinion is most true and demonstrate it by many arguments; and you, reader, will seek several more from our Father Maximilian Sandaeus.

The first argument is this. They have no one who may legitimately convoke a synod; therefore there can be no legitimate synod. For unless an assembly has been gathered by the authority and power of a magistrate, it is a crowd, in which there can be neither order, nor jurisdiction, nor any authority. The consequence, therefore, is clear. The Belgian Provinces themselves confess the antecedent; for neither any king nor the States General can proclaim a synod, while the provinces are unwilling. Therefore there will be no synod. No king can do so, because the Estates acknowledge none. The Estates themselves cannot do so; for the several provinces possess that liberty of religion by which the right of determining belongs to them, not to the States General. The man who wrote accurately on the same matter proves this and demonstrated the error of the British ambassador in §51:

“Because, according to the liberty and the privileges of the fatherland and of the Provinces, absolutely no province can by any power or right make laws for another, or all the provinces for one, in matters of religion, nor overwhelm one another by votes, even if a single province should dissent from all the others; rather, it is necessary that each

individually consent freely to that which is being transacted. For no one--unless he is altogether a stranger to Belgian affairs--is ignorant that each one of the Provinces possesses absolute jurisdiction, and that one is no more subject to another than to the Emperor or to any foreign king, and this in all matters to which they are not bound by force of the pacification, or final union. By that pacification, indeed, they in no way renounced their dominion and absolute jurisdiction; rather, each retained its own, both in the government of the state and in the administration of justice, and especially in the care of religion. Indeed, it is so far from the case that by these compacts and agreements the Provinces renounced their Privileges and the absolute Dominion consequent upon them, or wished to prejudice or be an impediment to one another in their respective special and particular privileges, immunities, exemptions, rights, statutes, laudable and approved customs, and other rights, that, on the contrary, they united precisely for this reason: that they might mutually aid, strengthen, and defend one another in every way they could against all, whoever they might be, who should attempt in any manner to violate those aforementioned privileges and rights of theirs in fact. On what foundation, therefore, is the authority of some provinces now diminished under the pretext of religion--a thing which was itself formerly attempted by the Spaniards? Under what appearance of reason or equity, after the other provinces, is Holland--the most powerful of the provinces, which during the war sustained greater burdens than the rest and defended them by contributing great sums of money--subjected to the dominion, and as it were the guardianship, of others, and that by those who have received the greatest advantages from her? It was rightly said by Lipsius that factions generally sprout from ambition, when one man endeavors to dislodge another from his place and invade his seat. God knows, and I leave it to the conscience of each person, whether our calamity does not derive its origin from the same source."

The provinces themselves profess, moreover, that not all are willing; and they cannot be compelled, because their liberty has been guaranteed by oath.

The second argument. The other party, namely the Remonstrants, attribute too much to the magistrate. Carleton accuses them of assigning this authority to the secular power: "To confer this authority upon the secular power, by giving Caesar what is Caesar's, is to decline too much toward the other side and to take from God what is God's." For the Remonstrants, most harshly harassed by the Classes and by their Rigid brethren, fled to the aid of the Magistrate, which the ambassador reproaches them for doing. Therefore they wish the magistrate, not a synod, to be judge; and for that reason a synod, which would be without authority, cannot exist. It must therefore first be determined whether the faculty of deciding belongs to the Magistrate or to the synod. This controversy cannot be terminated among them, either by a synod or by the Magistrate, because the parties are not suitable judges. Therefore they cannot judge for themselves against their adversaries; for the Dutch ministers are not the entire Church, nor is the power of the Estates universal over all the ministers. Finally, therefore, the preachers will lose their cause, and the right will belong to those who possess greater power.

For the Most Serene King of Great Britain decided the matter against his own servant, as is evident from the *Summary of the Conference* held in the chamber of His Majesty in the year 1603 and published by William Barlow, Doctor of Theology and Dean of Chester, and afterward printed at Leiden in the Belgian language, pages 38 and 30. For when Reynolds happened to make mention of instituting a synod in which a bishop with his elders would determine disputed points which previously could not be decided, His Royal Majesty was moved, judging that they intended the Scottish eldership--if the word may be pardoned--or were attempting that which accords as well with monarchy, as the King himself says, as God with the devil.

"There," he says, "Peter and Paul, Thomas and Matthias, will assemble, and at their own discretion will subject me and my council, and all our proceedings, to their censure. There Peter will rise and say, 'Thus it shall be'; and Paul will answer, 'We do not wish it thus, but it shall be in this manner.' And therefore I repeat what I said before: *Le Roy s'avisera* [the King himself will deliberate]. Pray, wait another seven years before you seek such a thing from me; and if you then find me asthmatic and exceedingly fat and stopped up by windy pipes, perhaps I shall grant an audience. For I am certain that, if this manner of governing should prevail, my mouth will then be stopped up."

Hence it is also evident that His Royal Majesty had recourse not to a synod but to his Privy Chamber at Hampton Court.

Since this dispute, therefore, is litigated on both sides with great exertions, it will be ἀόριστος [without limit], and it will furnish laughter to the enemy and compassion to Catholics.

The third argument. To this pertains the difficulty of the Provincial Synods of Gelderland, Zutphen, Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht, Friesland, Overijssel, and Groningen--and perhaps specifically of Amsterdam. Their ministers were instigators and approvers of the public plundering of the Arminians that took place; that cruelty must be cloaked by an elaborate disputation, lest it be disapproved by the others. But the preparatory synods will impede the general synod of all the provinces: first, because they will think differently; next, because the synods themselves are divided among themselves. The provincial Synod of Holland will be able to define nothing, because the Arminians judge nothing right except what they themselves think, and the Gomarists will delegate no one except a Rigid. Thus one party will protest against the other, and finally no one will expose himself so foolishly to the hatreds of his adversaries as to surrender himself to danger, without hope, with a half-complete--that is, most contentious--commission.

The fourth argument. Contrary to the opinion of the Calvinists, that synodal session and disputation presupposes an enormous miracle, without which it cannot exist. But assemblies and disputations of the Church by no means rest upon miracles. For why do they not seek an angel from heaven instead of contriving a synod which cannot exist without a miracle? The miracle, however, consists in this: that they think men most hostile to one another, exasperated by long-lasting and pertinacious hatreds, full of anger, shame, rivalry, and lies, will by a sudden metamorphosis become gentle and placid; and, although the presence of hostile men inflames and arms them, they imagine that, as soon as these men have beheld one another, they will put off every vice. As if Atreus, when he stood stupefied at the sight of his brother, had laid aside his savagery; or as if Thyestes had not preferred flights through the forests to royal riches because his brother also had to be seen.

This, therefore, I assert: that without a manifest miracle there will be no disputation free from anger, quarrel, hatred, curses, contention, envy, and lies. For if hitherto, as they testify concerning one another, they have filled everything with lies, why should they now suddenly fear to deceive, which they have hitherto learned to do? They act, therefore, just as if someone were to send mountain brigands into some tender region and, when an opportunity had been given them, suppose that they would immediately become good colonists and men.

The fifth argument. There is no rule and norm to which they can direct their disputations and faith. Therefore they will sail rashly in the vast ocean of controversies, and they must be borne wherever the impulse of some opinion drives them. There is no Scripture, no tradition, no authority of Councils, of Fathers, or of the Church. The first of these must be proved, for they spontaneously confess the others.

That Scripture cannot be their norm and judge is so easily apparent that they themselves cannot deny it, as was shown above concerning those of Dordrecht. Next, each person interprets Scripture according to the analogy of his own opinion; from this it arises that, in reading it, each confirms his preconceived opinions.

The sixth argument. A twofold condition can be imagined for those who will be sent from the provinces to the synod: for either they will arrive with free mandates, so that they may determine in the synod what seems good to them; or they will arrive having been sworn to the opinion of their own provinces. If liberty is granted, the delegates themselves will nevertheless not easily change their opinion. Or if they do change it, by their own transgression they will not thereby draw their entire province with them. Indeed, greater discord will arise from this matter. For it can happen that delegates from Arminian cities will cross on foot into the opinion of the Gomarists, and deputies from Gomarist cities will embrace Arminian opinions. If this should happen, all dissensions would be doubled, and various disturbances of the states would arise.

The seventh argument. By what law will the ministers, magistrates, and people of the provinces live during the synod? Will they teach all their customary assertions with confidence? Or will everything depend upon the future decree of the judgment? If they continue to teach, the synodal definition will profit nothing on either side, since it belongs to a few, and to men whom it is very easy to err. If they are ordered to doubt, they will mingle heaven and earth, since hitherto they have defended their dogmas so confidently and so furiously. Thus, if those who were deputed should alter anything in the faith, their return to their own people will by no means be permitted.

The eighth argument. The regard for honor and reputation which exists in the state will greatly impede a recantation and retraction of opinions. For since they have represented one another not only as heretics but also as infamous men, liars, and calumniators, they cannot return to favor unless they acknowledge themselves to have been such. Friends and enemies, and children and children's children, will perpetually reproach them with this matter.

The ninth argument. There will be no order at all in the synod. For either magistrates or preachers will preside. Not the magistrates: formerly the preachers did not acknowledge the magistracy. "In the year 1586," says Oldenbarnevelt in his *Apology*, "many preachers no longer acknowledged the Estates. Without the knowledge of the Estates, they sought from the Earl of Leicester the convocation of a synod which they called national." Next, the ambassador Carleton denies that this ought to be done. Not the preachers: for the Estates formerly opposed their decrees, and yet were compelled to dissemble. Thus Oldenbarnevelt, page 7:

"The decrees of the pretended National Synod are published. The States General raised a difficulty in approving them without the consent of the Estates of the respective provinces, by whom they themselves had been delegated. By doing this, they contracted the utmost odium and gave very great offense. Action was taken against them by writings, endeavors, and public sermons in the churches. The Estates of Holland yielded somewhat to the time, judging it a good thing if they accepted the decrees for a time, provided that meanwhile the Estates, Nobles, and cities each retained its own right of appointing and removing ministers of the Church."

But if they nevertheless assemble, will they give their votes with equal right and merit? Who will reconcile men equal in number and hatred?

The tenth argument. What number of synodal delegates will be established? Let there indeed be two hundred. If, matching equals in opposition, you place a hundred Arminians against as many Gomarists and next confer an equal right of voting upon both parties, you will experience a hundred opinions contrary to the other hundred. If you assign more to one sect, the others will complain of inequity; for those who are fewer in number will say that they are overwhelmed by the multitude. They will vaunt that their votes, although fewer, are nevertheless sounder.

The eleventh argument. Many of the deputies have explained their opinion in public writings and have condemned others. They will not refute their own decrees; for they would have to confess not merely that they had erred, which is human, but also that they had lied, which belongs to impostors.

The twelfth argument. Very many states and cities have harassed men of the opposing religion with prison, exile, and fines. The people of Amsterdam saw the Arminians publicly despoiled after a mob had gathered. For these things the acknowledgment of error is not sufficient; rather, compensation for losses and insults is necessary, which the preachers--by whose turbulent sermons the fatherland was shaken--will have to furnish and pay.

The thirteenth argument. Their Church is invisible, and all who constitute it are invisible; therefore their synod too must be invisible. As the Church is, so is the synod. For what if no one in that synod possesses the Spirit of God and faith? Therefore a synod cannot exist. For who

[Printed page 809]

will convoke a Church which he cannot see, hear, or recognize? A synod is a part of the Church, and indeed its most noble part--not a formal but an integral part. Thus a visible part will belong to a whole which is hidden and invisible. Therefore their synod cannot be called the Church.

The fourteenth argument. From this it follows that no one's conscience is bound by the decree of a council, for it is not known whether that council is a part of the invisible Church, and consequently whether the judgment they pronounce belongs to the Church or to unbelievers and heathens.

The fifteenth argument. A very great impediment will be placed before the synod by the multitude and variety of foreigners. For if Frenchmen, Germans, and Englishmen are to be endowed with the right of voting, in the judgment of the Arminians this cannot be done otherwise than by aiding the parties' opinions with an equal number on each side. This will not only fail to quiet the dispute but will also disperse it into foreign regions, although both France and England already possess enough controversies.

The sixteenth argument. The theologians of foreign nations are bound to the opinions of their own assemblies, princes, and kings, and will be able neither to think nor to speak otherwise than those by whom they are sent. Nor, if they act otherwise, will they ever be received again by their assemblies and princes. For if the Prince of Orange was already making ordinances concerning these matters long ago, what will kings do now? Concerning order, says Barneveldt on page 43:

“From the year 1574 onward, questions were raised in these provinces, my lord the Prince of Orange, of pious memory, and the Lords Estates asserting that it belonged to their office to establish ecclesiastical laws and ordinances, since lawful supremacy resided with them, in conformity with the practice received in all Kingdoms, Provinces, States, and Cities which undertook the Reformation against the idolatry, heresy, and tyranny of the Papacy.”

Therefore nothing can be expected from the other parties except rigid Zwinglianism, Socinianism, or Lutheranism. For why should the Arminians not summon Lutherans and Catholics to their aid if the Gomarists draw in Zwinglians?

The seventeenth argument. Those who seek a synod have not even established a place equitably.

They named Dordrecht. In this matter not a few disadvantages will occur. First, that city is remote from the Frisians and the people of Overijssel, so that they will come with greater difficulty and remain only with weariness. Second, it is an island, and therefore departure is less free and less subject to one's discretion. Third, Dordrecht exercises an ancient rivalry with Holland, which it has frequently opposed; thus those whom its inhabitants persecute not only from the common hatred of the nation but also on account of religion can expect nothing moderate in that city. Fourth, I do not think they will be safe. For although the people of Dordrecht have not yet stirred up a popular tumult against the Arminians, nor plundered those wretched men after the manner of the people of Amsterdam, there have nevertheless been ministers among them who wrote most bitterly against them in public and brought it about that the Arminians of Dordrecht preferred to hide rather than be despoiled. Fifth, perhaps the ancient calamities of floods will strike fear into some; for when it was torn away from the mainland, one hundred thousand perished. That was the crime of one man. Sixth, that city is more suited to testing wine than to judging dogmas; and therefore the ancestors established there τὸ δοκίμιον ἐν οἴνῳ, not τῶν πνευμάτων, although they did not hold even that privilege without a dispute, for they maintained that right through many contests against the people of Gelderland and Overijssel. Seventh, the proximity of Brabant and the Spaniards is also suspect; stirred by these disputes, it will sound the trumpet for a war of the Fifth and Sixth Gospel. Eighth, Dordrecht is full of Frenchmen and other foreigners, and therefore the city resounds with great noise; the Arminians will not be able to be safe. But if no snares are being prepared, why is Leiden, Haarlem, or indeed The Hague itself not conceded?

Is the purpose that captives may be handed over to the Spaniards?

The eighteenth argument. The excessive contention for proclaiming a synod is pressed with great prejudice to the provinces which think otherwise. For why do a part of the Hollanders and Zeelanders prescribe law? Why do magistrates reduce the Arminians to order? Why do they disarm the other provinces as though conquered and enslaved by secret contrivances and then oppress them with garrisons? The cause of all these things is religion, for whose liberty the Arminians think that they fought and now pay the gravest exactions--not so that they may consult their

consciences, but so that they may subscribe to the most abominable insanities of the Borborites and Manichaeans. Thus, after so many insults, are they also to be condemned by a public decree of the synod, although they are the more learned and honorable part of Holland and Belgium? Who can doubt that patience so unworthily injured will pass into fury and that arms will then be ready at hand?

The nineteenth argument. Gomarism cannot be introduced without arms. The cities, therefore, must be strengthened by a garrison so that they may comply with the opinions of the Rigid; or, if they refuse to believe, they must be encircled by a siege. And in this manner, when swords have been turned against one another's entrails, they will hand over the half-dead fatherland to those from whose rule, by fleeing, they fell into the most wretched servitude under the appearance of liberty. For what appearance will that fatherland possess in which one sect rules and the rest are oppressed? Or how will those fight for altars and hearths, for religion, who are compelled to serve on account of religion? Who, for this cause alone--that they do not believe in Rigid Zwinglianism--are cast down from their dignity with the mark of infamy and plead their cause in chains among enemies?

Some hope now remains, and therefore extreme measures have not yet been attempted. But if synodal violence drives to despair those who refuse to be more insane than the Borborites and Manichaeans, they will not be able to restrain themselves from preferring anything whatever to acceding to those horrid opinions. But if at the same time the truce is dissolved, with what concord will they be able to resist?

The twentieth argument. The Arminians have already predicted beforehand what the decree of the synod will be, and the preparatory synods now show it: namely, that the Arminians are to be condemned and the Gomarists approved. Thus there is no need for so laborious and expensive a convocation when the execution of the synodal judgment is already in force before the synod. For to this end the Arminians have been accused in the fatherland and before the tribunal of Great Britain; garrisons have been imposed upon Arminian cities; Arminian magistrates reduced to order; preachers restrained and driven away; and churches restored to the Gomarists. Since these measures vehemently offend their spirits, if those same things are approved by the public judgment of a National Synod, all who lose their cause will learn by this matter that the people of Amsterdam and the other Rigid seek dominion.

The synod, therefore, will stir up disturbances and tumults. For it will render unequal those who are equal by right and who hitherto were equal in appearance, which

[Printed page 810]

has never been done among a free people without a great commotion and never will be.

The twenty-first argument. Vengeance will be sought by the Rigid; for those who judge themselves gravely injured and fear that they will be affected by greater disadvantages rage more savagely when they have obtained power and authority. But the Rigid complain in court concerning the greatest injuries of the Mild and compose entire books about them. Therefore no one can hope that, in an anger which they judge most just, they will be so slow as not to employ the aid of the synod, when before the synod they have done everything hostile. The Hague Letter, which sets forth the condition of Holland, was printed at Cologne. Its beginning is: "On the fourteenth day of June, Count William arrived here from Friesland on the second passage."

Nor can it be hoped that the victorious Rigid will be gentler than the Mild were. For they are by nature fiercer, and by the decrees of their sect they are incited to cruelty, which they even attribute to God. Pain and anger are added, because they judge that they have suffered injury. Finally, those through whom they conquered--that is, the rigid ministers--will have to be obeyed.

The twenty-second argument. Not even consideration of expense permits a synod. First, there must be many participants, otherwise authority will be absent; for since all have hitherto been equal, the conventicle of a few will not be able to prejudge the rest. Next, the leaders of the preachers are summoned from France, England, and Germany, for without them they judge the decrees insufficiently firm; therefore the expenses must increase with the numerous army

of guests. Third, the ministers will not assemble alone; they must draw along their households and wives. For since they lack the gift of chastity, why should they be driven to synodal celibacy? Thus in the first session they will enact a decree concerning bringing or retaining their households. Fourth, the synod will be long-lasting, for they enumerate more than fifty disputed articles; and since hitherto they have not defined even one in a decade, they will expend many years upon so many.

Let there therefore be five hundred Arminian ministers and as many Gomarists, and two hundred foreigners--in all, 1,200. Let there be eight hundred politicians and delegates of the Provinces, for they too will state their opinion, lest the ministers prevail. But I prefer to posit fewer; let there indeed be three hundred. Thus let the entire synodal number be 1,500. Add as many wives, servants and maidservants, sons and daughters, and you will easily find eight or nine thousand. Provision must be made for their lodging, food, and clothing. But let us contract the number so that the ministers with their households make only four thousand. Nevertheless, they will burden the fatherland with great expense, and it will be easier to feed ten thousand armed infantrymen than to furnish the delicacies of the ministers--especially the foreigners--and their wives. A soldier's food passes by an easy route of supply; those doctors clothed in silk and accustomed to delights demand other dishes. Nor is it fitting for the synodal delegates and leading spearmen of all the ministers to be chastened by excessive frugality.

No one who has considered their accounts more deeply will doubt that this expense is burdensome to the federated provinces, for all things have hitherto been disordered. Barneveldt's *Apology* teaches this. He reports that, when he himself was summoned to the office of advocate, the Colleges of the Great and Provincial Council, the prefects of accounts, and the magistrates of The Hague were so disposed toward the Estates that by voice and writings they called into doubt whether so much authority still remained to the Estates of Holland and West Friesland that they could execute the imposed taxes and contributions. He adds that for a loan it was necessary to pay twelve annually in place of interest and two for brokerage. The burdens were far greater than the revenues. How much greater they were he teaches on page 14:

"From the time when the King of France made peace with the British King and thereafter with the Spaniard and the Archdukes, during the last nine years of the war the burdens of debts and expenses had increased so that they exceeded the entire amount of taxes and contributions--even though these had been increased by no small amount--by twenty-six million florins. The last two years too had passed with very little glory and great loss, and indeed fear of greater danger remained--although two expeditions of the enemy had meanwhile been removed by vigilant zeal--because during the same time foreign subsidies were both less certain and joined with a greater burden to the fatherland than they had been before; and because, as such great burdens took increase, the condition of the whole fatherland appeared likely finally to be reduced to despair, just as the senators and prefects of accounts had warned three years earlier."

