

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

BY A PROTESTANT THEOLOGIAN.
COCCHIO.

I remember that at the time of the Vatican Council, one of its German opponents (I am reasonably sure that it was Dr. Dollinger himself) speaking of St. Charles Borromeo as having held the thesis that it was lawful to kill a proclaimed heretic at sight, sarcastically remarks that in Italy they keep this fact concerning St. Charles well in the background, for that otherwise the question would force itself on men's minds, Ought Charles Borromeo ever to have been canonized?

On the other hand, Bishop Hurst, of the Methodist church, in his exceedingly genial article on the Counter Reformation, published in the Methodist Review not long before his death, while assuming the truth of this statement concerning St. Charles, does not find himself at all embarrassed by it in treating the great Archbishop as an eminently holy Christian, the worthy successor of St. Ambrose. He held this opinion, remarks Hurst, but he never refused it to practice.

The Bishop thought very much in agreement with my Irish Calvinistic teacher in theology, Dr. John Morgan of Oberlin. I was once lamenting to him the policy of persecution (not, however, extending to death) which the Archbishop is said to have exercised to some extent in some of the mountain districts of his diocese, where the influence of Geneva had made itself felt. "Ah, well!" lightly answered Dr. Morgan, "that does not signify much in the sixteenth century, when the relations of the two religions were so strained, and when almost everybody thought it a right and a duty to persecute heresy."

The Bishop and the Professor undoubtedly held a sounder view than the great old Catholic scholar. Not that Dollinger was a narrow-minded man, but that his view of things was distorted by the bitterness of immediate controversy, which we, after four centuries, ought to have passed beyond.

Froude is sounder here than Dollinger, and than those English Catholics who have been lately declaring that if this accusation could be proved against St. Charles, he ought to be deposed from the altars. He ought to be nothing of the kind. This talk appears to me to be mere hysterical silliness, whether applied to St. Charles Borromeo or to St. Pius V. The Catholics ever fall into such a fit of iconoclastic insanity, let them make over the statues of these two godly men to us, and we will find a place of honor for them in some Protestant church.

I should say this even if it were true that Pius planned to murder Elizabeth, and even if Charles not only held that a heretic might be shot at sight, but had even had some Protestants shot at sight. Happily neither charge is true. We have seen it disproved as concerns the Pope, and we shall soon see it disproved as concerns the Archbishop. His exculpation involves that of his uncle, Pius IV., who, however, not having been canonized, engages attention less.

Froude remarks that in the sixteenth century assassination was a weapon freely used by all parties, religious or political, against all. Excepting, of course, some peculiarly excited and dispassionate intelligences, the difference between a good man and a bad was not that either abhorred assassination, but that the good man did, and the bad man did not, abhor it except when used for some great public end.

Therefore Froude refuses, and I think justly, to declare John Knox a bad man because he applauded the murder of Cardinal Beaton, and of David Rizzio, or Philip II. because he procured the death of William of Orange. Each man viewed the deaths as serving a great public end, and, therefore, those who now agree, whether with Knox or with Philip, in applauding the end, ought not to be damned from rendering him honor because he used means which would now be rightly detested, but which then were freely used even by virtuous men. Therefore I view the recent protest of a Scotch priest against honor shown by a Presbyterian judge to the memory of Knox as wholly unwarranted. Nor can reasonable men fully sympathize (as an Independent article has justly observed) with Motley's extreme indignation over Philip's policy in the Netherlands, including the death of William the Silent. Were Knox or Philip living now, and found to abet religious assassination, we ought to abominate them. But they are not living now, and in order to try them, we are bound to go back to them. If we can not do this, it behooves us to hold our peace.

In the Middle Ages, as we know, a proclaimed traitor was not uncommonly declared *vogelfrei*, "free as a bird." After this any one who met him could slay him without blame. Luther applies this even to a sovereign who has been declared a tyrant by his Estates, and who attempts to resume his power. Now, in Western Europe, which then rested wholly upon the Catholic religion, heresy was of course the highest form of treason. Therefore, had Charles Borromeo retained this view of public right, it would not have proved that he was not a holy man, and worthy of canonization, but only, as Urban VIII. thought of St. Pius V., that the Middle Ages lingered somewhat too long with him.

However, it appears that the whole evidence concerning St. Charles and his uncle Pius IV. is this. The magistrates of Lucre had passed some ordinances forbidding the importation of Protestant books, the infraction of which naturally implied that the offenders would fall liable to the Inquisition. St. Charles, in his uncle's name, writes to express the Pope's gratification at the zeal of the Lucchese Signoria against the contagion of heresy.

