

Sacred Heart Review. PROTESTANT CONTROVERSY.

IV.

It is a relief, now and then, to turn from controversy proper to amusing blunders of pure ignorance and carelessness. Sir Walter Scott supplies us with a fair number of these. He has the exactness of genius, but not of learning. As Mr. Gladstone has suggested, in drawing a parallel between him and Burns, he sometimes, in the delineation of tragic passion, reaches a height and unerring force comparable to Shakespeare himself. In the delineation of nature also he is said to be as exact as free. Indeed, he would often take journeys to scenes that he had to bring into his poems and novels, to make sure that no detail was misrepresented, and in all that concerns Scotland, lowland Scotland at least, he seems to move with easy security, as respects speech, manners and history. There his foot is on his native heath, and his name is—Walter Scott.

On the other hand, let him so much as cross the border, and not only an Englishman, but by tradition of thought, an American of English blood, may easily detect false notes, of speech, of history, and of allusions to institutions. For instance, the Scottish king has scarcely taken possession of his southern throne when our novelist makes a Scotch baron, arraigned for a breach of law, claim a trial by his peers at Westminster, to which he was as yet no more entitled than a German baron would be now. On the other hand, he makes him liable to mutilation, from which I understand that peers in England were always exempt. Going back to earlier times, say those of Richard I., he reveals inexactnesses. It is true, Englishmen themselves were then hardly more precise, as to the earlier ages. Exactness in historical fiction scarcely dates back to Scott's time. On the other hand, we now make too much of it. It renders our historical fiction heavy. It is a proof of the genius of Tennyson, that it is not depressed by his scholarship. As Cardinal Newman intimates, it might be well to keep history and fiction apart, but if they are conjoined, let the history take care of itself. Let it be merely a background for a fair-land of imagination. The Macbeth of universal mankind owes nothing to the real Celtic chieftain Macbeth but name and local setting. It is nothing to the world what Burton or Freeman may have found out about him. So too, when in "Ivanhoe" the English of Yorkshires call themselves Saxons, this, historically, is absurd. The Saxons themselves did not use "Saxon" as a national name, and the Yorkshiremen, unlike the people of Hants or Somerset, were not Saxons even tribally. They were English, *tribally* and nationally. However, what does it signify? We are not moving in the real England of the real Richard, but in the fairy England of Scott and Robin Hood, just as in "King John," we are well content to have Pandolph the Cardinal substituted, in all the pomp of scarlet hat and robes, for the real Pandolph of Magna Charta, a simple subdeacon and domestic prelate of the Pope, who, after receiving John's submission, died in the obscure bishopric of Norwich.

Scott, of course, no more gives us the real Catholic Church than the real England of Richard I. or the real France of Louis XI. There is a strong family likeness in all three portraits to their originals, but traversed by profound dissimilarities to the actual kingdoms and to the actual Church. Externally, of course, Catholicism, with Scott, wears very much the same aspect that it has worn for a thousand years or more. Whatever want of precision there may be here I must leave to Catholic archaeologists to determine. So also he seems to give a fair feeling of the influence of the Church in medieval society, so far as this is practicable for so decidedly secular a temper. In some important points of Catholic history he seems to go astray. Worse than that, in at least one fundamental doctrine, that of Purgatory, he is vague and incorrect. In some fundamental points of discipline and use, moreover, he is completely unintelligent.

As to Catholic monastic history, there are two representations in which I think his accuracy may be sharply questioned. The action of "Ivanhoe" is dated in 1194. The Cistercian order was not yet a century old, and its great reconstitution under St. Bernard, with the wonderful inspiration streaming out from it, was as yet only seventy-nine years in the past. Moreover, Bernard's influence over the order, as over the Church, remained in full force as long as he lived, and much longer, and in 1194 he had only been dead forty-one years. I would not undertake to say that, even as early as 1194, there may not have been in England, and even nearer to Clairvaux, Cistercian dignitaries as careless and sensual as the Prior of Jorvaux. Assuredly, however, they are not to be introduced with the easy unconcernedness of "Ivanhoe," as a mere matter of course. Johnson's Cyclopaedia is doubtless right in representing the Cistercian body in Richard's reign as still on the upward move, and as not reaching its culmination for some sixty years from the time set for the story. Then began a gradual decline. My honored friend, Doctor Richard S. Storrs, it is true, justifies Scott in the matter of the Prior of Jorvaux, but I think he has deferred too much to this great genius, but not great historian, and exceedingly indifferent Church historian.