Behold, so great were the burdens. Now in peace they have been increased by the cities sitting in deliberation concerning the convocation of a synod. While some threaten the liberty of others, others endeavor to protect and defend their own liberty and religion by civil arms. Meanwhile even those cities which now enroll soldiers lest they be compelled to consent to convoking a synod will be induced with much greater difficulty to furnish expenses. For they will permit the contentions of the preachers much more patiently than pay money. Lest a war of preachers be waged, war is waged in the state; and nevertheless there are those who think that the cities will not contribute money so that the preachers can contend, when they are endeavoring with all their resources to quiet their conflicts.

The twenty-third argument. There are certain wounds which do not bear wind and air; likewise these evils of the state, when exposed, reject medicine. That true synod will not only make them notorious but also known by supreme right and publicly. When this has been done, shame concerning wickedness is lost. The most cunning old man Oldenbarneveldt rightly recognized this, for he always endeavored to conceal those discords. He says on page 27 of his *Apology*:

“I grieved from my heart over the dissensions which arose between the Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants. I always labored in every way lest they spread abroad or break out in public. I first procured that, under the presidency of different ecclesiastical persons, the cause of Arminius be examined within private walls. To this end the business was conducted in the house of the late Lord of Noordwijk as senior curator of the University of Leiden; and afterward the business was instituted in the supreme Council between Gomarus and Arminius, with ministers of different churches from each party presiding. I accepted or rejected neither of the opinions, since I understood--in conformity with the exceedingly wise instruction and repeated writing of the King of England--that each opinion could be tolerated without prejudice to truth, in Christian charity and union. I shall also take care not to indicate who are the authors of these tragedies.

“But I judge that the evil broke forth especially from a certain synodal Decree by which the professors of Theology at Leiden and all the Preachers were instructed to attend in the fear of God to those things contained in the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism, and, if they doubted anything anywhere, for each to send it, set down in writing, to their Classes. The cause of this decree was furnished by all the earlier ecclesiastical differences and controversies which had taken their origin from Caspar Coolhaes, H. Herberts, Taco

[Printed page 811]

Sybrandts, Cornelius Wiggers, and several others concerning the understanding, sense, and varying interpretation of certain points contained in the two aforementioned writings--especially Divine Predestination--and because for this reason in 1597 Your Most Illustrious and Powerful Lordships understood that the Confession was to be reviewed and corrected in a synodal congregation. For after your Commissioners had informed you of the aforementioned synodal Decree, you judged that it was not expedient for the doubts of the Professors and Preachers to be handed over to their respective Classes, fearing lest in this way an enormous flame of dissension be kindled among the theologizers.”

From this it is most manifest that both the Estates and Barneveldt acted so as to cover those disgraceful matters. Therefore, for them now to be opened more deeply and displayed is contrary to the public advantage.

The twenty-fourth argument. Not only controversies and errors but the crimes of the ministers themselves will be bandied about through the mouths of men. Let Grevinckhoven and Adrian Smout be an example: either they are such as they describe one another--that is, the wickedest of all bipeds--or they are not such, and thus each must be the worst of all calumniators. But whom will we be able to summon to the synod about whom more atrocious things are not said? What else will that synod be than τῶν κεχηνότων ἀγορά, that is, an assembly of men of whom the province should deservedly be ashamed?

The twenty-fifth argument. The outcome of the synodal disputation is doubtful or certain. If what is to be defined has certainly been predefined, if the judgments of the judges have been anticipated, the Calvinist world is disturbed within itself in vain. If it is uncertain, why do they not fear that judgment may be pronounced against the Rigid, the people of Amsterdam, and the most excellent Prince of Orange? If that should occur, who does not perceive that his authority will be cast down and that the magnanimous man will by no means endure the insult?

The twenty-sixth argument. When the synod has been happily completed, judgments, writings, and defamatory pamphlets against both the matter and the persons will immediately be brought forward. Everyone will disapprove something in it, many many things, and some everything. The anger of the parties will thus be inflamed. If free voices are suppressed, they will bite more venomously from concealment. The examples are in Germany, which after all the colloquies of the Lutherans among themselves and of those same men with the Calvinists was assailed by a new paroxysm and renewed the war.

The twenty-seventh argument. According to their laws, the norm of disputing is the Bible, but none is authentic except the Hebrew in the Old Testament and the Greek in the New. The other versions possess human authority, as they think. Therefore only the Hebrew and Greek languages must be employed in that synod, and everything must be examined

according to that norm. But whence among them are there so many Hebraists and Hellenists--so many, I say, most learned men to whom it is certainly established that they understand those languages so thoroughly that they know an error of interpretation to be absent from themselves?

The twenty-eighth argument. Nevertheless, let us establish that in the Belgian nation there are so many most learned in Hebrew and Greek. Yet who will persuade us and others that they are true interpreters of an unknown text? For whatever is transacted, their words will not be authentic for us.

The twenty-ninth argument. Indeed, some of them, such as Calvin and Vorstius, have discovered errors and lies in the Hebrew Bible itself, so that when this foundation is undermined, the whole mass will fall.

The thirtieth argument. Men will come from France, such as Sharp, who denies that the laws of magistrates pertain to consciences. Men will come from England who will restore bishops--that is, as the Puritans judge, build the criminal ladder of Antichrist. The Belgians will call these things monsters.

The thirty-first argument. If it pleases that synodal delegates be released from the oath by which they are bound to their opinions, the same right must be granted to all ministers; otherwise they will not be bound to obey the synod. It must be feared, however, that this matter may reach the soldiers and even the Magistrates.

The thirty-second argument. Although the States General and the princes labor to constitute the synod, nothing will ever be accomplished when the preachers are unwilling. Our countrymen rightly say that it is difficult to hunt with unwilling dogs. But the synod is instituted against the will of all the Arminians--that is, one half, and indeed the more learned half. They will come unwillingly and therefore, delaying, will contrive everything so that they may depart with the matter unfinished. And how easy this is! They will dispute concerning the conditions and laws, make exceptions, and protest. If an answer to questions is sought, they will ask for delays again and again. Some will allege their health, others their occupations; many will say that on account of weddings they cannot dispute, as Grevinckhoven reports to have happened. The sum is this: there cannot be a synod where one half does not wish there to be a synod. Violence will perhaps be applied, and they will be compelled to attend. They will not be able to repel force, but that presence will be useless; for they cannot be driven to dispute and answer unless willing and eager. Therefore there can be no synod and no concord from it.

CHAPTER XL

The Form of a Council Assembled to Make Peace Must Be Taken from the Ancient Custom of the Church

[Printed page 811]

I have taught that a council is useful for beginning and establishing peace, nor do the adversaries oppose this. I have also demonstrated in another book that a council of heretics cannot be assembled and held with advantage; and, if they judge my arguments insufficiently firm, behold: let words and the discourses of writers cease; let them furnish the thing itself. Here is Rhodes; here let them jump. Let them assemble a Calvinist-Lutheran or Rigid-Mild synod and κατὰ βίον refute me by experience. But if they cannot assemble a general one, let them at least assemble a national one. Until they have done so, we shall deny that it can be done, and not without cause, because they say that they desire it and acknowledge this to be the most advantageous way, while they reject other ways, as I showed above from the writing of the Hollanders.

If, therefore, there is need of a council, and one cannot be assembled from novice doctors, why do we hesitate to adopt the ancient councils and their form and authority, lest we be deprived of so great an advantage--which we confess on both sides--and of peace itself? Has heresy been able to engender in anyone's mind so great a hatred of holy and orthodox antiquity that he will not consent to receive even remedies and benefits from it? Or do we not know that those sick persons are most desperate who are obstinate against remedies and judge the hands of those who sincerely heal them to be hostile? Far from a Christian breast be such hardness that it refuses peace; far from it be such blindness that it closes against itself beforehand the approach by which peace is to be entered.

What then? Will you persuade me to accept the Council of Trent through these circumlocutions? I indeed should wish to do so, but I fear that I shall not persuade you--not because the truth which that Council illustrated is destitute of its own testimony, but because, through hatred of the persons, you will not easily receive the truth from them; for the wounds which the sycophants, the calumniators of the Council, inflicted have not yet been healed. And so I indeed formerly granted you release from that Council; perhaps, if you come to know it thus of your own accord, you will embrace it.

[Printed page 812]

It seems to me that in this conflict and vaunting of religions there occurs what occurs in medicine. For very many persons, out of disgust for old remedies and a vain hope of better ones, hear with the greatest eagerness mountebanks and wandering impostors, and sometimes, induced by promises, entrust life and health to them. And while they marvel at new things as true, they suffer loss of property and health. When, at their own peril and to the mockery of others, they perceive that they have given another's rashness the power to test its art upon their own body, they return to the old physicians, the Hippocratics and Galenists; for they prefer to use approved remedies without danger rather than again to make trial of new and uncertain ones.

For a long time now the peddlers of novelties have, by their outcries, called away a great part of mankind from the ancient healing of souls and from the customary nourishment. Luther calls in one direction, Calvin in another; and among the parties of Luther's sect there are manifold callers: Osiander, Major, Flacius, the Ubiquitarians, the rest, the Anomians, the Anabaptists--and these are not all of one stamp, although all call, and call to evil. On Calvin's side there are the Mild and the Rigid, the Libertines, the Anglo-Papists, and the Puritans. All promise salvation, life, health, and mountains of felicities--and that without labor--more shamelessly than all wandering impostors; but credulous and frivolous men discover too late that they are false. For most, nothing is lacking for a return except shame at recognizing and uncovering their wounds. They not only see but also touch with their hands that everything is changed

day by day. Why, therefore, do they not consult the old remedies, or at least deign to look at them? Why do they follow novelties condemned by their own authors?

Let there therefore be a general council such as even the adversaries concede the first councils to have been and such as we teach the following ones to have been. Namely, in it let the orthodox sit as judges--those who already possess the faith and who have long prescription against those who introduce unaccustomed dogmas. For novelty must be proved; it must not judge antiquity. It is a matter of undoubted law that a possessor enjoys his privilege and is not driven to proof, although councils also perform this: they vindicate the possession of the ancient faith against profane novelties. For why should Arius sit as judge at Nicaea, or Eutyches, Nestorius, and others in the succeeding councils? Why at this time should Libertines, Arians, Socinians, and Anabaptists have the same right, number, and merit for pronouncing opinions? Will those men assemble in the Holy Spirit who attack the Holy Spirit with the whole panoply of hell?

Second. Let there be in the Council neither a part of the Church nor a body without a head, but let the whole Church be represented in its senate. Let neither a part conspire against the whole, nor a cause be judged without the bishop of the primary see--a thing Augustine formerly recognized as unlawful and wrote at length to the pontiff Melchiades.

Third. Let the Council define, not what must be believed anew, nor let it define new articles, but let it explain the old ones more clearly, hand down the sense of Scripture, and make certain that concerning which there is doubt. For this is its office: to meet novelties and confirm ancient things.

Fourth. In matters which pertain to faith, let the Council possess a vote which no one is permitted to resist, and let him who proudly refuses to obey the command of the priests be considered, for that very reason, outside the Church.

Fifth. Let councils be free, neither dishonored by the violence of princes nor enslaved and subject to magistrates, so that not only may opinions be free and the secular power not prescribe what must be said, but also no punishment for liberty may be feared, nor may such control reside with princes that the substance of the matter finally falls back upon their decision.

Sixth. Let the causes of the accused be examined prudently, gently, with charity and sincerity; nor in any way let one whose heresy is known sit as judge, for he must receive the sentence as one to be judged.

Seventh. Let it defend the decrees of all preceding general and approved councils.

Eighth. Let the holy customs of prayers, fasts, and penance be observed according to the received practice.

No other procedure for councils can be entered upon. For if, as Pareus does in his own council, we admit all heresies to judge, I do not see what appearance of a council we retain, since we place all the accused upon the tribunal and allow neither authority to the judgment nor truth to the sentences.

CHAPTER XLI

There Are Weighty Reasons Why Catholics, but Not the Adversaries, Approve a Council

[Printed page 812]

We have frequently heard them appeal to a free, pious, general council. That in reality they do not desire a council is manifest from many things; for us, on the contrary, a council is desirable.

The Calvinists and the rest of the sectarians, most talkative in corners, will necessarily become mute in the public light and in a universal assembly; and, hating the light, they will hide themselves in their dens. For they will not be able to defend their teachings if they speak openly, nor in so great an assembly of learned men will there be opportunity to envelop their errors in their customary obscurities and ambiguous labyrinths of words. Hitherto they have vigorously done this in the Colloquy of Worms and elsewhere--so much so that even Calvin himself found intolerable the cunning of Bucer and Melancthon in devising deceptive articles. But how remarkably the Calvinists deceived their disciples in France I showed in the book *On the Synod and Union of the Evangelicals*. For the principal man, Baron Clervant, thought that his own people and the Lutherans disagreed in only one article; and Pareus himself professes this--how glaring a lie it is I taught in the preceding book.

What hope, therefore, do those men have in a council who did not dare to disclose openly, even among their own initiates, all the mysteries of their idol? Those who fear to make the disciples acquainted with their doctrine must necessarily flee the judgment of all. Our doctrine not only shines in the clear light of the whole Christian world, but was known to the ancient Church. It spreads the rays of its light toward East and West, and, because it possesses nothing shameful, no part of it is concealed.

Those who never satisfied any particular council will not be able to hope for victory or to prove their doctrine to a general, pious, free council. The Rigid Calvinists do not persuade even their own colleagues, fellow initiates,

[Printed page 813]

and brethren of their horrid opinion; much less will they establish before a general, pious, and free synod that this opinion is the mind of the Holy Spirit, when they must plead their cause burdened by the adverse judgment of their brethren and be examined whether they are Manichaeans and Borborites. For the Mild judge that the madness of the Rigid not only equals but surpasses that of these men.

The same reasoning applies to the Lutheran parties and their subdivisions. The Ubiquitarians will come apart, the Flacians in another party, then the Majorists and Osiandrians; and, marked by the prior condemnation and disgrace pronounced by their own fellow citizens, they will understand themselves condemned at the mere sight of the assembly. For they will see no judge favoring them except, from their own small number, a Ubiquitarian, a Flacian, a Majorist, or an Osiandrian.

The Landgrave of Hesse did not dissemble the dissension of his own people coming from the whole world in the year 1546, at Speyer, in a conference with Emperor Charles. "For my part," he says, "I place no great hope in a council. But I judge that an assembly of the province of Germany will not be useless. For the other peoples still dissent excessively from us in opinions and dogma. In Germany, however, matters have been so arranged and have come to such a point that they cannot be changed. Nothing, therefore, is more preferable or more excellent than that you permit free religion in it, yet so that all cultivate peace." He afterwards repeats the same thing before Granvelle and confesses entirely candidly, as became a prince, that because Italians, Frenchmen, and Spaniards dissent so greatly from the dogma of the Germans, there would be no great use for a general council--or, as they call it, an ecumenical one.

What advantage, therefore, will there now be for the benefit of any particular sect, when not only the Catholic universality and agreement with constant truth stands opposed to every petty sect, but ten other sects, more powerful or not much inferior, assail it with the greatest hostility?

We desire a council because we judge that by its judgment not only must the integrity of the ancient religion be restored, but also, when the occasion furnished by religion has been removed, we hope that restitution will be made, at least in part. For the Catholics are the plaintiffs; they prosecute the adversaries for the recovery of property. If the cause is decided by a council, nothing will bring greater difficulty than restoring things obtained, possessed, and squandered without any right. It is therefore not difficult to estimate who fear judgment and who place protection in it. And if the acts are read, we shall discover whose calamities demanded execution and justice, and whose rapacity exacted adjournment, delay, and finally the abolition of the actions brought, by entreaties, arguments, threats, and arms.

Let us make it be as they themselves wish: let the council be general, pious, and free--but general with Genevan generality, pious with Zwinglian piety, free with Libertine liberty. Let it, I say, be a council composed of the prefects of the Calvinists, who have borne all the labors and reproaches of the Genevan mitre. Let whatever has hitherto been condemned in Calvin be holy. Not even this council is to be feared by us for any cause except love of the truth.

For if they conquer, if the truth stands with them, our condition will not be worse than theirs; indeed, if we regard the advantages of life, it will be much better than that which we now enjoy. For now we serve God with fear and trembling, uncertain of our perseverance, yet we place certain hope in the divine good pleasure. But if we are transferred to them, all anxiety, doubt, and sorrow, carried far away into the Cretan sea with swift south winds, will depart. A new confidence will render us most blessed, most secure, and most immune from all punishments after this life. We shall live for a time happy in our error, and neither fear of death, nor of divine judgment, nor of hell will touch us even lightly. How many whom fear now holds to their duty, after the barriers have been broken, will rush into every crime? And, to prove themselves true Calvinists, amid robberies, murders, and lusts they will exclaim: "I know that I am just, that I cannot lose justice, that I am free from damnation. No, no crimes prohibit me from heaven."

Others will congratulate themselves that they are exempt from the trouble of confession, fasting, celibacy, almsgiving, and all works. For why should they do good works--that is, mortal sins? Then why should they fear sins, when both their guilt and their punishment are removed if before God they say in their heart: "I am just; I cannot lose justice"? Indeed, before they say these things they have been made just, because they once believed; as though they had fortified the soul with an impenetrable ἀλεξιφάρμακον, so that they may drink down all the poisons of vices without harm.

This doctrine, so pleasing to the flesh, so flattering to atheists, so enticing to every vice, a council pious in the Calvinistic manner will propose. If we are Antichristians, if we are covered with every crime--as they accuse us before the inexperienced--it is fitting for us to embrace it with the greatest readiness. For why would we not hear doctors who so flatter our desires? If we seek delights, why do we not fly to heaven through pleasures themselves, and indeed without fear of wandering? What holds us back from passing over into this sect? This alone: because it is contrary to truth and ruinous to morals. Accordingly, for us a council is to be desired whichever way the judgment falls, and is to be feared for no cause. If we conquer, deservedly we shall render the greatest and most submissive thanks for the sincerity of the faith preserved in us by divine virtue amid these disputes. If we are conquered, there will be no "Woe to the conquered!" as that man cried. For what will the conquerors command the conquered? "Live securely; indulge wantonly upon the rose; believe that you cannot perish." Would that there were not many who preferred thus to be conquered rather than to conquer, since even now many are conquered by enticements because they wish it.

There is therefore no cause why we should fear even a general council wholly and purely Calvinistic. Its synodal decree will not be of the kind which the austere fathers at Nicaea or Ephesus, bearing the marks of Christ upon their bodies, issued, but of the kind which some Aristippus from the gardens of Epicurus would dictate with his neck thrown back and a languid voice. Although I do not believe that those delicate and polished men--ὧ μακαρίους ἐπιβάτας [O

blessed passengers!]

--will expend so much labor as to write new canons; rather, they will approve those which have already been written. They possess a book of Ottmar Casmann with a most delightful title that flatters them, for it is inscribed *THE CUSHION OF CHRISTIAN SECURITY*. By the best right and deservedly so. For it commands for all Christians a supreme security of beatitude, which no good works assist and no crimes diminish. Supported by this cushion, they will dismiss all from the Council. Nor will they say the accustomed, "Go in peace," but, "Sleep securely upon this cushion."

Those who acknowledge no advantage in a council, or one so slight and diluted that it does not answer to the labor and expenses, cannot prudently desire a council. Matthias Hoe, the Electoral chief court-preacher, proposes this question and judges councils empty. For he judges both that prejudice is brought against Scripture and that the Calvinists are unwilling to submit themselves to the opinion of the synod or to be bound by its decrees, but desire to discharge their office with the same liberty of teaching as before. Hence he reasons rightly according to his own position: "If, therefore, they refuse to be instructed and taught, what need is there of a council?" Plainly, if a council can err no less than individuals, an exception will not be lacking. For all authority is evanescent if it is not accommodated to the Calvinistic analogy of faith. We, however, attribute infallible authority to general councils; they therefore profit us.

[Printed page 814]

All general councils hitherto have gone well for us and according to our heart's desire. For our doctrine has been condemned by no council; in all controversies judgment has been pronounced for us. The adversaries have lost their cause by the prejudgment of all councils. Not without reason, therefore, having been struck so often in the ancient heresiarchs, do they labor to avoid that battle line of judgments and shudder at synods as at infamous reefs where they perceive the spoils from the shipwreck of their ancestors floating. Whatever, therefore, they allege about councils to be convoked is empty; for they seek nothing other than an escape and an opportunity for corrupting the minds of the peoples. If they demand a new council sincerely, why do they despise the old ones?