Of course there is nothing in all this to reflect upon the memory of the Pope or his saintly nephew. It happened, however, that some five days before the date of the Cardinal's letter, the Lucchese magistracy had sent a message to certain Protestants of Lucre, who had fled to France, and were there very busy in propagating the new religion, admonishing them, I think within two months, to withdraw into some Protestant territory, on pain, if they still went on proselytizing in France, of being liable to be brought back to Lucre "dead or alive," with a reward offered to any who should bring them in, or failing to capture them, their dead bodies.

Surely this is an ordinance very far indeed from a license "to shoot down heretics at sight." The offenders are allowed ample time to wind up their affairs in France and to withdraw within the territories of their own religion. So long as they remain on Protestant ground, it is implied, their own government will leave them unmolested. Should they be obstinate, they are warned that they will be liable to capture, or resisting capture to the last extremity.

Considering Italian abhorrence of heresy, and the despotic authority and summary processes of the governments of those days, it would be hard to imagine an edict more indulgently considerate.

Therefore, had St. Charles meant to express approbation of this decree of Lucre, he would have refuted no discredit, even from our present point of view, either on himself or on the Pope. The Lucchese Signoria is very much milder in their ordinance than a British Viceroy in India, when he sometimes proclaims a reward for the bringing in of a notorious bandit "alive or dead." Yet Queen Victoria and her son have not yet been declared by anybody on this account "accessories to assassination."

However, St. Charles is probably referring only to the ordinance concerning the importation of books. The other had just been passed, and in the imperfect travel of those times could hardly have reached Rome and brought out an answer from the Pope in five days, not to say that Cardinalistic dignity, where, as here, there is no urgent reason, hardly allows of so precipitate a reply.

The charge therefore that St. Charles Borromeo approved of "shooting down heretics at sight" appears to evaporate into exceedingly thin air. However, with a good hearty Protestant ill-will, and the application of Luther's prescription of "edifying and salutary lies," less evidence than this might have sustained a graver charge.

The Republican correspondent gives it as a distinguishing mark of his "few persons at Rome" that they "protected assassination." So then, it seems, it was by Papal license that Knox, Melancthon, Baza, Coligny, and the whole body of the Huguenots, always excepting the noble-minded Du Plessis Mornay, perpetrated, or promoted, or prayed for, or gave solemn and public thanks over religious assassinations.

CHARLES C. STARBUCK.
Andover, Mass.

THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

BY A PROTESTANT THEOLOGIAN.
COCCHIO.

I remember that at the time of the Vatican Council, one of its German opponents (I am reasonably sure that it was Dr. Dollinger himself) speaking of St. Charles Borromeo as having held the thesis that it was lawful to kill a proclaimed heretic at sight, sarcastically remarks that in Italy they keep this fact concerning St. Charles well in the background, for that otherwise the question would force itself on men's minds, Ought Charles Borromeo ever to have been canonized?

On the other hand, Bishop Hurst, of the Methodist church, in his exceedingly genial article on the Counter Reformation, published in the Methodist Review not long before his death, while assuming the truth of this statement concerning St. Charles, does not find himself at all embarrassed by it in treating the great Archbishop as an eminently holy Christian, the worthy successor of St. Ambrose. He held this opinion, remarks Hurst, but he never refused it to practice.

The Bishop thought very much in agreement with my Irish Calvinistic teacher in theology, Dr. John Morgan of Oberlin. I was once lamenting to him the policy of persecution (not, however, extending to death) which the Archbishop is said to have exercised to some extent in some of the mountain districts of his diocese, where the influence of Geneva had made itself felt. "Ah, well!" lightly answered Dr. Morgan, "that does not signify much in the sixteenth century, when the relations of the two religions were so strained, and when almost everybody thought it a right and a duty to persecute heresy."

The Bishop and the Professor undoubtedly held a sounder view than the great old Catholic scholar. Not that Dollinger was a narrow-minded man, but that his view of things was distorted by the bitterness of immediate controversy, which we, after four centuries, ought to have passed beyond.