In truth, Scott is not thinking about the Cistercians in particular, or the Cluniacs, or the Benedictines, about their rise or their decay, or their reformations. Had he introduced his

high-bred and humane, but voluptuously self-indulgent prior fifty years earlier, he would probably have made him just the same man. He conceived the claustral life in itself as issuing only in well-intending dullness, or in sensual self-indulgence, crossed occasionally by blind zeal or restless ambition. He has so little conception of the magnificent lights of monasticism, that he cannot even portray the gloom of its shadows. The one defect of his description is flat, shallow and commonplace, so far as anything of his can be commonplace.

By the way, in his allusions to the Prior Jorvaux (and there are many), he makes confusion worse confounded. He evidently has never stopped to think what is the precise status of this functionary. In "The Monastery," it is true, he does not seem to understand that properly and originally a prior is the foreman of the monks of an abbey, representing them to the abbot, and in a manner the abbot to them. He is appointed, and may be removed, by the abbot. Next, when an abbey swarms out into a daughter house, still dependent on the mother, the subordinate local superior, also appointed and removable by the abbot, naturally keeps the name of prior. Here is the first step towards detachment. If then the priory at last became independent, it often out of reverence for the founding abbey, kept the inferior title. At last, says the Encyclopaedia Britannica, there was in England—at least among the monks, as distinguished from the friars—no difference between an abbot and a prior of an independent house. Scott, however, seems to have no conception of this slow development, but tumbles everything together in hopeless and anachronistic confusion. The same man, in the same chapter, indeed I think sometimes in the same paragraph, is first prior and then abbot, next abbot and then prior. Sometimes he appears as the independent chief of a separate monastery, chosen by the brethren. Then he is a prior in the early sense, subordinate, in the same house, to an abbot, and therefore no prelate. But to tangle matter past rescue, the author covers all his baggage with matres, so that he alternately plunges into non-prelatical subordination, and re-emerges into the very highest monastic rank, into almost episcopal dignity. In short, Scott, evidently, has never thought twice about the matter. His monastic books are, like a backgammon board, all back and no leaves.

Still the chapter of the Prior of Jorvaux is lucid compared with that of Friar Tuck. There are only three things certain about this worthy. He is a priest, an outlaw, and to cover his brigandage, ostensibly a forest hermit. How then is he a friar? There were no friars yet. The earliest order of friars, the Franciscan, is still half a generation in the future. The name of St. Francis has as yet never been heard of in England. The very notion of a friar, as dedicated to social service in contrast with the contemplative seclusion, is even farther away from "hermit," than "monk," although the Augustinian friars grew out of an aggregation of former hermits. Friar Tuck plainly is not even a runaway from any sort of monastery. His scornful defiance of "the Bishop of York's official" shows that he owes, though he refuses to render, diocesan obedience, as a secular priest serving a woodland oratory. Yet Scott puts into his mouth a rollicking ballad about "The Barefooted Friar," which is full two hundred years before its time. It can only be saved from being a whimsical anachronism by being thrust forward from the age of Richard I. to that of Edward III., the grandson of the grandson of Richard's brother. The whole portrayal is as helter skelter as Friar Tuck himself.

Scott deals even more inequitably with the Knights Templars than with their close allies the Cistercians, whose great abbot drew up the Templar rule. This famous order of militant monks lasted almost exactly two hundred years, being founded in 1118 and suppressed in 1312. In "Ivanhoe's" time, therefore, it is to be presumed, still in the ascending line, especially as, reckoned from its conelated back almost two hundred and eighty years, almost two-thirds of its whole public duration. Now, even at the time of its suppression, did it really deserve the four charges preferred against it? This is very doubtful. Its great offence, in the eyes of that usurpation and rapacious tyrant, Philip the Fair, was undoubtedly its vast wealth, and great power. The concurrence of Clement V. in the king's action could give the royal accusations no weight. Clement, a French Archbishop of no eminent repute, imposed on the long-resisting Cardinals by Philip's overmastering influence, and the still fresher dismay surviving the outrages of Anagni, so completely under coercion, that in a matter personal to Philip, he was hardly capable of giving a sentence of ecclesiastical, much less of moral, validity. The seventy years' Babylonian captivity of the Church had begun. In most countries which were free from the control of France, that is, in Spain, Portugal, Germany, the Templars were found innocent. Even in Italy, only the English Florence condemned them. England, under the influence of Isabella, the infamous daughter of an evil father, naturally followed France and the Pope. The whole evidence, given compactly and lucidly in the new Methodist church history, shows that modern disclosures concur with anciently known documents in giving solemn weight to the denial