[Printed page 814]

They are indeed accustomed boldly to object to us that we flee from a pious and free council lest our errors, abuses, and scandals be disclosed. In this manner, to be sure, these acute men judge that they will be free of blame if they anticipate the accusation and divert their own evils onto others. For as to what they calumniate concerning errors, we are conscious of no error; and we approach this part of the cause not only securely but even joyfully, destined to emerge victors without blood and dust. For the things which they impute to us as errors are the dogmas of the holy Martyrs, of the Bishops who once flourished in the Churches and presided over councils, and of the Apostles themselves. We shall therefore stand among these accused men and hear judgment concerning those most ancient masters of ours. Indeed, if the matter is conducted according to the opinion of the adversaries, the whole Christian world will stand accused before a few men.

"It offends very many," says Calvin in *On Scandals*, "that they see almost the whole world opposed to us. Nor indeed do the patrons of a bad cause lack the means to strike the unlearned and weak with a device of this kind: that it is exceedingly absurd for faith to be accorded to a few men while almost the whole Christian world is disregarded. But especially, in order to crush us, they arm themselves with the sacred title of the Church as though with a hammer."

He knows Catholics well. Thus plainly do we object, and we persevere in saying it. Nor are we moved by the example which he adduces against us, when he compares himself and his people to the household of Noah. "As far as we are concerned," he says, "if Noah alone by his faith condemned all the men of his age, there is no reason why the great multitude of unbelievers should move us from our position." But he has not yet proved himself Noah; he has not yet constructed an ark from which he may consign the whole Christian world, as a multitude of unbelievers, to the flood--although the present multitude of Christians, which does not now conduct its life according to Calvin's laws, seems to him entirely born for destruction. Does he also involve those who formerly completed their lives in the same

deluge? The errors, therefore, which they calumniously and most malevolently impose upon us belong to the whole world insofar as it is Christian, as our New Noah himself has proclaimed.

I, however, judge even Calvin's errors and blasphemies intolerable: that the branded Calvin should sit upon the tribunal; that Beza, infamous for his deeds and verses, should sit beside him; that Cyprian, Augustine, Basil, Nazianzen, and the whole nation of the chief men of the ancient Church should stand befouled; and that they should tremble before the faces of Sodomitic judges, be compelled to a recantation, and be condemned for idolatry and grave errors. Yet if these things should occur with the condition of affairs inverted, it is far more excellent for us to lie in the rank of the most innocent accused than to be partners in such unjust judgments. Therefore that disclosure of our errors in a council is not to be feared.

The adversaries, however, have nowhere to turn except to this refuge of obstinacy: that, as Noah formerly did, they by their own faith condemn the flock of unbelieving Pontificians, Fathers, and Martyrs. For although they do not openly and expressly condemn the Martyrs, nevertheless, since they condemn their faith in us and persecute it by writings, sword, and fire, their judgment concerning the masters is no milder than concerning the disciples.

As for abuses and scandals, there is no reason for us to fear a council, since no one approves abuses and scandals, even those who are a scandal. Indeed, all the orthodox implore the severity of a council in removing scandals; and by the Council of Trent, wherever its observance is in force, almost all scandals have been removed. Scandals possess very great power, but among the unlearned and weak. The rest know that Christ foretold that there would be scandals in the Church; therefore they do not withdraw from the Church on account of scandals which they learned would exist in the Church. We therefore excuse no abuse, no scandal.

Yet if you desire to see enormous scandals that have sprung from the doctrine itself, approach the Calvinists. You will discover that the axioms of the Libertines are consequences of their doctrine; you will discover morals such as those of the Manichaeans and Borborites, and, by Calvin's own testimony, scarcely every tenth man sincere. Formerly false teachers turned very many away from the truth of the faith by declaiming tragically against the vices of the clergy, and the life of certain men gave them occasion. But suddenly that accusation slipped from their hands, when among the Calvinists more numerous, greater, and more atrocious crimes were admitted from the faith itself, without fear of losing justice or incurring damnation.

Calvin, therefore, considering these things, wrote a book *On Scandals*, in which he pleads the cause of the crimes and shows that they always adhere to the Gospel. But let us see what scandals he himself acknowledges among his own people. Let us place before those about to enter Calvinism the mass of scandals from its own author.

First, when the profession of the Gospel reigned far and wide in Germany, he says that he feared for this triumphant Gospel because it was exalting his people to insolence. He then continues: "Unless the Lord had seasonably met profane license, the disease would in the course of time have been almost incurable. Doctrine and pious admonitions would have possessed no authority. Those who had not yet endured the admission of moderate discipline would have broken every yoke with a violent charge, just like untamed beasts." Calvin therefore thinks most contemptibly of the Gospel and the Evangelicals: namely, that unless they are constrained by fear and punishments, they will be untamed beasts.

Behold: what deeds of the Evangelicals do you suppose he had perceived, from which the man who begot them, who is merciful toward his own blood, conjectures so atrociously about their future? Of what kind were those crimes of men which, unless compelled by punishments they had abandoned them, would by now have passed into the manners and disposition of untamed beasts? And do you here press upon me the scandals of Catholics, you whom the fear of the sword alone separates from beasts, who owe it to the enemy

[Printed page 815]

and executioner that you have not yet put off human nature through crimes?

Second, he confesses that seditions were excited by the Gospel, although he makes a cause possessing the appearance of justice for the scandal: "As soon as the doctrine of the Gospel began to be published, as though from an opened spring, the impiety of many who formerly seemed religious burst forth." He denies that the Gospel is the cause, and I believe him. But who would deny that the doctrine which I proposed above from him is the cause? What wonder is it that the life of those beneath whom the cushion of security is placed when they sin is most licentious?

Then, after he had said truly and severely, "But this is more than sacrilegious impiety, to abuse the Gospel as a pretext for crimes," he adds: "I speak of the now-common artifice by which perfidious and worthless men insinuate themselves in order to deceive, defraud, and harm in every way." He speaks, however, about his own ministers, who extol the dignity of the ministry with swollen cheeks, while he himself marvels at the patience of the common people because women and children do not cover them with mud and dung. Thus even then Calvin's haughtiness was compelled to bear such associates in preaching, men so incautiously disgraceful. He complains that some of them, through hatred of virtues, readily indulge equally their own vices and those of others.

And these scandals arise from the very fountains and chief standard-bearers of Calvinism. But what of the people? Are those people, contemptuous of their preachers, better? Speak, Calvin; speak, I pray you.

"The people, however, in order to return the favor, love, embrace, and cherish them alone; and, in order to possess patrons for their own offenses, protect them by their patronage." Is there too little scandal where wicked teachers alone are loved by the people so that they may have patrons for their vices? Thus, surely, would the Sodomites and Gomorrheans, thus the Lemnians--who by the enormity of their crimes furnished material for a proverb--embrace teachers of wickedness, if they were living. Recognize, reader, why the Calvinistic people hate Catholic teachers: because they love only the patrons of crimes.

Perhaps you desire to know specifically the heroic deeds--or deeds more distinguished than heroic--which these preaching birds perform. I shall give them from Calvin:

"Some, after being kindly received into hospitality, depart secretly either burdened with stolen goods or defraud their hosts in other ways; or they solicit maidservants to fornication and sometimes even dare to attempt wives. Others, marvelous artificers at ensnaring, leave stripped bare those to whom they promised mountains of gold. Some deceive in a loan; others deny a deposit. Some are perfidious in partnership. Some consume in whoring, gaming, or other prodigal luxuries the money which they took from good and thrifty men in the name of alms. Others boldly gorge themselves in idleness upon what had been given as a loan to aid their industry. And some have their wives as associates in these crimes. Others do not hesitate to violate the sacrosanct bond of marriage, with their wives deceived and their children cast off. There are more examples of crimes of this kind than a brief catalogue would suffice to recount."

I certainly believe that there are very many more in that catalogue which God, the most exact knower, has recorded. Yet above all is this: that such men alone are loved by the people, held in their embrace, cherished, and defended by their patronage, so that in turn they may be patrons of vices. But even this is surpassed by another crime: for when they have done all these things, they believe with the most certain, most infallible confidence that they are just and cannot fall away from this faith and certainty of justice--a thing which I believe neither the Sodomites nor the remaining Canaanites believed. Now go and collect scattered scandals of the ancient Church; meditate upon an accusation in the Council.

What account, finally, will they render to a council of the daily trafficking in the Gospel and of their inconstancy depicted as though upon a tablet? What recently was the word of the Holy Spirit in Germany is now the enchantment of Satan. Sacred things are changed from day to day in a day, and religion is momentary according to the will of princes. They say that they believe nothing except what is expressed in the Scriptures, and from day to day they believe now one way, now another. Individuals are authors of their own credulity and inventors of their own opinion, and are therefore unstable.

Concerning the Germans Calvin says in the book *On Scandals*: “All were magnificently vaunting the Gospel under cover”--in Germany before the war. “In many places criminal hypocrites held the first positions.” Does he mean the Saxon, the Hessian, the Württemberger? “But after the defeat received first at the Danube and then at the Elbe, certain princes of great name, nobles, and states, thunderstruck by some fear or other, immediately lost heart and voluntarily collapsed.”

That accusation is forged against the Landgrave, the Württemberger, the people of Ulm, Strasbourg, and Frankfurt, and other cities which Melanchthon affirms were betrayed by cowardly princes. “Here an effeminate softness more than effeminate--indeed, perfidious cowardice--plainly betrayed itself. Within two years we saw more impious and sacrilegious defections from Christ in one nation than the histories of all times and nations recount.” But those were praiseworthy returns and conversions of many to the Catholic faith; afterward followed more defections to Calvinism and other sects.

If I speak falsely, let them show not one state, I do not say, or one city, or one petty church, but one soul which agrees in all things with the original Augsburg Confession. They will produce none. For it belongs to heresies never to stand, always to rush headlong, and to be broken by their own impetus and divided into new sects, until not only all religion but even the name of religion vanishes.

I have brought forward some examples of controversies in the book *On the Peace of Germany*--a few concerning many. I also summoned witnesses of every kind: a few from the universality of Christianity, but men from whom orthodox agreement is established; indeed, so many that, if anyone demands more for a general council, holier men for a pious council, or more constant and learned men for a free council, he would seem to need a physician, not a teacher.

Yet I do not abandon a cause so good, so evidently victorious, so unconquered in the judgment of the adversaries; again and again I press it upon them. They are ashamed of their small number. For when I proceed against them, I proceed separately against a fragment of some sect. What, for example, can that Ubiquitarian, Majorist, Osiandrian, or Illyrican fragment accomplish against so many hundreds of legions, by whom truth fights, conquers, and triumphs? For what protection can exist in the camp of deserters against so many strong armies and defenders of a good cause? What will spurious novelty be able to plead against the antiquity of legitimate right and possession? I know the ancient response of your patriarchs, O Innovator: that you conquer by Scripture.

But that evasion accomplishes nothing and affords no escape. It would possess an appearance of truth if you could conspire for some period of time in one interpretation; now falsehood has lost not only the thing but even its shadow, after by unstable rotation it changed approved doctrines and founded new ones. Tell me, I pray you: by what faculty, amid so many opinions of those reading, translating, and interpreting, do you understand these things? From what petty sect do you plaster over your error?

You will answer as Honoratus did to Augustine: “When I read, I came to know it by myself.” I shall not answer you as Augustine answered Honoratus. But since you wish it thus, enjoy your judgment concerning yourself. Certainly you ought not to be angry with me if I do not believe you, if I do not prefer you to so many thousands. For what you cry from one corner alone, all the sects on the opposite side profess concerning themselves. They also did so formerly. Vincent of Lérins is witness in chapter 37 of the book *On the Profane Novelties of Heretics*:

“But if anyone were to ask one of the heretics who persuades himself of such things, ‘Whence do you prove, whence do you teach, that I ought to abandon the universal and ancient faith of the Catholic Church?’ he immediately answers: ‘For it is written.’ And at once he prepares a thousand testimonies, a thousand examples, a thousand authorities from the Law, from the Psalms, from the Apostles, from the Prophets, by which, interpreted in a new and evil manner, the unhappy soul may be cast headlong from the Catholic citadel into the abyss of heresy.”

Therefore with an easy effort I cast you down from this position upon which you stand securely.

For even if I should believe, or at least not refute, that you alone perceive the sense of Scripture rightly and that all others are deceived, what will you say about Scripture itself? Before you had yet read it by yourself, did you know that what you were about to read was sacred? Or, as you read the several things, was it revealed to you concerning each one--even those which are difficult--that the several things you read were divine? No authority moves you to interpret the Gospels; you rely upon your knowledge alone. Yet some authority must necessarily move you to believe that this book is the Gospel.

"I, however," says Augustine, "would not believe the Gospel unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me. Why, therefore, should I not obey those whom I obeyed when they said, 'Believe the Gospel,' when they say, 'Do not believe Mani'?" To Calvin: "If you hold to the Gospel, let me hold to those at whose command I believed the Gospel."

[Printed page 816]

And so at the beginning Scripture is believed solely by the title of tradition and then under the protection of custom, without any instrument of Scripture. Who, therefore, possesses such audacity that he announces anything beyond what has been announced in the Church? Or such levity that he receives anything beyond what he has received from the Church? What a profession: "I understood it by myself; my sense is true"! Is the whole agreement of universality and antiquity thus justly condemned?

For if novelties of dogmas, things, and opinions--novelties which are opposed to age and antiquity--are received from the words of the Apostle, it is necessary that the faith of the blessed Fathers be violated, either entirely or certainly in great part. It is necessary that the faithful of all ages, all the Saints, all the chaste, the continent, the Virgins, all the Clerics, Levites, and Priests, so many thousands of Confessors, such great armies of Martyrs, such great celebrity and multitude of cities and peoples, so many islands, provinces, Kings, Peoples, Kingdoms, nations--almost the whole world, now incorporated into Christ its head through the Catholic faith throughout so long a course of ages--be pronounced to have been ignorant, to have erred, to have blasphemed, and not to have known what it believed. Thus Vincent of Lérins, chapter 33 of *On the Profane Novelties of Heresies*.

These things he said in his own time. Since then, down to the new Gospel, so many armies of other Martyrs have been added, concerning whom those who condemn the Council of Trent--assembled in the Holy Spirit on account of the faith of those armies--pronounce the same judgment. Why do I say "condemn"? They persecute it with fires and disembowelment. That one Catholic remains is not due to their clemency, but because they lack strength.

But what will anyone who errs more moderately answer me? What cause is there why you do not believe the saints? If you are so proud that you suppose all of them to have erred and yourself alone to be wise, are you also so foolish that you hope I shall believe you? If the authority of others moves you, by this very fact you withdraw from your position, because you are led by authority. Yet if you are moved by it, why do new, suspect, and few men move you rather than ancient and many men, who approved their faith by torments and death and sealed their confession with blood?

See how great is the obstinacy of not believing these men, how great the savagery of desiring to devour their disciples and to call them Antichristians and bestialities. For the insults do not stop at us, but are hurled through sixteen ages and through many thousands of Martyrs and Bishops, and reach as far as the Apostolic Churches. Act moderately in a matter so arduous, because you are contending with so many thousands of saints; if you love peace, speak peaceably. If you seek a council, embrace the one which is given. If we are impostors because we believe these men, rescind the judgment of the divine majesty; cast down from heaven and condemn for imposture so many thousands of the Blessed, who were illustrious for sanctity, doctrine, ecclesiastical dignity, and miracles; consign them to Orcus, where Tartarus alone opens sheer below:

So great is the prospect upward to the ethereal Olympus of heaven.

But you who are orthodox, flee novelties. "They announce to us a wisdom hidden since Christ--a thing worthy of tears. For if faith had its origin in these thirty (ninety) years, although almost four hundred (one thousand five hundred) years

have passed from the time when Christ was openly beheld, the Gospel was empty for so long a time, our faith too was empty, and the Martyrs indeed underwent martyrdom in vain; in vain also did such and so great bishops preside over the people.” Gregory Nazianzen, Letter 2 to Chelidonius.

CHAPTER XLII

The Council of Trent Must Be Received, So That Peace May Be Restored to Germany

[Printed page 816]

It would not be difficult to persuade them of this, provided that the name of the Pontiff and hatred of Catholics were absent. Now, alas, envy, anger, and avarice dispute concerning religion with such injustice that they carry the teachers to heaven but persecute the disciples with condemnation, exile, prison, and sword. Let this cataract of alienated minds be removed, and Germany will receive the Council no more reluctantly than the other parts of Europe. For why should it not receive that which it has so often desired and which it holds through its better part? Certainly the princes, as they speak in the preface to the Augsburg Confession, request a general council. These are their words:

“Since Your Imperial Majesty has also, not once but often, graciously signified to the Electors, Princes, and remaining Estates of the Empire, and at the Diet of Speyer which was held in the year of the Lord 1526 caused it to be recited and publicly read according to the given and prescribed form of your imperial instruction and commission, that Your Majesty, for certain causes alleged in Your Majesty's name, did not wish to determine anything in this business of religion and could not conclude anything, but according to the office of Your Imperial Majesty would diligently endeavor with the Roman Pontiff concerning the convocation of a general council--just as the same thing was set forth more fully a year ago at the most recent public assembly convened at Speyer. There Your Imperial Majesty, through Lord Ferdinand, King of Bohemia and Hungary, our friend and gracious lord, and then through the imperial orator and commissioners, caused these things, among others, to be proposed: that Your Imperial Majesty had understood and considered the deliberation of Your Imperial Majesty's lieutenant in the Empire, and of the president and counselors in the government, and of the legates from the other Estates who had assembled at Regensburg, concerning the convocation of a council;

[Printed page 817]

and that Your Imperial Majesty judged it useful that a council be convoked; and because the causes which were then being treated between Your Imperial Majesty and the Roman Pontiff were near to concord and Christian reconciliation, Your Imperial Majesty did not doubt that the Roman Pontiff could be induced to hold a general council. Your Imperial Majesty therefore signified that you would endeavor that the aforesaid Supreme Pontiff, together with Your Imperial Majesty, should consent to assemble such a general council, to be announced at the earliest time by public letters.

“In the event, therefore, that in the cause of religion the dissensions between us and the parties have not been composed amicably and in charity, we now offer ourselves here before Your Imperial Majesty in all obedience, superabundantly prepared to appear and plead the cause in such a general and free council. Concerning its convocation, in all the Imperial Diets that have been held during the years of Your Imperial Majesty's reign, it has always been treated concordantly by the Electors, Princes, and remaining Estates of the Empire and concluded by agreeing votes.

“To the assembly of this General Council, and at the same time to Your Imperial Majesty, in this by far greatest and gravest cause, we have already appealed beforehand in the proper manner and form of law, and we now appeal. We still adhere to this appeal to Your Imperial Majesty and at the same time to the Council, nor do we intend or have power to abandon it through this or another negotiation--unless the cause between us and the parties, according to the tenor of the most recent imperial citation, has been composed amicably in charity, quieted, and reduced to Christian concord. Concerning this we here also protest solemnly and publicly.”

It is true. For in the year 1524 a council was requested in earnest; business was conducted with the pontifical legates then present at Nuremberg so that, with the Emperor consenting, the Pontiff might proclaim a council. All things thereafter were directed to this end: at Speyer in 1526 and 1529; at Augsburg in 1530; at Regensburg in 1532 and 1541; at Speyer in 1542 and 1544; at Worms in 1545; at Augsburg in 1548, where the Emperor also proposed certain articles to endure until a General Synod; and again at Augsburg in 1551. These things were done, and either the judgment of the Council was awaited or the business was certainly conducted with little German candor.

The Emperor himself is witness in the recess of Regensburg in 1546. His words are: "His Imperial Majesty, in response to the humble prayers and petitions of the Estates, obtained and procured through various negotiations that at last a General Council should be established and begun at Trent, a city of the German nation." Concerning the same Council the same Emperor Charles V says: "The General Council, to which all the Estates of the Holy Roman Empire have subjected themselves, will without doubt apply pious and zealous diligence so that, in this cause, provision may be made for the consciences of many men and for the peace of the Catholic Church, as necessity requires."

Why, therefore, do men evilly curious, enemies of peace, now draw the princes and Estates away not only from the Council but also from the former opinion which they laid before the Council, and cast them into Calvinisms, Osiandrisms, and Socinianisms?