Froude is sounder here than Dollinger, and than those English Catholics who have been lately declaring that if this accusation could be proved against St. Charles, he ought to be deposed from the altars. He ought to be nothing of the kind. This talk appears to me to be mere hysterical silliness, whether applied to St. Charles Borromeo or to St. Pius V. The Catholics ever fall into such a fit of iconoclastic insanity, let them make over the statues of these two godly men to us, and we will find a place of honor for them in some Protestant church.

I should say this even if it were true that Pius planned to murder Elizabeth, and even if Charles not only held that a heretic might be shot at sight, but had even had some Protestants shot at sight. Happily neither charge is true. We have seen it disproved as concerns the Pope, and we shall soon see it disproved as concerns the Archbishop. His exculpation involves that of his uncle, Pius IV., who, however, not having been canonized, engages attention less.

Froude remarks that in the sixteenth century assassination was a weapon freely used by all parties, religious or political, against all. Excepting, of course, some peculiarly excited and dispassionate intelligences, the difference between a good man and a bad was not that either abhorred assassination, but that the good man did, and the bad man did not, abhor it except when used for some great public end.

Therefore Froude refuses, and I think justly, to declare John Knox a bad man because he applauded the murder of Cardinal Beaton, and of David Rizzio, or Philip II. because he procured the death of William of Orange. Each man viewed the deaths as serving a great public end, and, therefore, those who now agree, whether with Knox or with Philip, in applauding the end, ought not to be damned from rendering him honor because he used means which would now be rightly detested, but which then were freely used even by virtuous men. Therefore I view the recent protest of a Scotch priest against honor shown by a Presbyterian judge to the memory of Knox as wholly unwarranted. Nor can reasonable men fully sympathize (as an Independent article has justly observed) with Motley's extreme indignation over Philip's policy in the Netherlands, including the death of William the Silent. Were Knox or Philip living now, and found to abet religious assassination, we ought to abominate them. But they are not living now, and in order to try them, we are bound to go back to them. If we can not do this, it behooves us to hold our peace.

In the Middle Ages, as we know, a proclaimed traitor was not uncommonly declared *vogelfrei*, "free as a bird." After this any one who met him could slay him without blame. Luther applies this even to a sovereign who has been declared a tyrant by his Estates, and who attempts to resume his power. Now, in Western Europe, which then rested wholly upon the Catholic religion, heresy was of course the highest form of treason. Therefore, had Charles Borromeo retained this view of public right, it would not have proved that he was not a holy man, and worthy of canonization, but only, as Urban VIII. thought of St. Pius V., that the Middle Ages lingered somewhat too long with him.

However, it appears that the whole evidence concerning St. Charles and his uncle Pius IV. is this. The magistrates of Lucre had passed some ordinances forbidding the importation of Protestant books, the infraction of which naturally implied that the offenders would fall liable to the Inquisition. St. Charles, in his uncle's name, writes to express the Pope's gratification at the zeal of the Lucchese Signoria against the contagion of heresy.

Of course there is nothing in all this to reflect upon the memory of the Pope or his saintly nephew. It happened, however, that some five days before the date of the Cardinal's letter, the Lucchese magistracy had sent a message to certain Protestants of Lucre, who had fled to France, and were there very busy in propagating the new religion, admonishing them, I think within two months, to withdraw into some Protestant territory, on pain, if they still went on proselytizing in France, of being liable to be brought back to Lucre "dead or alive," with a reward offered to any who should bring them in, or failing to capture them, their dead bodies.

Surely this is an ordinance very far indeed from a license "to shoot down heretics at sight." The offenders are allowed ample time to wind up their affairs in France and to withdraw within the territories of their own religion. So long as they remain on Protestant ground, it is implied, their own government will leave them unmolested. Should they be obstinate, they are warned that they will be liable to capture, or resisting capture to the last extremity.

Considering Italian abhorrence of heresy, and the despotic authority and summary processes of the governments of those days, it would be hard to imagine an edict more indulgently considerate.

Therefore, had St. Charles meant to express approbation of this decree of Lucre, he would have refuted no discredit, even from our present point of view, either on himself or on the Pope. The Lucchese Signoria is very much milder in their ordinance than a British Viceroy in India, when he sometimes proclaims a reward for the bringing in of a notorious bandit "alive or dead." Yet Queen Victoria and her son have not yet been declared by anybody on this account "accessories to assassination."

However, St. Charles is probably referring only to the ordinance concerning the importation of books. The other had just been passed, and in the imperfect travel of those times could hardly have reached Rome and brought out an answer from the Pope in five days, not to say that Cardinalistic dignity, where, as here, there is no urgent reason, hardly allows of so precipitate a reply.

The charge therefore that St. Charles Borromeo approved of "shooting down heretics at sight" appears to evaporate into exceedingly thin air. However, with a good hearty Protestant ill-will, and the application of Luther's prescription of "edifying and salutary lies," less evidence than this might have sustained a graver charge.

The Republican correspondent gives it as a distinguishing mark of his "few persons at Rome" that they "protected assassination." So then, it seems, it was by Papal license that Knox, Melancthon, Baza, Coligny, and the whole body of the Huguenots, always excepting the noble-minded Du Plessis Mornay, perpetrated, or promoted, or prayed for, or gave solemn and public thanks over religious assassinations.

CHARLES C. STARBUCK.
Andover, Mass.

THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

BY A PROTESTANT THEOLOGIAN.
COCCHIO.

I remember that at the time of the Vatican Council, one of its German opponents (I am reasonably sure that it was Dr. Dollinger himself) speaking of St. Charles Borromeo as having held the thesis that it was lawful to kill a proclaimed heretic at sight, sarcastically remarks that in Italy they keep this fact concerning St. Charles well in the background, for that otherwise the question would force itself on men's minds, Ought Charles Borromeo ever to have been canonized?

On the other hand, Bishop Hurst, of the Methodist church, in his exceedingly genial article on the Counter Reformation, published in the Methodist Review not long before his death, while assuming the truth of this statement concerning St. Charles, does not find himself at all embarrassed by it in treating the great Archbishop as an eminently holy Christian, the worthy successor of St. Ambrose. He held this opinion, remarks Hurst, but he never refused it to practice.

The Bishop thought very much in agreement with my Irish Calvinistic teacher in theology, Dr. John Morgan of Oberlin. I was once lamenting to him the policy of persecution (not, however, extending to death) which the Archbishop is said to have exercised to some extent in some of the mountain districts of his diocese, where the influence of Geneva had made itself felt. "Ah, well!" lightly answered Dr. Morgan, "that does not signify much in the sixteenth century, when the relations of the two religions were so strained, and when almost everybody thought it a right and a duty to persecute heresy."

The Bishop and the Professor undoubtedly held a sounder view than the great old Catholic scholar. Not that Dollinger was a narrow-minded man, but that his view of things was distorted by the bitterness of immediate controversy, which we, after four centuries, ought to have passed beyond.

Froude is sounder here than Dollinger, and than those English Catholics who have been lately declaring that if this accusation could be proved against St. Charles, he ought to be deposed from the altars. He ought to be nothing of the kind. This talk appears to me to be mere hysterical silliness, whether applied to St. Charles Borromeo or to St. Pius V. The Catholics ever fall into such a fit of iconoclastic insanity, let them make over the statues of these two godly men to us, and we will find a place of honor for them in some Protestant church.

I should say this even if it were true that Pius planned to murder Elizabeth, and even if Charles not only held that a heretic might be shot at sight, but had even had some Protestants shot at sight. Happily neither charge is true. We have seen it disproved as concerns the Pope, and we shall soon see it disproved as concerns the Archbishop. His exculpation involves that of his uncle, Pius IV., who, however, not having been canonized, engages attention less.

Froude remarks that in the sixteenth century assassination was a weapon freely used by all parties, religious or political, against all. Excepting, of course, some peculiarly excited and dispassionate intelligences, the difference between a good man and a bad was not that either abhorred assassination, but that the good man did, and the bad man did not, abhor it except when used for some great public end.

Therefore Froude refuses, and I think justly, to declare John Knox a bad man because he applauded the murder of Cardinal Beaton, and of David Rizzio, or Philip II. because he procured the death of William of Orange. Each man viewed the deaths as serving a great public end, and, therefore, those who now agree, whether with Knox or with Philip, in applauding the end, ought not to be damned from rendering him honor because he used means which would now be rightly detested, but which then were freely used even by virtuous men. Therefore I view the recent protest of a Scotch priest against honor shown by a Presbyterian judge to the memory of Knox as wholly unwarranted. Nor can reasonable men fully sympathize (as an Independent article has justly observed) with Motley's extreme indignation over Philip's policy in the Netherlands, including the death of William the Silent. Were Knox or Philip living now, and found to abet religious assassination, we ought to abominate them. But they are not living now, and in order to try them, we are bound to go back to them. If we can not do this, it behooves us to hold our peace.