All assemblies of the Empire, all diets, all public meetings demand peace--peace, I say, especially the cities and princes who neither hope nor desire to grow through war. Even those who trust that they will be safe only when affairs are disturbed pretend peace. But they will be able to obtain neither political nor ecclesiastical peace except by approving and accepting the Council of Trent.

How often now, after the well-known variations of religions, and at how great an expense, do they seek civil peace and quiet? But they have not yet obtained it; rivalries and enmities grow stronger each year. For since the Council's decrees have been received by foreign nations with great applause and approval, and since the nobler part of Germany follows them, what peace will those men be able to possess whom a solitary and obstinate opinion divides from the rest of the Christian world and from their own colleagues--an opinion by which they judge that they alone think rightly, while the rest are impious, blasphemous idolaters? This is all the more so because no peace and agreement has hitherto been able to be established even among themselves.

In the year 1557 four ways to peace were proposed in the recess or decree of the Empire: a General Council, a National Council, a Colloquy, and an Assembly of the Empire. All the princes confess by their decree that a national council and an assembly of the Empire are useless for religious concord. They determine that a General Council is the most orderly and correct way to peace; that it has descended from antiquity through the Christian Church to the present time; and that it is without controversy the best, most useful, and most advantageous way--the way which the Church has employed in similar cases and dissensions and by which it has happily decided causes. Every care must therefore be devoted to making it possible for a General Council to be assembled.

Meanwhile they propose a colloquy because they had no hope of a Council. But experience has now taught that no colloquy is sufficient for peace, nor can one be. For they establish a colloquy as a consultation and deliberation in which every negotiation undertaken is conducted without obligation and without prejudice and contains no confession, decision, determination, or definition. Since, therefore, peace has not been made by a colloquy and, as affairs have now been settled, cannot be made by one, a Council is necessary--and indeed the one which the whole world has now embraced.

I have often taught that the adversaries cannot possess such a council. Matthias Hoe, supreme preacher at the Saxon court, proves this expressly: "Moreover, if we consider what a general council requires, all will confess and say that it is impossible for such a council to be instituted." He adduces arguments: because it must be assembled by imperial authority, and the Emperor will not do this; second, because theologians cannot be compelled to attend the Council and expenses are lacking. They will therefore never obtain solid peace, but will pass from errors into other and still other

errors unless they join themselves to the Universality. Domestic peace is weak if the whole city is afflicted by seditions.

The Roman Empire, as I taught above, cannot subsist without ecclesiastical peace. Its civil laws are not only now tempered by the canons of councils and pontiffs, but were so formerly, when the German nation did not yet rule: “The laws of the age do not disdain to follow the sacred canons,” in the *Authentic, That Clerics Be Judged before Their Own Bishops*, penultimate section, Collection 6. Unless, therefore, the Council is received, the conflict between ecclesiastical laws and the new civil laws will be perpetual, as I showed elsewhere, and consequently there will be no peace.

Following the example of their head, it is fitting that all the Estates of the Empire, as members, should receive the Council's saving doctrine and reformation willingly and with a grateful mind. But Charles, Ferdinand, Maximilian, Rudolf, Matthias, and Ferdinand, who now holds the governance of the Most August Empire, constantly adhered to the ancient Roman Church and profess themselves its advocates and defenders. They requested the Council and obtained it; they urged the restoration and continuation of it when interrupted;

[Printed page 818]

they promoted it and, when it had been completed, commended it to their subjects.

It is indeed fitting that members be conformed to the head and subjects obey the Magistrate. But those men will say, “It is necessary to obey God rather than men.” Yet they use so holy a maxim seditiously and impiously. For those Emperors were neither Jews nor Gentiles, nor do they rise against God so as to command what God forbids. But if they held them to be such, why by their own votes did they impose tyrants and persecutors upon the Christian people? Why did they themselves prefer to stand beneath the blow of an idolatrous prince rather than elect an Orthodox man from their own brotherhood? Why do they themselves condemn the Emperor whose religion all antiquity approved?

But I have already demonstrated these things above. I press this point, that I may make plain that stable peace cannot exist where there is so great an ἀνεμονία [wind-driven instability] and ἀκοινωνία [lack of communion] between the head and members. This formerly shook Germany with war, when the agitators of the pseudo-Gospel stirred up the princes against the supreme Magistrate. That war, notable as it was, was lamentable and destructive to the fatherland through the disasters of cities, the devastation of fields, and the chains of princes.

Even now there remain men who from Switzerland and neighboring places call the Emperor the Apocalyptic beast and the Empire the fullness of devilism. Indeed, at the most recent fair an image was publicly sold in which Ambrogio Spinola, an incomparable hero and commander of the imperial and royal army, rides upon the seven-headed beast. These things are certainly opposed to peace. But they gush from one fountain: that they hate the religion of the Emperor, to whose clemency, prudence, and justice they have entrusted themselves.

The battles of the Calvinists and Lutherans among themselves are now known. The Calvinists defend themselves because they have been condemned by no council. Sturm writes in the *Antipappus*, page 197, that “the Papistic doctrine ought not to be defamed and repudiated as erroneous, since no legitimate general council has defined this or rejected the Papists together with their doctrine.” Thus also the Calvinists in the preface to the *Orthodox Consensus*, thus Hospinian, thus Pareus in his *Irenicum*.

Accordingly, the preacher Hoe says that in this part they agree entirely with the Papists and Jesuits, who can do nothing other than cry, “Council, Council, Council!” That courtly chief preacher then proceeds: “In what, therefore, does the necessity of a council consist? Does it not follow from this that more is placed in the council than in Scripture? That the authority of the council is greater and more conspicuous than that of Scripture? Is this not entirely to fall back into the Papacy up to the girdle?”

If a council is needed for the condemnation of false dogmas, behold: I have already furnished so many councils which condemned these teachings; why, therefore, do the Calvinists not reject them? For concerning Scripture without

another authority, fanatical spirits will never agree. Our religion has been condemned by no council, theirs by many; therefore let them abandon the condemned religion and, together with the Emperor their head, follow the uncondemned one--indeed, the one approved by councils.

I should wish that the princes and states of Germany would learn what must next be done, not from turbulent enemies of truth, or impostors and apostates, but from the ancient Emperors, who led the way by deed and voice. It is fitting for the Germans, whom God has raised to the Empire in this last age of the world, to emulate them. Constantine undertook by imperial authority the execution of the Council of Nicaea. Theodosius the Younger defended the decrees of Ephesus; Valentinian and Marcian defended Chalcedon. Nor did any orthodox prince allow his labor to be lacking where it was required for those things which had been established by councils.

Golden indeed are the words in the decree of Emperor Marcian: "The profane contention has now departed. For truly impious and sacrilegious is he who, after the judgment of so many priests, leaves anything to be treated by his own opinion. It is indeed the height of madness to seek an imaginary light in the midst of clear day. For whoever investigates anything further after the truth has been discovered seeks a lie." But the Council of Trent must be defended much more earnestly, because in it the ancient councils are found and the deeds of pious kings are commended for imitation.

[Printed page 818]

In this Council that was done which all judged necessary for all councils: namely, that it be convoked by the vicar of Christ, that those who possess the right pronounce judgment, and that security and liberty be conceded to all. Accordingly, the legates of kings, princes, and states were present, and kings embraced the Council. Why will a few princes in Germany not do what they know that the others did with great praise for constancy, sincerity, and religion? Why do they not prefer foreign princes as friends and allies rather than as suspected persons?

We daily see divisions of minds, secret counsels, and confederations arising from deep envy and hatred toward Catholic princes. Hence come the estrangement of nations and hereditary dissensions. Italians, Spaniards, and Frenchmen are alienated from Lutheran Germans, while the Germans themselves are inflamed against Catholic nations by perpetual invectives, calumnies, and defamatory pamphlets. And yet, since human affairs are fragile and fleeting, it can happen that they need mutual aid and that they must become suppliants to those whom they presume to be enemies.

Why, therefore, do the German princes not embrace the true and ancient religion of their fathers, explained by the Council of Trent, so that they may enter into, renew, and confirm affection and treaties with foreign nations? Why do they permit their subjects to be aroused by factious and tribunician preachers to hatred of other kingdoms--kingdoms which deserve better of the German princes than the preachers themselves do?

Look at the matter. The Innovators contend that all the ancestors of the princes were what they fashion us to be: Antichristians, that is, the most criminal of all men; and by so atrocious a charge they defame all the families of Germany. The Council defends the faith, honor, right of succession, and reputation of illustrious families. Why do you attend to malevolent detractors, to the reproach of yourselves and your stock, and neglect the true defenders of your dignity and your ancestors?

Behold: kings no less powerful than your Emperor nevertheless defer to the Emperor and with an untroubled mind hold the second or third places, reverencing the Sacred and August Empire of which you are noble members. But your preachers, as I taught at the beginning of *On Syncretism*, do not fear to call and write that it is Antichristian, the Apocalyptic beast, and the fullness of devilism. Therefore at last recognize these men who, under the pretense of truth, mock your noble and inborn nobility; once recognized, abandon them.

Have you not yet recognized them? Do they not direct and toss you and your subjects at their decision, not without tumults? Now they drive you, after the manner of cattle, into Luther's pens, now into Calvin's; then again they send

you out upon the sea of Ubiquity and expose you to Flacian winds. Now they remove bishops, now restore them; now compel you to grow mild with the Hollanders, now to grow rigid with the Genevans. They are constant only in their own mutability. Return, therefore, to the truth of the ancient age,

[Printed page 819]

for there is no end of innovating, since every novelty destitute of truth is swiftly removed by another novelty.

Ninth. I marvel if all are not able to touch their error with their own hands. For what, I ask, is more ill-advised than to write a few private laws of princes and towns concerning a common thing--that is, concerning the religion of all Christian kingdoms--and to establish an ecclesiastical order, and from the municipal laws of one party to overturn universal law?

Augustine rightly says on Psalm 75: "Truth is common; it is not mine, nor yours, nor his, nor that man's; it is common to all. And no one says, 'It is mine,' lest he wish to make his own portion of that which stands in the midst for all."

What, I ask, did the few subscribers of the Confession say at Augsburg in the year 1530? "Truth is on our side; the rest of the world is insane; we alone are wise; the others ὡς σκιαὶ πέτονται [fly like shadows]." And not only those who now live, but all ages were ignorant of the truth. How do new and few men judge it worthy that all Christians should migrate into their laws, abandon approved things, and condemn salutary things? Why does the small number not rather yield to the universality, subjects to their Magistrates, sheep to shepherds?

A rival confession is opposed to the Council, Augsburg to Trent, Philip Melanchthon to the Pontiff. I exhort and beseech you to believe the Council and acknowledge the Pontiff, for as a leader in withdrawing from the Confession you possess Philip Melanchthon himself, the author of the Confession--and now almost all of you have withdrawn. The author himself condemned and hated his own work. The rule which he offered to the world he himself broke; what as a younger man he approved, when older he rescinded. See Roland Pontanus, book 3 *On Memorable Affairs*. See Melanchthon's letters to Frederick the Palatine; see his tears concerning ἄρτολατρίᾳ [bread-worship].

If the master and craftsman of a Confession of so great a name--so that he alone seemed to have imbibed Luther's spirit and mind--abandoned the Confession, enticed neither by a reward, nor by human fear, nor by hope, and condemned his own decrees before he had even heard the Council's decrees, the disciple is not above the master. Do not retain what its maker cast away.

"We shall therefore be Calvinists," you will say, "for he passed over to Calvin."

By no means. Follow him when he condemns evil things; flee him when he follows worse things. For to which Calvinists will you depart? He was one of the Mild, and therefore not even thus will you stand among the larger minority; you will dwell amid the offense of more men. Yet you will be nearer the Council than if you thus harden yourself in the ἀθάδειξ obstinacy of the Rigid. Both his letters and Joachim Mörlin's book, which Andreas Petri of Eisleben printed in the year 1565, teach that Melanchthon defected to the Calvinists.

But concerning Philip let it be as you wish. "We oppose the Confession to the Council." Yet that Confession is neither certain nor pleasing to all your people; it has been changed ten times. Nor do I alone or the Calvinists alone say this, but your own countrymen themselves. Andreas Musculus, in his *Pious and Necessary Admonition concerning Avoiding the Gross and More-than-Papistic Errors of Major*, book 3, folio 194, says: "The authors of the Confession accommodated themselves to the time, or wrote without sufficient consideration."

What then? Will you prefer to the Council of Trent--a council to which the councils and Fathers of all times bear testimony--a confession which in my judgment is novel and heretical, in the censure of the Calvinists a torch by which France is set aflame, and in the confession of the Lutherans a confession accommodated to the time and written without consideration? What then does Musculus conclude from this? "Therefore an argument taken from the authority of the Confession and the Apology is not valid." Deservedly indeed; for a temporary and inconsiderate

confession must be corrected according to the words of eternal truth, the most carefully considered councils, and the confessions and martyrdoms of fifteen centuries.

What does Abdias, the defender of the Confession, reply to these things? “I should have omitted our Confession if this must truly be alleged concerning it. On that reasoning, what else is it than a confession written without consideration and accommodated to the time? In this manner it will cease to be authentic; in this manner a most splendid occasion is given to our adversaries for condemning us ourselves together with our Confession. In this manner we ourselves cannot be certain concerning our religion, nor shall we leave anything certain to posterity. In this manner the distinguished testimonies of Luther and others concerning the Augsburg Confession will most unworthily fall away.”

Since they now see that these things have occurred, there is no reason why they should adhere to a slippery and ambiguous confession and spurn the orthodox agreement of all ages explained and handed down by the Council of Trent.

The Augsburg Confession cannot be salutary, since, like a tragic buskin, it fits either foot, and sits not upon two stools but upon twenty. For it has been changed, corrected, and mutilated in many editions, the beginning of the alteration having been made by its author himself, so that it is now asked of which edition each professor is.

Then, how many heresies lurk beneath that cloak? The Calvinists claim it for themselves, but rightly understood; the Ubiquitarians arrogate it to themselves alone, but explained in their own sense; all the others think so diversely and dissent so inimically. Pareus attempts to prove that it is defended by no one such as it was first proposed. If no one defends it in that form, why does he adhere to it once changed? Why does one who has cast away a part of falsehood not profess the truth in its integrity? Does he not show as vain and mendacious the vaunting of Melancthon and his colleagues about Scripture alone, infallible truth, and new light, since he withdrew from the Confession at least in part? The Estates of the Augsburg Confession were deceived by the cunning of impious men in the very construction of the Confession, because the Confession was interpolated, changed, and abandoned by posterity.

Eternal salvation, therefore, is not in a temporary confession; stability of faith is not in daily ἐφημερίῳ vaunting. Rather, it is in that Rock upon which Christ built the Church, against which the Augsburg Confession, when it dashed, was broken and flew apart into little pieces. Those who are called the Estates of the Augsburg Confession vainly attempted to join and solder them together. Secular power cannot bind spiritual wickednesses, nor does God permit the concord of those in error to grow excessively, lest it give authority to error.

Finally, the salvation which they lose so inexcusably ought to move everyone to return to the place from which they rashly departed. “He who hears you hears me; he who despises you despises me,” was said. The men of Trent can say this: bishops joined to the Apostolic Church through perpetual succession, handing down through the succession of the Apostolic Churches the faith.

Cyprian, Letter 9, book 4: “You ought to know that the Bishop is in the Church and the Church in the Bishop; and that if any are not with the Bishop, they are not in the Church. And those who, not having peace with the priests, creep in, flatter themselves in vain, since the Church, which is one and Catholic, has not been rent or divided, but is certainly connected and joined by the glue of priests cohering mutually with one another.”

You await salvation in vain while of your own accord you separate yourselves from fellowship with the common and ancient Church, whence saving doctrine is derived to us.

[Printed page 820]

For what excuse is there for abandoning and condemning the doctrine of so many saints and adhering to the opinions of those who themselves condemned them? The Apostles were the Fathers of the Church; in place of the fathers those sons were born and were appointed Bishops. The Church herself calls them fathers. She herself begot them and established them in the seats of the fathers. Therefore do not think her deserted because you do not see Peter, because you do not see Paul, because you do not see those through whom she was born. Fatherhood comes from the offspring

of the Church: in place of her fathers sons have been born to her, appointed as princes over all the earth--princes for explaining the faith, princes for implanting piety, princes for abolishing error.

May he who inhabits inaccessible light illuminate the eyes of your mind and strengthen your spirits, so that you may dare to say to your Innovators what Augustine said to the disturbers of his own time in chapter 14 of *On the Usefulness of Believing*:

“I did not see Christ himself in the manner in which he willed to appear to men, who is proclaimed to have been seen even by these ordinary eyes. When I consider whom I believed concerning him, so that, now furnished beforehand with such faith, I might approach you, I see that I believed none except the confirmed opinion of peoples and nations and a most celebrated report; and that the mysteries of the Catholic Church have occupied these peoples everywhere. Why, therefore, should I not inquire most diligently among them above all what Christ commanded, since, moved by their authority, I have already believed that Christ commanded something useful? Will you explain to me better what he said--you at whose recommendation I would not think that he existed or exists, if this were commended to me as something to be believed? This, therefore, as I have said, I believed through report strengthened by rapid diffusion, agreement, and antiquity.

“But you are so few--and so few--and so turbulent, and so new, that no one doubts that you here bring forward nothing worthy of authority. What, therefore, is this so great madness? ‘Believe those men that Christ is to be believed, and learn from us what he said.’ Why, I ask you? For if they should fail and could teach me nothing, I should far more easily persuade myself that Christ is not to be believed than that anything concerning him must be learned from anyone except those through whom I had believed him.

“O enormous confidence--or rather folly! ‘I teach you what CHRIST commanded, in whom you believe.’ What if I did not believe in him? Would you be able to teach me anything concerning him? ‘But,’ he says, ‘it is necessary that you believe.’ Is it because you commend him to us?

“‘No,’ he says, ‘for by reason we lead those who believe him.’ Why, therefore, should I believe him? ‘Because the report has been established.’ Whether through you or through others? ‘Through others,’ he says. Shall I therefore believe them so that you may teach me? Perhaps I ought to, unless they chiefly warn me precisely of this: that I must not approach you at all. For they say that you possess pernicious doctrines. You will answer: ‘They lie.’ How, therefore, shall I believe them concerning Christ, whom they do not wish to see?

“He says, ‘Believe the writings.’ But if every writing is presented as new and undoubted, or is commended by a few, with no reason confirming it, belief is accorded not to it but to those who present it. Therefore, if you who are so few and unknown present those writings, I am not inclined to believe them. At the same time you also act contrary to your promise, by commanding faith rather than rendering a reason. Again you will recall me to the multitude and the report. Restrain at last your obstinacy and some indomitable lust for propagating your name. Rather, admonish me to seek the chief men of this multitude, and to seek most diligently, so that I may learn something concerning these writings from those men through whom, if they did not exist, I should be wholly unaware that it must be learned. But you, return to your hiding places, and do not plot anything under the name of the truth which you attempt to take away from those to whom you yourself concede authority.”

CHAPTER XLIII

The Objections against the Authority of the Council Are Empty

[Printed page 820]

Nevertheless, even in a clear matter and with the accused convicted, there is not lacking the greatest impediment to a better life: a refuge in excuse. They say that they possess reasons why they cannot return to the inherited religion. This is not the evil of heresy alone, but an evil common to human depravity: they sin willingly and conceal their sins by denying them.

“No one,” says Seneca, “understands himself to be avaricious; no one, covetous. Yet the blind seek a guide; we wander without a guide. We say: ‘I am therefore not ambitious, but no one at Rome can live otherwise. I am not extravagant, but the city itself demands great expenditure. It is not my fault that I am irascible; youth causes this.’ We indeed deceive ourselves. Our evil is not external; it is within us, it sits in our entrails. And for that reason we come to health with difficulty, because we do not know that we are sick.” Letter 60.

These are the vices of human affairs, but especially of those in error; for unless they loved their vices, they would not err. Indeed, they generally err in such a manner that they impute error to sanctity and truth.

The first objection against the Council is therefore customarily this: because it was assembled by the Pontiff, although it ought to have been done by the Emperor.

Yet that is not a legitimate objection. For why do the Germans and the English, with a few others, seek a knot in a bulrush when the rest of the world reverences the Council? The Emperor himself, the head of the Empire, brought it about that it was proclaimed and continued by the Pope. If they are moved by the honor of their prince, let them not spurn his solicitude in seeking the Council. Why did they offer the Saxon Confession to the Council in the year 1551? In it they say that they are not conscious that their preachers possess any error, either in doctrine or in the government of the Church; nevertheless, they do not doubt that those men are endowed with such modesty and piety that, if they are admonished by testimonies of heavenly doctrine and by the true agreement of the Catholic Church, they will by no means fail the edification and tranquility of the Church.

Let subjects not disappoint the hope of their princes, and let them revere the orthodox agreement of that Council which possesses the unity and agreement of the ancient Churches. But if they repudiate the Council because it was assembled by the Pope's authority, why do they receive Nicaea, which not only was assembled by Pope Sylvester but also determined by its own decree who could lawfully proclaim a council?

These are the words of Athanasius's *Letter to Felix concerning the Persecutions of the Arians*: “We know that in the great Synod of Nicaea it was unanimously confirmed by the three hundred and eighteen Bishops that councils ought not to be celebrated without the judgment of the Roman Pontiff.” Hence also Socrates, book 2 of the *History*: “Councils which are celebrated otherwise than the ecclesiastical rule commands possess no force; councils ought not to be celebrated apart from the judgment of the Roman Pontiff.”

So far, therefore, is the authority of the Pontiff interposed in the celebration of the Council from having to deter the Estates of the Augsburg Confession, that for this reason it is fitting for the Council to be received with the greatest readiness, since without such authority a council is invalid. For a council must be assembled by him who presides over the Church; but emperors are not presidents of the Church--indeed, they have often been

[Printed page 821]

persecutors.

Next, I cannot sufficiently marvel at what reason those men allege who say that they approve the assembly of councils by the authority of the emperors Charles, Maximilian, Ferdinand, Rudolf, and Matthias. For their doctors calumniate in voice and writings that these Emperors are Antichristians. Aretius, on Apocalypse 13:2 and 15, contends that the Emperor or Empire is the ten-horned beast. The same man says: "The name of the beast is to be a son of the Roman Church, or a Catholic, or a member of the Roman Church." The same: "The dragon is the Devil, who attaches his ornaments to the Empire." The same: "To worship the beast is to cultivate the Emperor superstitiously; even those who call him the unconquered Emperor do this." The same man complains at verse 8 that men marvel at the success of princes and therefore pass over to their parties.

How, therefore, will they approve as Catholic and legitimate a council assembled by imperial authority--that is, by beastly, draconic, Antichristian, persecuting, and idolatrous authority, as they themselves are accustomed to fashion it by blaspheming the Majesty in a horrid manner? To what end, therefore, do they object the Emperor to us? If they acknowledge his authority in the convocation of a synod, why do they not follow the modesty, prudence, faith, religion, and zeal with which, at the beginning and continuation of the Council, he moved, aided, and heard the Pontiff and embraced the Council's judgment? In a matter of the greatest moment he followed Constantine and other pious Emperors.

You seek a council assembled by imperial authority, which cannot be given; why do you not follow the one defended, approved, and honored by imperial authority? Finally, both Pareus and the Saxon chief preacher think that a Council can be commanded by princely authority, so that one is not free to refuse it in whatever manner one wishes, because they judged that coercive power too is necessary for a Synod.

But what Emperor will compel the Spaniards, Italians, Frenchmen, Englishmen, Swedes, Poles, and others--foreigners, namely, who are not subject to his scepter--to undergo the dangers of journeys and the losses of expenses? You judge him so weak that he cannot restrain a few merchants of Mülheim from an unjust attempt and from making an insane expenditure. In those halls that promote imperial vigor you depicted him sleeping; you contemptuously fashioned his eagle ἄπτερον [wingless] and featherless.

Those, therefore, who pretend to seek a council of this kind reject every council. Did not Luther himself expressly teach at the beginning, in *On the Chief Articles of the Christian Faith*, that the Pope is bound to institute a General Council? Who would believe him bound to do that which it is not lawful for him to do? If a council assembled by him is void through the invalid authority of its convoker, what law constrains him to labor in vain, to move the world by a ridiculous attempt, and, when he has convoked it, to accomplish nothing beyond expense? Indeed, must the whole affair therefore perish because the Pope is its author?

But if anyone is little concerned about Luther, let him consider the unanimous opinion of an entire imperial assembly. In the year 1524 it was decreed thus at Nuremberg:

"And lest good things be oppressed together with evil ones, and so that it may finally be defined what is to be done by each person in this cause, it has seemed to our Lieutenant, orator, and also to the Electors, princes, prelates, counts, and Estates of the Empire present here to be supremely necessary that a general, free, and universal Council of the whole of Christianity--which can most advantageously, if it is possible, be effected by His Pontifical Holiness with our consent--be proclaimed and convoked, as is fitting, at a suitable place in the German nation. Concerning this matter negotiations have been conducted here with the legation of His Pontifical Holiness, which has undertaken to refer it to His Pontifical Holiness and to promote it most faithfully."

To what end is there need of these decrees of the Empire if the Pope ought not to assemble a Council, or if that which the Pope assembled according to the judgment and request of the whole Empire is therefore void because it possesses the Pope as its author? But if the judgment of the Empire is correct, we easily see how mad is the audacity of the preachers who by private detraction and malevolence rescind the opinion of the August Majesty and of all the Electors and Estates then present.

Besides the Catholics, there were also present at that assembly the legates of the Electors Ludwig of the Palatinate, Frederick of Saxony, and Joachim of Brandenburg, and of many other princes. The assembly approved their acts, and then there was the consent of those who had sent them. The objection against the Council's author therefore comes too late, if they themselves selected the author.

The second objection. The Council of Trent was not free, nor was it within the German nation; for Trent is in Italy, in a place insufficiently healthy, whose Bishop was a Cardinal.

The preachers could therefore easily have protected themselves from the heat, especially since the Emperor and Pope Julius, unless they had been prohibited by an impediment, were ready to betake themselves there. Since it was a suitable seat for so many wealthy men and princes, especially since it is warm as though with a temperate breeze between the Italian suns and Alpine cold--for the cold which Italian and Spanish cosmographers ascribe to Trent is less than the northern frost, even if it should nevertheless surpass a Saxon and Baltic winter--the Italians, Sicilians, Spaniards, and Frenchmen should have complained about the frost of Trent, since the dissensions of the Germans drew them from their native warmth into the Germans' freezing regions. Would they not have prayed for a milder and somewhat quieter climate?

What they complain concerning liberty denied is most unjust and most false, fashioned solely to arouse hostility toward Catholics by an invented fear. For Trent is a city of the German nation; it was then under Ferdinand's dominion and even now belongs to the house of Austria. How, therefore, did an imperial town diminish the liberty which the Emperors themselves kept safe and unimpaired? Nor did the Cardinal obstruct it--indeed, he could not--since not only he, but the universal Council together with the Pontiff and Emperor, proclaimed a safe-conduct for all Germans and the other nations, not once but again and again. Finally, the whole Christian Church granted it to the German nation, in Sessions 13, 14, and 18. And so that those who do not have the Council at hand may possess something by which to refute the lies of their preachers, I shall transcribe the safe-conduct which was given in Session 18.

SAFE-CONDUCT granted to the German nation, in the general congregation on 4 March 1562.

“The most holy Ecumenical and General Synod of Trent, legitimately assembled in the Holy Spirit, the same legates of the Apostolic See presiding in it, assures everyone that, to each and all priests, Electors, Princes, Dukes, Marquises, Counts, Barons, Nobles, Military Men, Commoners,

[Printed page 822]

and all other men whatsoever, of whatever estate, condition, or quality they may be, from the cities and other places of the German province and nation, and to all other ecclesiastical and secular persons, especially those of the Augsburg Confession, who together with them will come, will be sent, or are about to set out for this General Council of Trent, or have come hitherto--by whatever name they are designated or may now be called--it imparts and altogether concedes, by the tenor of the present instrument, the public faith and the fullest and truest security, which they call a safe-conduct:

“freely to come to this city of Trent; to remain, stand, and tarry here; to propose and speak; to treat, examine, and discuss any business whatsoever together with the Synod itself; to offer and disclose freely whatever things they please and any articles whatever, both in writing and by word; to explain, establish, and prove them by the Sacred Scriptures and the words, opinions, and arguments of the blessed Fathers; and, if necessary, also to answer the objections of the General Council and to dispute or confer charitably, without any impediment, with those who have been selected by the Council, with reproaches, revilings, and insults entirely removed;

“and specifically that the disputed causes be treated in the aforesaid Council of Trent according to Sacred Scripture, the traditions of the Apostles, approved Councils, and the authorities of the holy Fathers; with this also added, that they shall in no way be punished under the pretext of religion, or of offenses committed or to be committed concerning it. It

concedes this also in such a manner that, because of their presence, divine offices shall not in any manner cease, either on the journey or in any of the places while they are going, remaining, or returning, nor in the city of Trent itself.

“And when these things have been completed or not completed, whenever they please, or when, at the command and with the assent of their superiors, they desire to return to their own places, or any one of them desires it, they may immediately, without any resistance, occasion, or delay, freely and securely return according to their good pleasure, their property and likewise their honor and persons being safe, and vice versa; yet with the knowledge of those to be deputed by the same Synod, so that provision may then be made opportunely for their security, without deceit and fraud.

“The holy Synod also wills that in this public faith and safe-conduct all clauses whatsoever be included and contained, and be held as included, which may be necessary and opportune for full, effectual, and sufficient security in going, remaining, and returning.

“For greater security and for the good of peace and reconciliation, it also expressly declares that if anyone or any of them, whether on the journey while coming to Trent, while remaining there, or while returning, should perpetrate or commit some enormous deed--which God forbid--by which the benefit of this public faith and assurance conceded to them could be annulled or made void, it wills and concedes that those discovered in a crime of this kind shall be punished immediately by their own people alone, and not by others, with a worthy penalty and sufficient amendment, which must deservedly be approved and commended by the party of the Synod, while the form, conditions, and terms of their assurance remain altogether inviolate.

“In like manner it also wills that, if anyone or any persons from the Synod itself, whether on the journey, while remaining, or while returning, should perpetrate or commit some enormous deed--which God forbid--by which the benefit of this public faith and assurance could be violated or in any way removed, those discovered in a crime of this kind shall be punished immediately by the Synod itself alone, and not by others, with a worthy penalty and sufficient amendment, which must deservedly be commended and approved by the party of the Lords of Germany of the Augsburg Confession then present here, while the present form, conditions, and terms of assurance remain altogether inviolate.

“The Synod itself further wills that it shall be lawful for each and all of the ambassadors, as often as it shall be opportune or necessary, to go out from the city of Trent to take the air and to return to it; and also freely to send or dispatch their messenger or messengers to any places whatsoever to arrange their necessary business, and to receive the persons sent or dispatched, or the one sent and dispatched, as often as it seems expedient to them, in such a manner that some person or persons among those deputed by the Council accompany them to provide for their security.

“This safe-conduct and security must stand and endure from the time and throughout the period when it happens that they are received under the care and protection of the Synod and its people, until they are brought to Trent; throughout the whole time of their residence there; and again, after they have had sufficient hearing, with a period of twenty days allowed beforehand, when they themselves request it, or when the Council, after a hearing of this kind, orders them to depart, it shall restore them, with God's favor, from Trent to whatever safe place each has selected for himself, all deceit and fraud being entirely excluded.

“It promises and pledges in good faith that all the aforesaid things are to be inviolably observed on behalf of each and all the faithful of Christ, on behalf of all Princes whatsoever, both ecclesiastical and secular, and on behalf of all other ecclesiastical and secular persons, of whatever estate and condition they may be or by whatever name they are designated.

“Moreover, all fraud and deceit being excluded, it promises in true and good faith that the Synod itself will seek no occasion, either manifestly or secretly, nor in any way employ--or permit anyone to employ--any authority, power, law, statute, privilege of laws or canons, or of any Councils whatsoever, especially those of Constance and Siena,

expressed in any form of words, to the prejudice of this public faith and free hearing conceded to them by the Synod itself; and for this occasion it derogates from them in this matter.

“But if the holy Synod, or anyone from it or its people, of whatever condition, estate, or preeminence he may be, should violate in any point or clause the prescribed form and manner of assurance and safe-conduct--which nevertheless may the Almighty deign to avert--and sufficient amendment, deserving of their approval and commendation, should not immediately follow, they may hold the Synod itself, and will be able to hold it, to have fallen under all the penalties which violators of safe-conducts of this kind can incur by divine and human law or custom, without excuse or any contradiction in this matter.”

No one will easily say that greater liberty was ever granted either in a Council or in a state. Accordingly, while they allege fear, they sufficiently show that they distrust their cause, fear the light, and prefer to deceive the simple in Germany rather than come before the sight of the Church. For why do they decline the place and liberty when the whole Empire approved it? It is contained in the Imperial decree promulgated at Augsburg in the year 1548, to which I refer the reader.

[Printed page 823]

[Printed page 823]

Why does the whole Empire here complain about nothing concerning the place, the liberty, and the convoker of the Council, but submit itself to its judgment? But who bewitched many so that they would believe neither the ancient Church nor the recent Council, with which all antiquity agrees? Who so swiftly altered the constancy of the Germans that they neither came to the Council nor defended its decrees? Namely, those who severed them from the primitive Church are now bringing it about that they do not unite with the rest of Christianity; and, lest this ever occur, they divide the wretched men into very many petty sects and into names and dogmas equally monstrous.

The third objection. Bishops, Cardinals, and Monks alone pronounced judgment; laymen were excluded from the right of voting. It was therefore not a legitimate Council.

No one was excluded who possessed the right to come and pronounce judgment.

These are the words of the Pontiff proclaiming the Council: “All, from every place, both our Venerable brethren the Patriarchs and Archbishops and our beloved sons the Abbots, as well as all others whatsoever to whom by right or privileges the power of sitting in general councils and pronouncing judgments in them has been permitted,” and so forth.

One must proceed according to the ancient religion, and consequently councils must be proclaimed and celebrated according to ancient law. But since the power of coming and pronouncing judgment is given to all to whom it has been conceded by right or privilege, no one can complain that he was excluded, unless someone judges it just to come contrary to right.

But that judgment concerning controversies of faith was formerly entrusted to priests is clearer than to require teaching. For what is clearer than that the three hundred and eighteen Bishops subscribed to the Synod of Nicaea, but no layman? Therefore either let him produce a single council among all the councils in which laymen subscribed together with the Bishops and pronounced a definitive judgment, and we shall hear his complaints about Trent; or, if he cannot, let him cast away all ancient councils with a single nod and betake himself openly and without deceitful pretense to the enemies of all councils--that is, of the whole Church. We know that Emperors subscribed to certain councils, but they protested that by this act they bore witness to their pious assent and did not arrogate to themselves the role of judging.

The fourth objection. The Prelates who attended the Council were bound to the Pontiff by oath; therefore they did not pronounce free judgments.

Once this has been established--which all confess to be true--that the legitimate oath of Judges, Counselors, and Senators does not remove but confirms their liberty of pronouncing judgment, it must be investigated whether the oath of the Prelates at the Council of Trent obstructed the truth. Peter Fuentidueña teaches in his oration to the Germans that it was instead advantageous. For they were constrained by oath to teach and accept the truth insofar as they knew and were able. But if you have sworn that you will do so, this does not prevent you from inquiring freely into the truth. Otherwise princes would be judged to take liberty from the subjects whom they bind to themselves by oath.

But since an oath is not a bond of iniquity, all know very well that they are bound by no oath either to defend lies or to oppress the truth. What then? Because the Princes of the Empire are bound by oath to the Emperor, are they for that reason prohibited from confessing the truth? Which of the Protestant Theologians is not bound by many--indeed, unjust--oaths, both put under oath and administering an oath concerning the heresies of his Academy?

The fifth objection. The definitions and canons of the Council of Trent are not according to the word of God; therefore we deservedly refuse them. For why should we subject ourselves to human laws? Let CHRIST alone pronounce judgment; let his word alone be heard.

Uncertain error is not consistent with itself; it dashes against itself, and falsehood finally crushes itself while it flees from the manifestation of truth on every side. A little before they equated the votes of laymen with the decrees of priests; now they deign to hear Christ alone--that is, Scripture. And would that they heard him, for thus they would also hear the priests whom Scripture pronounces must be heard.

What had to be said concerning Scripture alone has been explained in various places. For if Scripture alone suffices, what need is there of a Council? For in it the true sense and interpretation of Scripture must be treated. The Princes of the Empire were certainly not ignorant that this cause was being treated when they requested the Council. It is established that they did not doubt the truth of the divine utterances, but sought with so much labor peace among interpretations.

The sixth objection. There are scandals in the Papacy and the life of the Popes has often been evil; therefore the Council is not legitimate.

I shall employ not merely the common response, but the true response which Christ too approved, Luke 18; nor in return shall I cast back at you that a beam adheres in you who labor to pluck a mote from the Papacy, because I ought not to compare the vices of those in error with the sins of the Orthodox. The comparison of a Catholic with a heretic is unequal, especially with one whose justice is imputed, from whom no crime strikes out justice.

Let us therefore leave these things aside, lest we be compelled to teach with Luther that Evangelicals are possessed in the Gospel by seven devils, who previously were troubled by only one; lest we be compelled to complain with Calvin that scarcely every tenth man among the Calvinists is sincere, and so forth.

I ask this one and only thing: let them not accuse the innocent and, from envy and hatred of the name, make the cause common to all; I shall not defend the guilty. In the Council there were many learned, holy, and upright in life--Cardinals, Bishops, Priests, and doctors, men whose faith and morals are to be judged from the truth, not from the abuse of detractors. Who among so great a number was ἀκατονόμαστος [unspeakable] and publicly infamous after the manner of Calvin and Beza? Behold, so great a Council is in sight. Review the sins and disgraces of the subscribers if you accuse them, or assert that you can prove them if you revile them.

"But they are covered by walls." I ask how that which is covered by such solicitous caution is known to you. For if you accuse without an argument, you are a calumniator. Yet let there also be scandals among us, as there truly are--and would that they ended in the destruction and condemnation of their authors. Nevertheless, the Church does not cease to be the Church although it also contains its evil members within its enclosures; nor did Christ cease to be the head of the Church because Judas too was there. Wheat does not lose its nature although it is among tares.

A Bishop does not lose his dignity and the power of his office--indeed, not even the truth of the faith--even if his works are not complete before his God. Otherwise, why do princes of the age not fall from their thrones by sinning, if a Bishop is reduced to order when he has fallen? But if you read the decrees concerning reformation, you will easily perceive that the Council teaches, admonishes, exhorts, and reproves right things, whether they concern the Pontiffs and the Roman Curia or kings and magnates. No one approved either simony or other crimes, but by a true judgment all determined that they must be amputated, although laws are unequal to the evils of many men--a fact unknown only to those who are ignorant of the human race.

The seventh objection. The doctrine of the Council is false;

[Printed page 824]

therefore the Council itself must be repudiated.

I have already demonstrated above that the Council's decrees and dogmas have come down to us from the ancient Church in a perpetual and nowhere interrupted sequence.

It will indeed be worth the labor to learn who those men are who accuse the Council of Trent of falsehood and who, in the midst of the discords and contentions concerning religion by which Germany is shaken, judge the universal Church. Seeking a remedy for your dissensions from a Council, you selected arbiters; now, after you as defendants have lost your cause, it pleases you to calumniate the judge. The Germans, disturbed by their dissensions, implored the Christian world and requested a Council. The whole body was shaken by one sick member; one part wearies the universal Church and gratuitously despises its labor on its behalf and spurns its counsel, imitating the madness of the frenzied, whose fury is first embittered against the solicitude of those treating them.

Italy possessed religious peace; England lived according to the institutions of its ancestors; the Pontiff and Emperor strove for Hungary to be preserved. France was at rest, for no Calvinist existed. Portugal in the East and Spain in the West extended the boundaries of the Empire and the Gospel. The new faith of the Germans disturbed so many goods and cut off greater hopes. After it was divided and torn within itself and could no longer bear the evils which it had itself caused, it looked to the universal Church, so that by the judgment and agreement of the universality it might compose its domestic factions. Would that it had persevered in what had been rightly instituted.

But the same parish priests, the trumpets of civil war, obstructed the restoration of peace. Accordingly, after despising the Council, given over to a reprobate sense and turned against one another, they began to rage still further. For what is more audacious and foolish than that those whom all selected as judges should be condemned by the most desperate of defendants; that those whose cause, now crushed and defeated, was to be condemned by the final vote should preoccupy the judges' benches and turn against the judges the evils they feared for themselves?

"The doctrine of the Council," they say, "is false." Therefore that doctrine which the ancient Councils and Fathers handed down to the Council of Trent is false. If, therefore, truth does not exist in the whole world, in what faction of Germany, finally, does it possess its dwelling? This accusation cuts off every hope of peace. There is no Memnonist, no Schwenckfeldian, no Ubiquitarian, Socinian, Trinitarian, Sacramentarian, Flacian, Majorist, Anglo-Papist, or Puritan who cannot by this speech mock and elude every ancient or recent, greatest or least council, if he calls false whatever is opposed to his opinion, displeasing to his will, or contrary to his glory or advantages.