In the Middle Ages, as we know, a proclaimed traitor was not uncommonly declared *vogelfrei*, "free as a bird." After this any one who met him could slay him without blame. Luther applies this even to a sovereign who has been declared a tyrant by his Estates, and who attempts to resume his power. Now, in Western Europe, which then rested wholly upon the Catholic religion, heresy was of course the highest form of treason. Therefore, had Charles Borromeo retained this view of public right, it would not have proved that he was not a holy man, and worthy of canonization, but only, as Urban VIII. thought of St. Pius V., that the Middle Ages lingered somewhat too long with him.

However, it appears that the whole evidence concerning St. Charles and his uncle Pius IV. is this. The magistrates of Lucre had passed some ordinances forbidding the importation of Protestant books, the infraction of which naturally implied that the offenders would fall liable to the Inquisition. St. Charles, in his uncle's name, writes to express the Pope's gratification at the zeal of the Lucchese Signoria against the contagion of heresy.

Of course there is nothing in all this to reflect upon the memory of the Pope or his saintly nephew. It happened, however, that some five days before the date of the Cardinal's letter, the Lucchese magistracy had sent a message to certain Protestants of Lucre, who had fled to France, and were there very busy in propagating the new religion, admonishing them, I think within two months, to withdraw into some Protestant territory, on pain, if they still went on proselytizing in France, of being liable to be brought back to Lucre "dead or alive," with a reward offered to any who should bring them in, or failing to capture them, their dead bodies.

Surely this is an ordinance very far indeed from a license "to shoot down heretics at sight." The offenders are allowed ample time to wind up their affairs in France and to withdraw within the territories of their own religion. So long as they remain on Protestant ground, it is implied, their own government will leave them unmolested. Should they be obstinate, they are warned that they will be liable to capture, or resisting capture to the last extremity.

Considering Italian abhorrence of heresy, and the despotic authority and summary processes of the governments of those days, it would be hard to imagine an edict more indulgently considerate.

Therefore, had St. Charles meant to express approbation of this decree of Lucre, he would have refuted no discredit, even from our present point of view, either on himself or on the Pope. The Lucchese Signoria is very much milder in their ordinance than a British Viceroy in India, when he sometimes proclaims a reward for the bringing in of a notorious bandit "alive or dead." Yet Queen Victoria and her son have not yet been declared by anybody on this account "accessories to assassination."

However, St. Charles is probably referring only to the ordinance concerning the importation of books. The other had just been passed, and in the imperfect travel of those times could hardly have reached Rome and brought out an answer from the Pope in five days, not to say that Cardinalistic dignity, where, as here, there is no urgent reason, hardly allows of so precipitate a reply.

The charge therefore that St. Charles Borromeo approved of "shooting down heretics at sight" appears to evaporate into exceedingly thin air. However, with a good hearty Protestant ill-will, and the application of Luther's prescription of "edifying and salutary lies," less evidence than this might have sustained a graver charge.

The Republican correspondent gives it as a distinguishing mark of his "few persons at Rome" that they "protected assassination." So then, it seems, it was by Papal license that Knox, Melancthon, Baza, Coligny, and the whole body of the Huguenots, always excepting the noble-minded Du Plessis Mornay, perpetrated, or promoted, or prayed for, or gave solemn and public thanks over religious assassinations.

CHARLES C. STARBUCK.
Andover, Mass.

THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

BY A PROTESTANT THEOLOGIAN.
COCCHIO.

I remember that at the time of the Vatican Council, one of its German opponents (I am reasonably sure that it was Dr. Dollinger himself) speaking of St. Charles Borromeo as having held the thesis that it was lawful to kill a proclaimed heretic at sight, sarcastically remarks that in Italy they keep this fact concerning St. Charles well in the background, for that otherwise the question would force itself on men's minds, Ought Charles Borromeo ever to have been canonized?

On the other hand, Bishop Hurst, of the Methodist church, in his exceedingly genial article on the Counter Reformation, published in the Methodist Review not long before his death, while assuming the truth of this statement concerning St. Charles, does not find himself at all embarrassed by it in treating the great Archbishop as an eminently holy Christian, the worthy successor of St. Ambrose. He held this opinion, remarks Hurst, but he never refused it to practice.