Hence comes that enormous and most notorious propagation of schisms and new sects in the new religions; hence the eternal wars into which the demon casts those who despise the remedies of peace. For what peace can exist in a kingdom, what concord of citizens, what union of a family and its many duties, unless either the Magistrate or the father of the household possesses the power of terminating disputes? Who will be able to endure those who flee altogether from every judge and judgment? For what judge, finally, will those who despise a Council admit?

Cyprian rightly says concerning them in book 1, Letter 3: "What kind of men do you suppose those to be who are enemies of the priests and rebels against the Catholic Church and who are terrified neither by the Lord's threatening

nor by the vengeance of the future judgment? For heresies have arisen and schisms been born from no other source than that the priest of God is not obeyed, and that one priest for the time and one judge in place of CHRIST for the time is not contemplated in the Church. If the whole brotherhood obeyed him according to the divine teachings, no one would move anything against the college of priests.” Flight from and detraction of the Council is therefore an evident sign of Schism.

The eighth objection. Councils have rarely had prosperous outcomes; therefore the Council of Trent must not be received.

Councils legitimately instituted, not by their own fault but sometimes through the malice and cunning of impious men, have produced wars and persecutions. Christ himself, by teaching, living rightly, and performing miracles, armed the envy of the Jews against himself. Just laws prudently enacted and to be observed by the state are the destruction of many; discipline, admonition, and correction itself are a detriment to proud and harsh dispositions. What disturbances did the Council of Nicaea produce, when the Arian heresy, armed first with pen and voice and then with arms, avenged itself upon the Orthodox?

No one turns this into an accusation against laws because the law proceeds against malefactors; no one accuses discipline because it often provokes savage spirits so that they rush more licentiously and desperately into the precipices of vice. These are not the faults of good things whose preservation is necessary for cities and kingdoms and has always been retained to break the attempts of the wicked, but of impious men who refuse to be contained and ruled by laws.

Thus neither was the Council of Trent--consecrated to peace and most zealous for peace--the cause of the disturbances which followed. A multitude of Bishops and doctors from the whole world assembled to procure the peace of one nation and join it to the rest of Christianity; rather, those men were the cause on account of whose turbulent attempts it was necessary for the Council to be assembled.

But I judge that more things must be said about the fruit of so great and holy a Council. First, the agreement of the Catholic world was manifest in it, not only among Theologians from different kingdoms, but also with the primitive Church.

Next, the morals of the clergy and people were reformed, a reformation which also illuminated Germany in great part.

Third, all the heresies, struck by the Council's anathema as though by a thunderbolt, were in a worse condition than before; little by little they began to tend toward decay and destruction. The Synod was confirmed in the year 1564, when the last session had been begun on 3 December 1563 and completed on the fourth day. After that time the heresies began much more to be divided and to perish by mutual anathemas--so much so that now scarcely any city can be found in Germany which defends all those heresies into which they had conspired when the Council was begun. No one now professes the Augsburg Confession in its integrity. Meanwhile half the Lutherans have defected to Calvinism or returned to Catholic unity. Calvinism has ceased to be propagated among Catholics with the power in which it formerly excelled; indeed, it too, now divided into equal factions, threatens its own ruin.

The ninth objection. Those who sat in the Council are enemies and opposing parties; therefore they must not be heard by us, nor is it equitable for us to stand before the judgment of enemies.

Would that you were either not enemies of the men of Trent or did not pretend that they were your enemies. For how are those men enemies who so often invited you

[Printed page 825]

to concord, who made expenditure for your sake and endured the troubles of travel? I do not doubt that they were adversaries of errors, since they themselves condemned them so that no one could doubt it. “But it was a hostile Council.” Yet I ask you: what council do you call friendly? If you are a Calvinist, the Lutherans are in your judgment

turbulent enemies of truth. If you are a Mild Calvinist, the Rigid judge you worse than any heretic, Turk, and Jew. If you are Rigid, the Mild assert that you are both a Manichaeian and a Borborite. If you are a Majorist, Flacian, or Osiandrian, you will possess as enemies all who refuse to belong to your faction.

What kind of council, therefore, do you choose? One from that kind of men which is devoted to you, or to which you have bound yourself? You will conquer before such a council without contest and without danger, for you have selected your judges most prudently: you admit no one except the man who has already absolved you, except the man whose cause is the same as yours.

CHAPTER XLIV

The Method of Entering upon Peace

[Printed page 825]

Good peace, O sincere peace, the end of my disputation and the happiness of the Church, where shall I seek you? Paul, the vessel of election, commands me at Romans 14:19 to pursue the things that are of peace. Peter, the rock of the Church, commands me at 1 Peter 3:11 to seek peace and pursue it. And God himself is not the author of dissension, but of peace. But whom shall I address concerning peace? Or rather, whom have all Catholics long been addressing together with me? Not the Theologians of the opposing party; for they, ἄσπονδοι, have declared eternal war against us without a treaty. What shall we do with them? What shall we expect from them? Recently one man from their company, Joseph Hall, began a polemical work and called its first part *Rome Irreconcilable*. There he says that it is necessary for them and Rome to disagree, §21, and in §22: “God will sooner create a new Rome than reform the old.” Nevertheless, if we are rejected by the Theologians, we are not embittered against peace by their curses; we shall flee for refuge to the moderation of statesmen and the equity of princes. Perhaps those who now wage war after having been led into it by a cunning stratagem will grant peace more readily.

Now, therefore, I address you, O Kings and Princes, who foster any religion different from the Roman, Catholic, and ancient religion. As a suppliant I call upon you as arbiters, patrons, and advocates of peace. What I ask is great, I confess, and difficult, which I lament. But it is lawful for great things to be sought from magnates, and the power of the giver makes easy those things which by nature are difficult.

I have a reason to hope for peace, and you have a reason to grant it: the frailty of human judgment, which vehemently seeks certain things and swiftly abandons the same. What it held fixed and ratified when the day departed, it condemns and impales when the day returns. This indulgence, therefore, must be granted to infirmity; and where there was no perseverance in innocence, let there be repentance. Let it be permitted to return to the point at which what was rashly denied may be conceded and what was incautiously admitted may be renounced.

The examples are at hand and are in the acts of your archives: within a hundred years peace has been attempted a hundred times, both between us and your people and among the various divisions of your parties. For what region, what city, holds that faith which it first received after departing from our Church? Some began with Zwingli and went over to Luther; very many, after manifold changes within Lutheranism, departed to Calvin.

Behold, moreover, while I am writing these very things in the year 1618, on the Kalends of November, a new peace and a new Synod are under discussion between the Gomarists and the Arminians--that is, between the bitterest enemies whom Europe contains. The Arminians protest that the Gomarists are Manichaeans and Borborites, and that they worship the very Demon himself in place of God. The Gomarists, now stronger in military force, run forward on the same line against the Arminians. They say that the latter are worse than Turks, Jews, all heretics, and even the Jesuits themselves; and yet they do not despair of peace, although they will never attain it, however they may devise truces and syncretisms, because both parties lack the support of peace--that is, the foundation of truth. Nor does God ever permit an agreement of errors without allowing more dissensions to flow from the nature of that agreement.

If, therefore, peace is hoped for and attempted amid such hostile wrath, inveterate hatreds, and recent wounds, why not also between us and those who are vehement in their opinion but nevertheless unstable? The good and merciful God has compassion upon those who err; perhaps he will grant that those regions which have been changed three, four, five, and six times to another religion may at last be changed to the true one. Those whom the windings of the roads within the labyrinth have long wearied may sometime find the true exit.

Unhappy indeed is an error which is driven on by another error, as wave by wave, and is never dashed to pieces by the truth. The Augsburg Confession was changed twelve times, as is stated in the Colloquy of Herzberg, fols. 91--92. At the assembly of Naumburg an uncorrupted copy was sought in vain. At the assembly of Altenburg the Theologians of Jena called it a buskin. I omit the rest. If your Theologians have erred and have been divided into so many sects, they can err even now; they can take up again what they have condemned and return to the Catholic faith. This will easily occur if you, O Princes, are willing to tread in the footsteps of your fathers; for we see the opinions of peoples turned at the nod of princes, while all accommodate themselves to the ruling power--a word which the unhappiness of the times has now made proper to the business of religion.

The difficulties of the cause, however, are innumerable, and they render peace difficult, though not impossible. For, first, it is the character of error that it cannot stand for long, and yet those who err do not therefore return to the truth first, but are scattered. Thus the Arians and Macedonians departed into various sects, until Mohammedanism was compounded from them all; and it too has parties among so barbarous a people. We see it occur thus in Europe: all disagree, all wish to be Christians, but what fraction is sound? The cause is that those who have abandoned the truth are struck with blindness. If the blind begin to walk, the farther they proceed, the greater the divergences they make.

There is more than one cause why your teachers fall into new errors, but the chief cause is that they do not believe to be true the things which they hawk to you as oracles of the Holy Spirit. Mathesius, in Sermon 12 on the life of Luther, fol. 147, relates that Anthony Musa told him that, when he said that he had sorrowfully complained to Luther because he himself could not believe the things which he preached to others, Luther replied: "Blessed, then, be God, since the same thing happens to others as happens to me; for until now I believed that it happened to me alone." Because, therefore, they do not believe what they wish others to believe, they presently choose something else which appears more probable; they reach the truth itself with difficulty. For they do not reject at once all the things which they wish to appear to have believed, lest they appear defeated; and they delight in the praise of novelty. Hence there are so many new sects in Belgium and in the North. Nevertheless, this is a good within the evil: being cut into small pieces, they look back upon themselves and embrace the truth more readily.

[Printed page 826]

Next, I see those who contend far more bitterly with one another than with us contriving peace. What today is more common and better known than the syncretism of your preachers? Do you believe that they disagree among themselves? Hear the Dean and Theologians of Tübingen sounding a terrible trumpet in the year 1588. Second, they say that the errors of the Zwinglians and Calvinists, as they call them, are far more horrible than Papist idolatry. Third, they say that the Zwinglians and Calvinists, abusing the doctrine and profession of the Gospel, inflict more harm than the Papists. Therefore:

1. Following the example of Paul, one must fight against them; 2. following the example of Luther, who wished that Zwingli had remained a Papist; 3. after their defection from the Papists, they inflicted more harm than they could have inflicted if they had remained with them; 4. the Calvinists abuse the humanity of the Lutherans and vaunt brotherhood; 5. the Calvinists introduce new errors intolerable to the Church--and they enumerate them.

Thus they dispute at Heidelberg concerning syncretism. Although they say these things and said them in 1588, nevertheless in the meantime a great part of the Lutherans migrated to Calvinism, even your ministers themselves, for whom the will of princes was sufficient for abjuring their faith. Someone will say that these things are said by the Lutherans of Tübingen but denied by the Calvinists of Heidelberg. The Lutherans say them rightly; the Calvinists deny them wrongly. For although at the beginning they say that they disagree with the Lutherans only in one article, and not in that whole article, nevertheless at the end they retract this: "What things could we, in turn, cast against these men"--the Tübingen theologians--"in this place, and how MONSTROUS and UNWORTHY of Theologians?" Thus say the Heidelberg theologians.

Peace, therefore, can prudently be hoped for from the mercy of GOD; but the method and the beginning must be treated. The true and customary method is indeed that which I proposed in the book *On the Peace of Germany*: that we should stand by the judgment of the ancient Councils when they interpret the Scriptures. But since, amid so great a variety of dissenters, no council can be given which all embrace, many things must necessarily precede, and methods must be entered upon which all ought to approve by right judgment.

The first method of concord is that the state of the question and controversy be correctly formulated--a state which a great part of the disputants and your Stentors in the pulpits corrupt. For the question is not whether the pure and unadulterated word of God must be taught; whether definition must be made from it; whether the word of God must be rejected. Accordingly, Bucer, in his book *On Concord*, calumniously judges that this must be conceded among the first things: "that the true word of God be freely preached everywhere"; for we granted this long ago.

This, therefore, is the controversy: when the word of God, which we all call sacrosanct, has been placed in the midst, which party possesses its true and genuine understanding? Nor is this the question only between us and them, but among their petty sects: whether the Lutherans or the Calvinists truly interpret the word of God, and whether the Arminians or the Gomarists do so.

The first advantage of this consideration is that those who are to make peace agree at least in certain matters and possess common principles. Nor is it an obstacle that they acknowledge for the most part the written word alone, whereas we acknowledge the written and handed-down word, or ἄγραφοι [unwritten]. For this very matter will be disputed from the written word: whether the existence of traditions is repugnant to it; whether it is a tradition that those books which the Church venerates as the word of God are canonical. For Luther himself confesses that infant baptism cannot be proved evidently from Scripture. Ochino argued thus: "Whatever is not evident in Scripture must not be believed; the condemnation of polygamy is not evident in Scripture; therefore:" And thus, from that principle concerning the written word alone, he introduced polygamy.

Nor do I demand anything inequitable when I pronounce and insist that this state of the question must be proposed. All the hundreds of those who err repeat with one voice: "Scripture, the word of God, the pure and unadulterated word of God." And yet they dispute about its meaning. I am not ignorant that very many disputations are useless, as Tertullian observed long ago; but I judge that all can be brought back to some equity and concord if we all dispute about the meaning of Scripture and that one aim alone is proposed.

You, O Prince, believe Scripture. I too believe it; indeed, I am prepared to die for one iota or stroke. There is agreement, therefore, in this matter. But from this beginning you subsequently believe one thing and I another, because Scripture says one thing according to my meaning, another according to yours, and perhaps another in the opinion of those whom you believe. Hence, therefore, arises another question: whether you and your people, or I, possess the true meaning. We must therefore join battle more closely.

The second method of concord is that we should all together beseech almighty God that, since the controversy concerns the meaning, God may deign to aid us with his own light, so that we may draw out the truth and be confirmed in the truth. Next, let us debate the true meaning from the idioms of Scripture, analogy, comparison with other passages, evident deduction, and the usage of the ancient Church, the Councils, and the Fathers.

That method of comparison possesses many advantages if it is conducted among humane men and with modesty. First, no one will make us hateful among those who do not know us, as though we were despisers of Scripture. Second, when the paint has been stripped away, the disease of those who oppose Scriptures to everything, both against us and mutually against themselves, will immediately appear. Third, there will be fewer contentions, since all will be occupied in investigating Scripture, not in mutual combat, in which they blaze up at a light touch--indeed, like sufferers from gout, they cry out at the suspicion of a touch. Fourth, since ministers are of two kinds--some clamorous and eristic, who refer everything to their preconceived opinion, and others more peaceable and more learned--the commentaries of the latter afford a great opportunity and means for blunting the insolence of the Stentors. Fifth, the

ministers will not be compelled to act intemperately and angrily because they are interpreting Scripture; for in eristic disputation, unless they wash themselves in all their bile, their cause seems to have fallen, and a patient disputant is regarded as a betrayer. Sixth, although someone is not evidently defeated, he will nevertheless observe that Scripture does not support him; he will also fear the array of many great men on the other side. Nor will he be able to condemn me when he has not defeated me from his own principle.

I shall demonstrate an example. In Proverbs 16 it is said: “God made all things for his own sake, the impious man also for the evil day.” The Gomarists in Belgium, and the rigid men who follow them, interpret this passage so as to say that God creates the impious in order that his own justice may shine forth in their punishment. See Piscator's theses 6, 7, and 9, and his disputation against Vorstius. The theses read thus:

1. Sins occur with God procuring them, and they occur with the same God willing them--indeed, willing them altogether thus. §17; likewise §§6 and 64, and throughout.
2. God wills that iniquity be done, although he does not delight in it, just as a sick man wills to drink a bitter draught although he does not delight in it. And thus that saying of Psalm 5, “You are not a God who delights in iniquity,” and so forth, must be understood. §95.
3. God willed that Judas betray Christ and that the Jews kill him, although he had prohibited this to them. §§10, 16, and 24.
4. That which is unjust--that is, contrary to his precept--is in conformity with the will of God; for example, that homicide by the Jews and the betrayal by Judas, and so forth. In the same place, especially §§16 and 24.
5. All things occur from the decree of God, even sins themselves, and indeed from an absolute and special decree. §§56, 58, and 130.
6. Because God wills to make known his justice and mercy, for that reason he also wills that sins occur. §61.
7. Because God procures that manifestation of his justice and mercy, for that reason he also procures the sins themselves. §64.
8. God procured that Absalom should violate his father's wives and that Shimei should curse his king, and so forth. In the same place, as also §17.
9. God destined all men for sins, and did so for this reason: that he might save some by mercy, and punish and destroy others by justice. §89.
10. Because God decreed to permit sins, it is therefore necessary that they occur, because otherwise he would have decreed in vain to permit them. §131.
11. The unbelief of the Jews--and similarly of all unbelievers--depends upon God's predestination. And the Apostle expressly teaches this in Romans 9. §133.

[Printed page 827]

These things are according to the mind of Zwingli, Calvin, Beza, Gomarus, and others. I interpret the passage otherwise, more truly and better. God created the impious, not by implanting impiety in them, but he created men whom he foresaw would be impious; and he will use their impiety--which he did not make, but foreknew--to manifest his justice. He created the man who was to go into the evil day; he did not ordain him to punishment except from foreseen impenitence.

I prove my interpretation thus. 1. The Hebrew words do not indicate that God *ordained the impious man for the evil day*, or that he made the man impious; and that text alone is authentic for you: רעה ליום רשע גם, “also evil for an evil day,” or, as others render it, “and the evil or impious man will fall or perish in the evil day.” For since the article הַ is not joined to the word רשע, it can be expressed in the nominative case just as well as in the accusative. Next, the Seventy interpreters explain it thus: οἱ δὲ ἀσεβεῖς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κακῇ ὀλοῦνται. “But the impious will perish in the evil day.” Those words, therefore, do not signify an absolute ordination by God and a decree of condemning without fault.

2. Unless we follow this interpretation, we shall make God unjust; for he cannot destine someone to punishment without foreseen fault, just as he cannot condemn without committed fault. This, therefore, is an exercise of cruelty, not of justice.

3. God is infinitely good; therefore he infinitely abhors the infliction of unjust punishment, and consequently also the destination to punishment.

4. It is much more cruel even to procure sins. For then God would be the Tiberian God which the Hollanders have described for us.

5. The Fathers interpreted the passage thus with me. Augustine, Letter 106 to Paulinus: “Although he did not make sins, nevertheless who but God created the natures themselves--which in themselves are undoubtedly good--in which, nevertheless, from the choice of the will the vices of sins were to exist, and in many such vices for which eternal punishment was to be rendered?”

And in book 2 *Against the Calumnies of the Pelagians*, chapter 3: “God is indeed the creator of all men, but no one was created by him in order that he might perish, because the cause of being born is one thing, the cause of perishing another. For that a man is born is the benefit of the Creator; but that he perishes is the desert of the transgressor.” The ancient Fathers agree in the same judgment, as does that whole Church which existed in the age of Augustine and thereafter.

6. Thus also interpret all the Arminians, those who think more mildly in Germany and France, and even those in Britain who interpret against Calvin and altogether condemn Calvin's error in this interpretation. The Lutherans do so much more severely: they judge that interpretation so impious and deadly that in whole volumes they prove that the GOD of the Calvinists is the very evil demon.

If in this manner we search the Scriptures from the beginning of Genesis to the end of the Apocalypse and dispute about their true meaning, it will appear most clearly that no iota and no stroke of the divine word is denied, mutilated, or perverted by us.

No one can deny us this opportunity, provided only that he is a lover of truth. From it, moreover, it will be brought about that what previously appeared to be contrary to the law is found to be according to the law and the mind of the legislator.

[Printed page 827]

The third method of concord is that princes should hear our doctrine from us or from our books, not from their ministers, who are our enemies. For before God, the judge of all and avenger of calumnies, and before the whole world, we protest with our whole heart that very many and very grave dogmas are falsely imputed to us. Others have proved this, and most recently Maximilian Sandaeus in his *Antithesis against Pareus*, and Andreas Fornerus in his work *Against the Jubilants*. Why do they fasten upon us errors which we anathematize? Do they desire us to err, or to deceive their own people?

This method of concord is both necessary and efficacious. It is necessary because in councils, colloquies, and judgments concerning religion, one stands by the profession of the man with whom the controversy is conducted. Therefore what I believe must be attacked, not what an adversary imputes to me through ignorance or calumny. For example, they say that we deny that Jesus Christ is the sole Redeemer. With every asseveration, even by oath, we attest that Jesus Christ alone redeemed us. That calumny, therefore, must be put to rest so that the truth may be heard.

This method, moreover, is most efficacious because the greatest part of the controversies will fall away; indeed, the material of infamous sermons will vanish. For if they speak only truths about our doctrine, they will be unable to create hatred against us. We therefore stand before your tribunals, Most Illustrious Princes, and ask you to furnish patronage to the truth, as belongs to great fortune and to the office of a prince. What we request is not burdensome, but most equitable: namely, that in return for so many accusations and calumnies by which we have been and are daily brought into ill repute before your ears, you grant us one hearing--not vengeance, not retaliation. If you love peace, if you hold Christian charity, if you are guided by the laws of nature, hear what we believe and what we condemn. Hear it, however, from us, not from our enemies.

It is the office of a judge to investigate diligently: *l. cum ii, § si praetor, de trans. in π*. Next, he must not be moved rashly by rumors, nor judge undeserving men marked by hostile reputation, but inquire by a complete investigation. Why do they accuse us where our defense is not heard? Your ministers utter abuse; they do not accuse. For it is one thing to utter abuse, another to accuse. Cicero, *For Marcus Caelius*: “An accusation requires a crime: it must define

the matter, designate the man, prove it by argument, and confirm it by a witness.” If we are reviled, we shall bless in return; if we are accused, let our defense be heard. For we are oppressed by a most violent calumny: they maliciously and mendaciously defame us with errors which we are prepared to flee even by death.

[Printed page 828]

The fourth method of concord is that there be a limit to calumnies concerning morals. It is an ancient artifice of Satan to defame the best men so that, since some men are openly evil and others feignedly good, if he also renders those who truly and sincerely cultivate virtue suspect of crimes, no one may be believed to be good, and therefore even to be capable of being good--although, otherwise, this is the greatest consolation of evil men: to carp at the good. Cato pleaded his cause forty-four times and was always acquitted. Pliny, book 7, chapter 28.

Never have so many and such foul kinds of calumnies been heard as in our age concerning Bellarmine, the Pontiff, and our Society. If they are true, grant a trial. With an escort we shall go to Heidelberg, The Hague, or London; let the accuser appear and prove the crime; we ourselves shall surrender ourselves to punishment. That method is necessary and efficacious for concord. For our enemies attempt to defame us so that we will not be heard; for if we are heard, we have conquered. Where is Christian gentleness? Where is justice? Shall I be brought into ill repute not only as an Antichristian on account of religion but also as an adulterer, thief, seditionist, and regicide, and yet, when I offer myself for judgment, not be heard? If you wish to kill me, condemn me after I have been heard, so that you may appear to have expended my blood for the state, not for calumny. You see what natural justice demands.

Your ministers defame not only the doctrine of Catholic doctors but also their life, and beyond the ordinary manner and conspicuously so in the case of the Society. There is no crime of which they do not make us guilty, no punishment which they judge excessive, no hatred of the whole world which is equal to our malice. Now I call God and men to witness: summon us into court, prove the crime; let us be permitted to die as men condemned, if not by law, at least by rite and process. Amid so many men who speak abuse and insults, we seek an accuser. We shall follow his forum; there will be none in which there is not some protection for innocence.

There are Kings and Princes acquainted with our affairs; there are prelates, magnates, nobles, Senators, citizens, craftsmen, servants, so many myriads of young students and men--among them Lutherans and Calvinists, and even Apostates from religion. If our crimes are unknown to them all, although our colleges are open to them, whence are they known to you? If they are known to them, behold: produce the witnesses, join issue, convict us.

It once came into my mind to persuade our Father General that, since so many calumnies against us arise daily, he should arrange for all the diplomas of Emperors, Kings, Princes, Prelates, states, cities, and courts which bear testimony to our innocence to be published--and he would certainly act prudently. For what brow will be so brazen, what face so hard, that if it should see a thousand testimonies of Monarchs, Princes, states, and other magnates on behalf of our innocence--and indeed of those who know us intimately and who have inquired into our affairs and life--it would still dare to calumniate? But let him to whom that duty belongs determine those matters.

Now I wish to be accused. I shall plead my cause from chains, provided that I am admitted to the chains from which I may plead my cause. Peace cannot be made otherwise, unless disgrace is removed from the innocent. For because they know that reputation is more excellent than life, and lest they be compelled to fight and debate, they wish us to be buried by infamy.

You, Most Illustrious Princes, will grant this the more readily because you are either Lutherans or follow the doctrine which they call Reformed--and, if the latter, either that first reformed doctrine or the one most recently adulterated. If you are Lutherans, you ought, if you believe your own people, to judge all Calvinist ministers the worst of calumniators. If you are Reformed, the same judgment must be made concerning the Lutherans. If, therefore, this is the complaint of all your people, admit mine also.

The sixth method of concord is that the impediments peculiar to you be removed. I call those impediments peculiar which inhere in your parties and yet can easily be removed.

The first impediment is the ἀντίληψις [preconception] and preoccupation of prejudgments, which shudders at everything alien. But this can be removed by the variety and altercations of the dissenters, and next by the changes of religions. Your ancestors were all most certain, but nevertheless they changed. After Zwingli was killed, your ministers themselves came into Germany; when the Protestants were defeated, the Lutherans fled into Switzerland and, having become Calvinists, declared that their own Lutherans had deservedly been defeated. Even now, as each prince goes over to a different religion, he draws and draws back a crowd of ministers; and do you believe them to be worshipers of God rather than flatterers of your power? What confidence, therefore, can there be in a cause abandoned so many times, a cause whose defenders stood on the other side?

The second impediment was removed long ago: namely, scandals given and received on both sides. For many years ago Bucer, in his book *On Christian Concord*, enumerated the impediments to his Gospel: the impious life of the Evangelicals. If, therefore, the impiety of the Evangelicals ought to deter us from their fellowship and association, there is no reason why our sins should greatly keep them from the ancient faith, especially since inventions of new heresies are added to malice of morals. “Added to all these things,” says Bucer, page 65, “is the not inconsiderable number of those who withdrew from Papist ceremonies and boast of the Evangelical reformation, and under that pretext and boast began--and today continue to begin--many evil and poisonous heresies and sects, seditions and tumults.”

The third impediment to our coming over to you is that we would become unlike the whole remaining Christian world, and, after abandoning the universal Church, would become like one hidden little part of a single corner. Augustine would then cast against us what he cast against the Donatists, who boasted that the Church had remained in their part alone. But you, O Princes, if you hear your own men, hold a solitary faith. For who holds a Lutheran faith in common with his neighbors? Who maintains the rigid faith together with a portion of the Genevans? All your people create little parts, because they do not hold peace with a part and because they wage wars against the whole. This, therefore, ought to be an incitement to you to join yourselves to the whole body from which you have been torn away.

The fourth impediment enumerated by Bucer is the fear of Catholic prelates lest they fall from their dignities. He judges this to be most grave. But he himself turns this back upon you, O Princes, for you possess more prelacies, and therefore you can fear as much as the Catholics. Yet this impediment too delays no one any longer. Our Prelates are prepared to bargain not only their dignities but even their blood for the faith.

Next, what great evil will befall those who defect from the faith of their fathers? If many and powerful men do it, they will not only retain their wealth but even make it hereditary, for a wife will be added. Nor is it secret what Luther advised Albert of Brandenburg, Archbishop-Elector of Mainz. You will leave their property also to our Canons and parish priests if they come over to you. This impediment, therefore, must be removed from your ministers; you would see hundreds of them migrate to the Catholics in a short time if we possessed the means from which to nourish them with their families.

[Printed page 829]

The fifth impediment is lack of concern for salvation. It is a great impediment, and one by which occupied men excuse themselves. For because nothing better has yet appeared, they remain upon the course which they once undertook--not from knowledge of the good in which they are, but from ignorance of better things.

Nevertheless, there are many things which can move your ministers so that at last they too may undertake concern for their salvation and treat of it with us. First, they have perceived that they possess no foundation upon which to stand. For they cannot rest upon Scripture unless they are most learned in Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Greek; the rest lack an authentic Scripture, as I taught above when I treated of Scripture.

Second, they defend an antiquity which is doubtful. No one follows Luther, no one Calvin, no one anyone else in full; each man is a master to himself. On this account, since it is necessary that they struggle with doubt and suffer torments and lacerations of conscience, they are driven daily toward the truth by great torment. Every fluctuation warns voyagers of danger. And how are the ministers certain, when Luther himself doubted? In the Colloquy of Eisleben, fol. 96, §3: "I often think thus with myself: I almost do not know where I stand and whether I teach the truth or not."

Third, there are two things which especially afflict them and, as though with their necks twisted backward, drag them to the ancient religion; for, placed between the sacrificial knife and the stone, they cannot escape except by the most extraordinary aid. For at every hour they expect a command to change religion. If they vehemently inculcate as Orthodox what the prince now believes, it must soon afterward be changed with greater infamy. If they inculcate it languidly, they will be accused of betrayal. Hence confident speech, and thence despair of permanence--two utterly conflicting evils--devastate the soul, so that for this reason alone they ought to wish to return to the ancient religion, which has remained most constant for one thousand six hundred years.

Finally, unless a determination concerning the true religion is made by mature counsel, great zeal, and genuine sincerity, and a beginning of meeting and hearing is made, perfidy will gradually end in Turkism. The Arians, Samosatrenians, and Ostorodians or Socinians are gaining strength; they deny the merit and divinity of Christ and teach other things which will reconcile them with the Mohammedans more easily than with us. This thought will easily shake out whatever lack of concern, sloth, and negligence inheres in doubtful minds.

Since, therefore, we cannot abandon the Church, go outside, and come over to you, we seek and beseech you with whatever exhortations we can that you instead return to Mother Church and to our brotherhood. But if we do not obtain this, grant at least that you hear our cause and either approve it or understand what ought to be approved.

We venerate Christ alone as true God and Son of God, and his Father and the Holy Spirit. We hold the *αὐτοπιστίαν* [self-authenticity] and authority of Scripture; concerning its meaning we dispute with your people. We teach nothing that is not orthodox. We cannot be condemned unheard. We implore the noble office of the judge; we are prepared to plead our cause under any condition. We both can and will render an account of all things, provided only that the tongue of your ministers--which is our daily furnace--does not occupy minds with prejudice which would otherwise judge justly. We call God and men to witness these things: prepared to prove our cause if we are heard; prepared to die undefended but innocent if we are neglected.

CHAPTER XLV

Severe Punishments Have Been Established for Seditious Persons and Rebellions

[Printed page 829]

It makes a great difference how seditions have been instituted. Sometimes subjects disagree among themselves; sometimes they rise against the magistrate. At times factions remain within words, accusations, and insults; at times their spirits blaze up into fights and killings. It also makes a great difference whether a sedition arises among townsmen or countrymen, or among armed men. For tumults of armed men are not easily restrained without the sword.

Seditions were rare in Roman camps, for reverence for the oath was great. The soldiery stoned the consul Postumius when he denied them the spoils he had promised; under Appius Claudius they refused to conquer. In later ages, when the power of creating magistrates had been transferred to the camps, seditions too migrated there.

The ordinary punishment for seditions was capital, unless mercy dictated that the multitude be spared. Dio Cassius understands this of an atrocious sedition. If it remained within shouting or a light complaint about military service, the offender was cast down from his military rank. If a soldier had grasped the vine-staff, he changed his military service. And indeed the ultimate punishment was decreed for the man who stirred up sedition, even for those who appeal; for deference is not paid to an appeal, but the guilty man is punished at once with the penalty due.

For there are four kinds of crimes of *maiestas*. The first occurs when sovereign power is sought or the person of the prince is attacked; the second, when treason is undertaken; the third, when sedition is instituted; the fourth, when other lighter things are attempted against the prince. Evils permit no delays. Meanwhile all crimes of *maiestas*, either immediately or at least mediately, advance toward disturbing the state. Hence no one is exempted from torture in this cause.

Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian established in Code 9, title 8: "Let absolutely no one upon whom, without our consultation and knowledge, the torments of cords are inflicted be prohibited from employing a defense based on military service, birth, or dignity, with the sole exception of a cause of *maiestas*, in which alone there is an equal condition for all." Given on the eighth day before the Ides of July, Valentinian the Younger and Victor being consuls. Thus Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus were killed by a concourse of men. In the same manner Carbo was killed as though by the state itself.

Houses also are customarily confiscated or demolished. Maelius's house was demolished, and the place is called the Aequimaelium. The house of Saturninus was also destroyed. Not only the houses of those who stirred up sedition, but also those in which forbidden assemblies were held, were destroyed. Sometimes monuments of crimes are set up, as we have seen done at Aachen and Frankfurt.

Canon Law excommunicates seditious persons if, after being admonished, they are unwilling to return to peace, distinction 90, final canon: "It has been reported to the Apostolic See that some of you wish to harm their brethren and contend so that they may fall; that they likewise disagree in the sacraments, and that on this account contentions and rivalries arise among you. We command you to turn away from these dissensions, to agree in all these matters, and mutually to bring aid. For if you quickly neglect to do this and do not strive to be mutually reconciled, do not doubt that you will be driven from the communion of the Apostolic See and of the whole Church."

It forbids them to be initiated into sacred orders, distinction 46, canon 8: "We establish that seditious persons are never to be ordained clerics, just as neither usurers nor avengers of their own injuries are to be ordained." Those already initiated are deprived of their honor, canon *Conspirationum*, cause 11, question 1.

The severity of the punishment is weighed according to the magnitude of the fault and the dignity of the persons. Under the ancient law, the authors of a sedition are either raised upon the fork, thrown to beasts, or deported to an island. In Germany they are cut into four parts and the heart is drawn out while it is still beating. These things must be understood of a sedition truly attempted and accompanied by some act or preparation for acting; for a slip of the tongue must not readily be drawn into punishment. Under Roman law, the man who attempted to stir up sedition was punished with a very heavy fine, not with death; by the first law *On Seditious Persons*, he was prohibited from spectacles. Demetrius the Cynic was relegated to an island by Vespasian because he debated too incautiously concerning the state. A certain Diogenes, who dared the same, was beaten with rods. Crates the Cynic was punished capitally. Dio, *Vespasian*.

But if they attempt it more often, they are struck with the sword. Callistratus, chapter 28, § *solent*, *On Punishments*, book 48, title 19, although at times they were punished with exile and at times by beating with cudgels. The law reads thus: "Certain men who commonly call themselves 'young men' are accustomed in certain cities to accommodate themselves to the turbulent acclamations of the populace. If they have admitted nothing further and have not previously been admonished by the governor, they are dismissed after being beaten with cudgels, or they are even prohibited from spectacles. But if, after being corrected in this manner, they are found in the same offenses, they must be punished with exile, and sometimes capitally--namely, when they have repeatedly conducted themselves seditiously and turbulently and, after being apprehended several times and treated more mildly, have persevered in the same settled rashness."

No different practice was customary among Christians. In the year 788, as Sigebert is the authority, Hardrad and other nobles were put to death by Charlemagne because of sedition. Indeed, Pippin, the son of Charles, was thrust into a monastery, but those who were his instigators in conspiring against his father were subjected to punishments.

[Printed page 830]

Where a multitude has sinned, some part is enveloped in the punishment, yet in such a way that fear reaches all. Julius Caesar composed the soldiery in such a manner that those who had dared were each selected by lot for death. Macrinus likewise decimated them. Thus the punishment reached a few, the fear all.

When Leontius the prefect was being attacked by sedition on account of a charioteer who had committed a crime, he ordered whomever they encountered to be seized and hanged. This is certainly greatly disapproved, since very incautious men, although perhaps not innocent, pay the greatest penalties. Decimation, vicesimation, and centesimation are therefore better and more customary, because with little blood they bring much fear.

When the sole survivor carrying news of the Aeginetan disaster related that all the Athenians had perished, he was pierced by the needles and brooches of the widows whose husbands had perished. The Areopagite Senate afterwards forbade the use of the kind of clothing which they were wearing at that time. They pursued a womanly but malevolent sedition with a civil punishment, and one grave nevertheless in proportion to the frailty of the sex.

The multitude must therefore be spared; the law also indicates this, book 48, title *On Punishments*, law 38: "Deserters to the enemy or revealers of our counsels are either burned alive or suspended upon the fork." And: "The authors of seditions or tumults, when the people have been aroused, are, according to the quality of their dignity, either raised upon the fork, thrown to beasts, or deported to an island."

The Code also looks back to this law, book 9, title 30: "If anyone should perhaps attempt, contrary to the most manifest command, to take up the cause of the plebs and defend it against public discipline, he will sustain a most severe fine." And: "In no places or cities is anyone's insulting interruption to proceed with tumultuous cries, nor are wanton words to be hurled merely to bring anyone into ill repute. Those who utter such voices and stir up tumults are to know that they will by no means obtain the fruit of the things they demand, but will be subjected to those punishments which the most ancient decrees established for the authors of sedition and tumult."

Therefore participants in a sedition must be punished more moderately, but its authors more gravely. When the authors are uncertain, the multitude is punished more lightly. Gaius Curius acted thus, Frontinus, book 4, chapter 1: “When the consul Curio, in the Dardanian War near Dyrrachium, had five legions and one of them, after making a sedition, had refused military service and denied that it would follow the rashness of its commander on a harsh and dangerous expedition, he led out the four armed legions and ordered all of them to stand with weapons drawn as though in battle. After this he ordered the seditious legion to come forward unarmed and, ungirded in the sight of the armed army, compelled it to cut straw. On the following day he likewise compelled the ungirded soldiers to make a ditch; and no entreaties of the legion could obtain from him that he should not lower its standards, abolish its name, and distribute its soldiers as replacements among the remaining legions.”

Those who speak evil of the prince are sometimes tolerated. Modestinus: “The person, namely, must be considered in this crime: whether he was capable of doing it, whether he contemplated it, and whether he was of sound mind; nor must a slip of the tongue readily be drawn into punishment. For although rash men are worthy of punishment, nevertheless they must be spared as though insane, if the offense is not of such a kind that it either descends from the letter of the law or must be judged as an example.”

The edict of Theodosius, Arcadius, and Honorius, Augustuses, Code 9, title 7, is most mild: “If anyone, ignorant of modesty and unacquainted with shame, should believe that our names must be assailed with a wicked and wanton curse, and, turbulent through drunkenness, should become a detractor from our times, we do not wish him to be subjected to punishment or to sustain anything hard or harsh; for if it proceeded from levity, it must be despised; if from madness, it is most worthy of pity; if from injury, it must be remitted. Hence, all things remaining unimpaired, let the matter be referred to our judgment, so that we may weigh men's words from their persons and determine whether they ought to be passed over or investigated.” But if insults of pernicious example, or indeed the beginnings of seditions, should be scattered, that madness must be restrained by grave punishment.

Some princes, however, exercised that inquiry severely. In the time of Tiberius, Paconianus was strangled in prison on account of poems repeatedly made against the prince. Caligula caused many men to be killed who, while flattering him, had called him “the young man of Augusta,” because he judged himself held in contempt. If anyone should seek a catalogue of these matters, the *Lives of the Caesars* will supply it; in them we read of very many punishments for words.

Deservedly and justly, those who speak evil of princes, their revilers, and their mockers are gravely punished. And although it is pious and consonant with divine laws to remit offenses and injuries, and not to punish words with exiles or tortures--and although princes bind themselves with grave crime when they rage rashly against bodies on account of uttered words--nevertheless, at times it is lawful, and indeed necessary, to punish. The following determinations must therefore be made concerning this matter.

FIRST. It is a grave crime to speak evil of the prince, detract from his reputation, disclose hidden sins, exaggerate true things, and fasten falsehoods upon him. Thus the divine oracles: “You shall not speak evil of the gods, and you shall not speak evil of the prince of your people.” Exodus 22:28. And Numbers 12: Miriam, the sister of Moses, is struck with leprosy. “He who was angry departed; the cloud also withdrew which was over the tabernacle; and behold, Miriam appeared white with leprosy like snow. And when Aaron looked upon her and saw her covered with leprosy, he said to Moses: ‘I beseech you, my lord, do not lay this sin upon us, because we have acted foolishly. Let her not become as one dead and as an aborted child which is cast from its mother's womb. Behold, half of her flesh has already been consumed by leprosy.’”

Consider the circumstance and gravity of the sin. Miriam, from rivalry and womanly contention, having drawn Aaron into the cause, spoke against Moses: “Has the Lord spoken only to Moses? Has he not also spoken to us?” Miriam spoke truths, for she was a prophetess and Aaron a prophet; but they owed honor to Moses as the greater. Miriam is punished so severely that leprosy consumes half her flesh. Aaron owed his escape from punishment to the priesthood,

for God did not wish to afflict him with public disgrace as he did Miriam. Had Moses not poured out prayers for his sister, without doubt she would very swiftly have been consumed by leprosy and paid the penalty with death.