The Bishop thought very much in agreement with my Irish Calvinistic teacher in theology, Dr. John Morgan of Oberlin. I was once lamenting to him the policy of persecution (not, however, extending to death) which the Archbishop is said to have exercised to some extent in some of the mountain districts of his diocese, where the influence of Geneva had made itself felt. "Ah, well!" lightly answered Dr. Morgan, "that does not signify much in the sixteenth century, when the relations of the two religions were so strained, and when almost everybody thought it a right and a duty to persecute heresy."

The Bishop and the Professor undoubtedly held a sounder view than the great old Catholic scholar. Not that Dollinger was a narrow-minded man, but that his view of things was distorted by the bitterness of immediate controversy, which we, after four centuries, ought to have passed beyond.

Froude is sounder here than Dollinger, and than those English Catholics who have been lately declaring that if this accusation could be proved against St. Charles, he ought to be deposed from the altars. He ought to be nothing of the kind. This talk appears to me to be mere hysterical silliness, whether applied to St. Charles Borromeo or to St. Pius V. The Catholics ever fall into such a fit of iconoclastic insanity, let them make over the statues of these two godly men to us, and we will find a place of honor for them in some Protestant church.

I should say this even if it were true that Pius planned to murder Elizabeth, and even if Charles not only held that a heretic might be shot at sight, but had even had some Protestants shot at sight. Happily neither charge is true. We have seen it disproved as concerns the Pope, and we shall soon see it disproved as concerns the Archbishop. His exculpation involves that of his uncle, Pius IV., who, however, not having been canonized, engages attention less.

Froude remarks that in the sixteenth century assassination was a weapon freely used by all parties, religious or political, against all. Excepting, of course, some peculiarly excited and dispassionate intelligences, the difference between a good man and a bad was not that either abhorred assassination, but that the good man did, and the bad man did not, abhor it except when used for some great public end.

Therefore Froude refuses, and I think justly, to declare John Knox a bad man because he applauded the murder of Cardinal Beaton, and of David Rizzio, or Philip II. because he procured the death of William of Orange. Each man viewed the deaths as serving a great public end, and, therefore, those who now agree, whether with Knox or with Philip, in applauding the end, ought not to be damned from rendering him honor because he used means which would now be rightly detested, but which then were freely used even by virtuous men. Therefore I view the recent protest of a Scotch priest against honor shown by a Presbyterian judge to the memory of Knox as wholly unwarranted. Nor can reasonable men fully sympathize (as an Independent article has justly observed) with Motley's extreme indignation over Philip's policy in the Netherlands, including the death of William the Silent. Were Knox or Philip living now, and found to abet religious assassination, we ought to abominate them. But they are not living now, and in order to try them, we are bound to go back to them. If we can not do this, it behooves us to hold our peace.

In the Middle Ages, as we know, a proclaimed traitor was not uncommonly declared *vogelfrei*, "free as a bird." After this any one who met him could slay him without blame. Luther applies this even to a sovereign who has been declared a tyrant by his Estates, and who attempts to resume his power. Now, in Western Europe, which then rested wholly upon the Catholic religion, heresy was of course the highest form of treason. Therefore, had Charles Borromeo retained this view of public right, it would not have proved that he was not a holy man, and worthy of canonization, but only, as Urban VIII. thought of St. Pius V., that the Middle Ages lingered somewhat too long with him.

However, it appears that the whole evidence concerning St. Charles and his uncle Pius IV. is this. The magistrates of Lucre had passed some ordinances forbidding the importation of Protestant books, the infraction of which naturally implied that the offenders would fall liable to the Inquisition. St. Charles, in his uncle's name, writes to express the Pope's gratification at the zeal of the Lucchese Signoria against the contagion of heresy.

Of course there is nothing in all this to reflect upon the memory of the Pope or his saintly nephew. It happened, however, that some five days before the date of the Cardinal's letter, the Lucchese magistracy had sent a message to certain Protestants of Lucre, who had fled to France, and were there very busy in propagating the new religion, admonishing them, I think within two months, to withdraw into some Protestant territory, on pain, if they still went on proselytizing in France, of being liable to be brought back to Lucre "dead or alive," with a reward offered to any who should bring them in, or failing to capture them, their dead bodies.

Surely this is an ordinance very far indeed from a license "to shoot down heretics at sight." The offenders are allowed ample time to wind up their affairs in France and to withdraw within the territories of their own religion. So long as they remain on Protestant ground, it is implied, their own government will leave them unmolested. Should they be obstinate, they are warned that they will be liable to capture, or resisting capture to the last extremity.

Considering Italian abhorrence of heresy, and the despotic authority and summary processes of the governments of those days, it would be hard to imagine an edict more indulgently considerate.

Therefore, had St. Charles meant to express approbation of this decree of Lucre, he would have refuted no discredit, even from our present point of view, either on himself or on the Pope. The Lucchese Signoria is very much milder in their ordinance than a British Viceroy in India, when he sometimes proclaims a reward for the bringing in of a notorious bandit "alive or dead." Yet Queen Victoria and her son have not yet been declared by anybody on this account "accessories to assassination."

However, St. Charles is probably referring only to the ordinance concerning the importation of books. The other had just been passed, and in the imperfect travel of those times could hardly have reached Rome and brought out an answer from the Pope in five days, not to say that Cardinalistic dignity, where, as here, there is no urgent reason, hardly allows of so precipitate a reply.

The charge therefore that St. Charles Borromeo approved of "shooting down heretics at sight" appears to evaporate into exceedingly thin air. However, with a good hearty Protestant ill-will, and the application of Luther's prescription of "edifying and salutary lies," less evidence than this might have sustained a graver charge.

The Republican correspondent gives it as a distinguishing mark of his "few persons at Rome" that they "protected assassination." So then, it seems, it was by Papal license that Knox, Melancthon, Baza, Coligny, and the whole body of the Huguenots, always excepting the noble-minded Du Plessis Mornay, perpetrated, or promoted, or prayed for, or gave solemn and public thanks over religious assassinations.

CHARLES C. STARBUCK.
Andover, Mass.

A POWER on Every Farm

THERE should be a power of some kind on every farm.

It saves labor, time and money, and increases the earning capacity of the farm.

It will work the raw material of the farm into a finished product.

All up-to-date farmers agree that the modern gasoline engine is the best farm power.

Our I. H. C. gasoline engine is the best gasoline engine.

It is strong, durable, long lived and is of full rated, actual (not estimated) horse power.

It is easy to operate and is easily kept in working order.

It develops the maximum of power with the minimum of fuel.

I. H. C. gasoline engines are made in the following styles and sizes:

Call on the International Agent for information or write nearest branch house for catalog.

INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER COMPANY OF AMERICA, CHICAGO, ILL.

Horizontal—(Portable and Stationary), 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 & 15 Horse Power.
Vertical—2, 3 & 5 Horse Power.
Specially adapted to cutting dry fodder and ensilage, husking, shredding and shelling corn; threshing and grinding feed; sawing wood, separating cream, pumping water, etc. Indeed there is no service required of a power that will not be performed most satisfactorily by this engine.

If you are not intending to purchase an engine now, you may want one in the future and really ought to know more about them.

When a man's ambition is to be a farmer, he feels that he is tugging at a rope, and he may strain himself to the point of exhaustion, but he will not get any more out of it.

Did you trouble a stirred up will, and fully and completely in your own mind, you started by their busy world, old men, some men, as is true, such things of some, something of their old busy make busy, constant.

What a little trouble a stirred up will, and fully and completely in your own mind, you started by their busy world, old men, some men, as is true, such things of some, something of their old busy make busy, constant.

What a little trouble a stirred up will, and fully and completely in your own mind, you started by their busy world, old men, some men, as is true, such things of some, something of their old busy make busy, constant.

What a little trouble a stirred up will, and fully and completely in your own mind, you started by their busy world, old men, some men, as is true, such things of some, something of their old busy make busy, constant.

What a little trouble a stirred up will, and fully and completely in your own mind, you started by their busy world, old men, some men, as is true, such things of some, something of their old busy make busy, constant.

What a little trouble a stirred up will, and fully and completely in your own mind, you started by their busy world, old men, some men, as is true, such things of some, something of their old busy make busy, constant.

What a little trouble a stirred up will, and fully and completely in your own mind, you started by their busy world, old men, some men, as is true, such things of some, something of their old busy make busy, constant.

What a little trouble a stirred up will, and fully and completely in your own mind, you started by their busy world, old men, some men, as is true, such things of some, something of their old busy make busy, constant.

What a little trouble a stirred up will, and fully and completely in your own mind, you started by their busy world, old men, some men, as is true, such things of some, something of their old busy make busy, constant.

What a little trouble a stirred up will, and fully and completely in your own mind, you started by their busy world, old men, some men, as is true, such things of some, something of their old busy make busy, constant.

What a little trouble a stirred up will, and fully and completely in your own mind, you started by