[Printed page 831]

SECOND. It is lawful to punish with death those who speak evil of kings. Apostolic Canon 83 is cited: ὅστις ὑβρίσει βασιλέα, ἢ ἄρχοντα τιμωρίαν τινύτω, καὶ εἰ μὲν κληρικὸς καθαιρεῖσθω, εἰ δὲ λαϊκὸς ἀφοριζέσθω, “If anyone should insult a king or prince, let him pay the penalties; if indeed he is a cleric, let him be deposed; if a layman, let him be deprived of communion.” This Canon, I say, does not decree death, but deposition and excommunication; therefore some do not correctly translate τιμωρίαν as “capital punishment.”

The Greeks had a law that those who spoke evil should be led into chains. With that custom observed, the Triumvirs cast the poet Naevius into prison. Gellius, book 3, chapter 3. Dio relates that all injuries committed against the prince were judged to be impiety. Paconius was strangled in prison because of poems published against the prince. Therefore the offense is not simply remitted; rather, the evaluation belongs to the prince, so that he may weigh men's words from their persons and decide whether they ought to be passed over or investigated.

Certainly evil words against a magistrate have always been regarded among crimes of *maiestas*, and at times they are exceedingly injurious and seditious alike. When, therefore, the magistrate, who is the vicar of God, is affected with ignominy, he can avenge the public injury. When incitements to tumults arise from evil words, he cannot neglect his reputation, since the safety of his subjects rests upon it. The reason is that a man gravely harms the state when he detracts authority from its head and makes contemptible or hated the man whom all ought to reverence in the place of God. For all these things are incitements to seditions and secessions.

It is not lawful to rage against the friends and children of conspirators, for this is forbidden by divine law, Deuteronomy 24:16 and 4 Kings 14:6: “And when Amaziah had obtained the kingdom, he struck his servants who had killed the king his father; but he did not kill the sons of those who had killed him.”

In Persia, therefore, the custom was cruel and unjust whereby the children and wives--and even the households--of those who had attempted something against the king were killed. Justin, book 10; Plutarch, *Artaxerxes*. The greater part of the kings of Israel did the same, destroying the entire household of their predecessors lest some avenger arise. The same law existed among the Macedonians, as Curtius relates in book 6. It was a wicked and dangerous law, for no equity permits an entire household to perish for the offense of one man. But who cannot infer how great a danger to kings was created from it, when for the sake of one assailant many brave men attempted everything, shaking off their danger by flight, killing, and treason? Hence the continual killings of kings, despite the severity of the law.

Archelaus killed Alcetas with his son Alexander; he himself was killed by a young man whom he had mocked. Orestes, Archelaus, and Pausanias followed; after they had been extinguished within a very short interval, the kingdom again devolved upon Amyntas. His son Alexander was killed by the man of Alorus, and the man of Alorus by Perdiccas. Finally, on the occasion of this law, the whole progeny of Alexander was killed. For Cassander killed Olympias, Alexander's mother; Roxana, Alexander's wife, with her son Alexander; and Barsine, his other wife, with her son Hercules. Demades the orator was also killed by Antipater after his son had first been slaughtered in his embrace. Yet nothing was effected by such cruelty. The son Antipater killed his mother; Alexander, the other son, killed his brother Antipater; Demetrius killed Alexander. At almost the same time the stock of Alexander was removed by Cassander and the stock of Cassander by his rivals, and on each side rage was directed against the women.

The clemency of King Mithridates was praised: after he had exacted punishment from Attilius the plotter and from the conspirators, he dismissed the servants because they had offended not voluntarily but under unhappy necessity.

On this matter there exist laws of Arcadius and Honorius which are mild and consonant with equity, Code 9, title 8, *On the Julian Law of Maiestas*: “Whoever shall enter into a criminal faction with soldiers, private persons, or barbarians, or shall accept or administer the oath of that faction, and shall even plot against illustrious men who take part in our

councils and consistory, against senators also--for they too are a part of our body--or, finally, against any man who serves us: since the laws have willed that the intention of a crime be punished with the same severity as its accomplishment, he himself, as guilty of *maiestas*, shall be struck with the sword, all his goods being assigned to our treasury.

“But his sons, to whom by special imperial mildness we concede life--for they ought to perish by their father's punishment, since in them examples of the paternal, that is, hereditary, crime are feared--shall be excluded from the inheritance and succession of their mother or grandmother and of all their nearest kin; they shall take nothing under the wills of outsiders; they shall be perpetually needy and poor; their father's infamy shall always accompany them; they shall attain absolutely no honors and no oaths of service. Finally, they shall be such that, while they are defiled by perpetual want, death shall be a consolation to them and life a punishment. Finally, we command that those who ever attempt to intervene with us on behalf of such persons shall themselves be marked without pardon.

“But to their daughters, however many in number they may be, we will that only the Falcidian fourth from the goods of their mother--whether she dies testate or intestate--shall come, so that the daughters may possess moderate support rather than the whole advantage and name of an heir. For the sentence ought to be milder toward those whom, on account of the weakness of their sex, we trust will dare less. Emancipations, moreover, which shall have been conferred by the aforesaid persons--whether upon sons, but only after the law was promulgated, or upon daughters--shall not be valid. Dowries, gifts, and, finally, alienations of any property whatsoever which it is established were made by any fraud or law from the time when the aforementioned persons first contemplated entering into a faction and association, we establish to be of no force.

“The wives of the aforesaid persons, after recovering their dowry, if they shall have been in that condition in which they are obliged to preserve for their children the things which they received from their husbands under the title of gift, shall know that, at the time when the usufruct is extinguished, they will leave to our treasury all those things which according to law were owed to the children; and from these goods also the Falcidian fourth shall be deemed assigned to the daughters only, not to the sons. What we have provided concerning the aforesaid persons and their sons, we judge with similar severity concerning their attendants, accomplices, and ministers and their sons.

“But if any one of these men, at the beginning of the faction that has been entered into, inflamed by zeal for true praise, shall betray the faction that was entered into, he shall be gifted by us with both reward and honor. But the man who shall have made use of the faction, if--even late, yet while it is still unknown--he shall disclose the secrets of its counsels, shall be regarded as worthy only of absolution and pardon.” In these provisions many special measures are established for averting the crime.

If anyone violates the prince or a subordinate magistrate--whether a proconsul, the prince's vicar, or a son designated as successor--the same crime of *maiestas* is committed. For when it is said that this crime is committed if anyone violates a magistrate of the Roman people, this is not understood of the consuls or Augustus alone. Indeed, if anyone beats the attendants of a magistrate, he is customarily punished capitally; this, however, must be understood when they are exercising the function of their office.

Otherwise, those who opposed the attendants and prefects of Nero or Gaius when they prowled by night were certainly not guilty of *maiestas*, since not the citizens themselves but the intimates of the princes were stirring up seditions and disturbances. Nor do the sacred Canons punish as assailants of clerics those who restrain clerics while they run about by night in secular dress. It has expressly been said that, if an inferior magistrate is discharging his office, the man who opposes him is regarded as seditious or as a disturber, but not if he is doing other things. At Rome a prostitute was acquitted who shut out an Aedile while he was reveling and wounded him with the blow of a stone when he attempted to break in by force.

CHAPTER XLVI

A Good Citizen Should Sometimes Join One Party, and Sometimes Neither

[Printed page 832]

The law of Solon has been discussed by many; Gellius relates it: “If, because of discord and dissension, a sedition and division of the people into two parties should occur, and if on that account, their spirits being inflamed, arms should be taken up on both sides and fighting should occur, then whoever at that time and in that case of civil discord has not joined himself to either party, but, solitary and separated, has withdrawn from the common evil of the city, let him be deprived of his home, his native country, and all his fortunes; let him be an exile and an outcast.” Others believe entirely the contrary: that in civil wars and sedition one should withdraw from disturbances.

In this difficult matter, which nevertheless often occurs in practice, it seems to me that a distinction must be employed: a distinction of persons and controversies, which must be discussed individually.

Sometimes seditions are stirred up in such a manner that it is doubtful which party fosters the legitimate cause. The people secede and free those bound for debt, but they have been stirred up by the patricians contrary to law and covenants. There was a long controversy concerning the war of Caesar and Pompey. “The victorious cause pleased the gods, but the defeated cause pleased Cato.” Accordingly, a man defends himself by a great judge, and even under the reign of the Caesars later generations were Pompeians:

Still Magnus goes, an exile, with peoples accompanying him;

let the world adore Pompey's adversity as much as his prosperity.

In this controversy, therefore, it was prudent to be absent from the disturbances. Pomponius Atticus acted thus, more illustrious for his friendship with Cicero than for any other thing. The reason is at hand. For when a war is of doubtful justice, it is not lawful for a free man to enroll in it unless he judges the cause of one party to be just. This is permitted much less in a sedition and civil war, for it is more atrocious to oppress citizens than foreigners. Atticus therefore acted rightly.

Justus Lipsius is almost of the same opinion, century 2, Letter 24. But he says that he does not involve himself, yet he does not define the matter. In book 6 of the *Politics*, chapter 7, he also employs a distinction. Therefore, although every war is sorrowful, and civil war especially, nevertheless at times it must be waged through necessity. Yet civil war must be avoided more than foreign war because it is more cruel.

I demonstrated this at the beginning. Now I am pleased to confirm it by Augustine's testimony, so that it may appear how rightly those men judge who flee civil war while they can. Augustine, book 3 of *The City of God*, chapter 23:

“But now let us recall briefly, so far as we can, those evils which, the more internal they were, the more wretched they proved to be: civil--or rather uncivil--discords; and no longer seditions, but even actual urban wars, where so much blood was poured out; where the zeal of parties raged against one another, no longer through the dissensions of contentions and diverse voices, but now plainly with iron and arms. How much Roman blood did the Social Wars, the Servile Wars, and the Civil Wars pour out? How great a devastation and desolation of Italy did they produce?

“For before allied Latium moved itself against Rome, all animals subject to human uses--dogs, horses, asses, oxen, and whatever other cattle were under human dominion--suddenly became wild and, forgetting their domestic gentleness, left their shelters and wandered free. They shunned every approach not only of other men but even of their masters, not without the death or danger of the man who dared, if anyone pressed them from close at hand. Of how great an evil

was this a sign? And if this was a sign, how great an evil was that of which this was the sign? If this had occurred in our times, we would have suffered these men as more rabid than those men suffered their animals.”

It is by no means the part of a good citizen to stir up or assist such great evils in a doubtful cause. So many fell in the war of Marius and Sulla, so many in peace, and yet it is still disputed whose cause was more just. The aristocrats defend Sulla, the plebs Marius; both parties detest the cruelty of each, and they mourn the deaths of their own people.

It is also the part of a good man to abstain from civil controversies, although he perceives the just cause of one party, if the other party maintains an unjust cause but itself probably judges that cause to be just, and if he sees that the victory will be very bloody and the disaster greater than the offense--a thing ordinary in civil wars. Therefore, although Sulla defended a just cause--let us grant that this was so--nevertheless good men who approved the victory shuddered at the cruelty. A man is not bound to fight in Sulla's camp, nor to promote a victory whose companion is such great cruelty and a greater evil than the war itself. For since the Marians judged that they were properly conducting the public cause, they must not be destroyed by such great slaughter that scarcely any remain over whom the Sullans may rule.

In this affair a man can indeed abstain, but he is not bound to abstain, because he can assist the legitimate cause. But if he is in a magistracy, if he will bring great weight to the victory, and if he observes that Marius will use victory cruelly, he ought not to withdraw assistance from the just cause. Therefore, if Atticus judged the Pompeian party to be the Roman and just party, he ought to have joined Pompey; if he doubted, neither party.

If one party openly maintains a wicked cause, either by protecting wicked men and robbers or by oppressing good men, so that they themselves confess that they do not act without crime, it is the part of a good man to join the upright party and the just cause; and, if called by his native country, to fight, although he sees that the outcomes of victory will be most sorrowful and cruel.

When the children of Israel had decreed war against the tribe of Benjamin, Judges 20, they ordered the men of Gibeah who had perpetrated that evil to be handed over to them. After they had conquered, they killed the inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead because they had not been present at the war. For at Mizpah they had bound themselves by a great oath to kill those who were absent. The cause of the civil war was that the Benjaminites were unwilling to surrender the wicked men for punishment. All were compelled to the war under penalty of death. They killed all the citizens of Jabesh-Gilead, chapter 21:10: “They therefore sent ten thousand of their strongest men and commanded them: ‘Go and strike the inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead with the edge of the sword, both their wives and their little children.’”

Indeed, they killed all the Benjaminites, together with wives, little children, women, and beasts, chapter 20. Although, therefore, the victory was most sorrowful--and, unless God, who had determined to punish the crimes of the Benjaminites, had commanded it, most cruel--nevertheless no one could be absent from the civil war, because they punished the delayers and those who refused service in the same manner as the guilty. Moreover, those who willingly and knowingly maintain an impious cause through wickedness and injustice will deservedly impute to themselves all the cruelty of the victory.

When causes for sedition exist on both sides, as in the Roman state--for example, the importunity of moneylenders and the obstinacy of the plebs demanding new account-books--although it is established on which side justice stands, it is nevertheless the part of a good man, so far as can be done, to join neither party, but to attempt peace and, as long as it is hoped for, to bring all assistance to that end. For peace is better than any war and any victory, since in civil war the victory is more miserable than the war.

[Printed page 833]

If peace is despaired of, one must go over to those who maintain the right. But when the causes of seditions are exceedingly slight--such as some which we enumerated above--it is not necessary for anyone to join himself to the just cause, provided that he does not maintain the unjust cause. For to stir up sedition and begin a civil war for a slight cause is unjust. Then, however, a powerful citizen is bound to compel the parties to concord and to effect peace, and to

take up arms against those who refuse to accede to equity and concord. For if honorable men, exasperated by a slight cause, should attempt a duel and eagerly seek mutual wounds, a prince can compel them to peace, and so too can their native country, so that he who obstinately resists is judged to have lost his cause. For it is unjust to ruin one's native country on account of insignificant trifles.

If there is a rebellion of one party against the prince or magistrate, or if treason is under consideration, one ought to join oneself to the magistrate and, each according to his ability, defend him by every means possible--by counsel, aid, and hand. For the man who does not come to the prince's aid in necessity, but deserts him until he sees where the affair tends, is judged a traitor to the prince. Mettius Fufetius, prince of the Latins, did this when he deserted Tullus in the midst of the battle-line.

In this case Solon's judgment is most true. For who would not judge worthy of every punishment the man who would not assist David against his son Absalom or against Sheba? It is plainly necessary for the members to expend their labor in defense of the head, for all have sworn to the defense of the prince. But each does this according to his ability: by zeal, contribution, fighting, and other means by which the life of the Prince may be provided for.

But if subjects rise against the magistrate, many against a few, so that scarcely any hope exists that the better cause will be victorious--indeed, if the just party in the state fights against the unjust party in such a manner that it seems scarcely able to defend itself--a great difficulty arises. No one can join himself to the unjust party; adherence to the upright party carries a risk to life and fortunes. Therefore they ought not to assist the stronger, by whom they would be stained with the same crime, and they are unwilling to aid the weaker.

In this cause I judge thus. If there is someone who by his prudence, strength, and wealth can raise up the just party and obtain hope of victory, he ought to expend himself and his possessions upon liberating and establishing the state. Jehoiada acted thus: when he now hoped that he would be a match, he opposed Athaliah at immense peril and raised Joash to the kingdom. But as long as hope of victory does not yet appear, he will foster justice by counsel, admonitions, secret plans, and assistance, until there is hope that the just cause will triumph. Jehoiada did this same thing while he secretly reared the royal boy and prepared strength and men for him.

But if someone is a private man and cannot bring any weight to the relief of the state, he will not be bound to expose his fortunes and life to his enemies without any hope of public advantage. He will therefore remain quiet and foster the oppressed by prayers and secret assistance. For if he adds himself to the oppressed, he too will be oppressed; his wealth and capacity to assist will be taken away; and by this means the just party will be weaker and the unjust stronger.

This was done by many in the royal city of Aachen. Seditious men and rebels, through supreme wickedness, deprived the magistrate of authority; they were as contumacious against the Emperor's commands as they were injurious toward the magistrate. But in domestic and foreign strength they far surpassed those who followed the just cause, and the grave oppression of all good men endured for more than twenty years. If anyone sent forth a free voice, calumnies, insults, prisons, exiles, and proscription were immediately before his eyes. At last the state was recovered by patience and the secret assistance of certain men and by the brave constancy of others. This could not have occurred if the weaker and fewer men had at the beginning opposed the stronger and more numerous with armed force; for in the first conflict they would all have been slaughtered.

When matters stand thus in a state--that civil war is being waged and the justice of one party is established--it is almost always prudent to join that party. For the man who stands in the middle offends both parties. They judge themselves injured by him: they themselves defend the state at the peril of all their possessions, while those who maintain the middle neither undertake labors for the common good nor wish to make expenditures. Hence during the war they are prey to both parties, for each battle-line demands assistance from them as citizens for the defense of the city; after the victory they are victims of the victor.

Pomponius Atticus remained quiet while Caesar and Pompey fought; nevertheless, he felt the same losses of fortune as others. Had Pompey been victor, Atticus would not have been in a better condition than Cicero and the others who were in Pompey's camp. Cicero, book 11, Letter 6 to Atticus: "I have never regretted that I departed from arms. There was such great cruelty among them and such great alliance with barbarous nations that a proscription was framed not by name but generally; so that it had already been determined by the judgment of all that the goods of all of you would be the spoil of that victory. I say 'of you' without qualification, for they never thought of you yourself except most cruelly. Therefore I shall never regret my intention; I regret my counsel."

When one party has been defeated in civil disaster, it is better for the remnants to defend themselves than to yield suddenly. Accordingly, Cato renewed the war in Africa--not indeed in hope of victory, but, as others judged, in hope of a settlement. Cicero, book 11, Letter 12 to Atticus: "But, as I see, we must labor much more concerning Africa, which you write is daily being strengthened more in hope of terms than of victory." For in truth the new war in Africa and Spain mitigated Caesar's victory, lest he render himself more hated.

For what Caesar's disposition was, Caelius the Caesarian sufficiently indicates to Cicero, Letter 11, book 10 to Atticus: "If you judge that Caesar's method in dismissing adversaries and offering terms will be the same, you err. He thinks and even speaks of nothing except what is atrocious and savage. He departed angry with the Senate. He has clearly been provoked by these intercessions. By Hercules, there will be no place for entreaty. Therefore remain there if your only son, if your household, if your remaining hopes are dear to you; if we are of any value with you, if your son-in-law, that excellent man, is of any value. You ought not to wish to disturb their fortune so that we may be compelled either to hate or abandon that cause in whose victory our safety lies, or to entertain an impious desire against your safety."

If he had not feared the Spanish and African war, he would have exhibited himself in victory as the man whom Caelius depicts. And certainly he soon exhibited himself as proud and insulting toward all; nothing was lacking beyond cruelty arising from pride and suspicion.

When civil wars have blazed up to such a point that barbarous nations are called to assistance with great danger, I judge that it is the part of a good man even to desert a just cause rather than assist those who summon barbarians. Cicero again did so, and gives his reason in Letter 7, book 11 to Atticus:

[Printed page 834]

"But of all things nothing is nevertheless more regretted than that I did not go to Africa. I employed this judgment: that the state ought not to be defended by the barbarian auxiliaries of a most deceitful nation, especially against an army often victorious. Perhaps they do not approve. For I hear that many good men have come to Africa, and I know that they were there previously. I am greatly pressed at this point. Here too there is need of fortune, that there may be some among them--or, if possible, all--who prefer safety. For if they persevere and prevail, you see what will become of us."

Therefore the Greek emperors who summoned the Turks to their aid against their rebels deservedly lost the empire. It is certainly better that some state should exist, even one belonging to adversaries, than that none should exist. At times fear, at times ambition, impels great men to those counsels: fear impelled Boniface; ambition impelled Rufinus, Stilicho, and others. Nor are examples among our own people lacking. Part of Hungary perished thus, and many have experienced this evil.

The Belgian rebels were indeed twice in the utmost danger of servitude: first when they summoned Alençon, then Leicester. The latter began to betray their liberty to the English, the former to the French. For this reason wiser statesmen soon turned themselves to every means of expelling both--Alençon by arms, Leicester by artifice; and if Leicester had not yielded, he would have felt their arms. But I do not speak of foreigners of every kind, but of barbarians, such as Turks, Tartars, and others, and of those equal to them in perfidy, impiety, and savagery. But now let us proceed to wars.