of all guilt made by fifty-four knights at the stake, and confirmed, four years later, under the same fearful tortures, by the Grand Master Molay, and De Charney, the grey-haired Master of Normandy.

Cardinal Hergenrother, (i. e., the great encyclopaedia republished under his auspices) Doctor Dollinger, and Bishop Hurst, representing, respectively, the Roman Catholics, the Old Catholics, and the Methodists, all agree in severe condemnation of Clement's action. Indeed, it is very evident that he was not a free agent. He was in such continual fear that Philip would coerce him into bringing ignominious ignominy on the Papacy by anathematizing Boniface VIII. that he really could not say that his soul was his own. Thus, it may fairly be declared that, in the estimation of all shades and grades of Christianity, the reputation of the Knights Templars stands higher now than for the last six hundred years, and the conviction of their innocence is firmer.

Now Scott not only assumes as authentic the charges of voluptuousness, heresy, and Epicurean atheism, but actually transfers them back (at least as already largely prevailing in 1312) to 1194. This anachronism would be a matter of grave comedy if we could take "Ivanhoe" and "The Talisman" very seriously. We cannot well do this, yet it is well not to pass unnoticed this after-working of the malice of an evil king.

I will next pass to another assumption of Scott's respecting the Templars, which is not a calumny, but a very great blunder.

Charles C. Starbuck. Andover, Mass.

[Rev. Mr. Starbuck gives us above a very terse and interesting solution of what might be called one of the historical mysteries of the Middle Ages. Volumes have been written on the history of the Knights Templars, their alleged crimes and the reasons of their suppression. Some of the ablest historians of ancient and modern times have treated at great length these matters, and they seldom if ever agree in all their conclusions. Our friend, Mr. Starbuck, however, appears to find no difficulty in solving the knotty and intricate historical questions that have so successfully defied the learning and research of many eminent historians. The whole affair, according to Mr. Starbuck, is very simple. "The rapacious tyrant, Philip the Fair," envied the power of the Knights and longed for their wealth. As the Knights were a religious order in the Church, Philip must have a Pope of his own, who, obeying his orders, will abolish the Order and allow Philip to appropriate its wealth. This is the simple story. Now for the evidence. Mr. Starbuck finds it "given compactly and lucidly in the new Methodist church history." To us it appears as grotesquely funny to put on the witness stand against the Pope a "New Methodist Church History" as it would be to quote the testimony of a Spanish newspaper of five months ago to prove the standing, worth, and civilization of the citizens of the United States. Of course, Cardinal Hergenrother (or rather the Doctor Dollinger and Bishop Hurst, the author we presume of the above Church history, is made to express the same opinion of the Pope.

Compelled some time ago by the state of our health to "take to the bed," we are not within reach of the encyclopaedia credited above to Cardinal Hergenrother. We have, however, other sources of information as to the Cardinal's opinion of Clement V. and the suppression of the Knights Templars. In his "Catholic Church and Christian State" the Cardinal says: "At the Council of Vienna which was opened on the 10th of October 1311, the affairs of the Templars appear to be the most important matter." The Pope, "with the approval of the Council" pronounced the sentence of abolition of the Order of the Temple. From this same decree we learn that all the property, movable and immovable, of the Templars, was given to the Hospitallers of St. John by the Pope. Again history does not appear to sustain Mr. Starbuck when he says "In Spain, Portugal and Germany the Templars were found innocent." On the contrary, it would appear that in each case the courts appointed to hear the evidence simply reported their unfavorable findings to the Holy See. It is evident, therefore, that the Fathers of the Council of Vienna considered the whole question of the Knights including the charges made against them, and the evidence supporting these charges, and, as a result, agreed with the Pope in the opinion that the Knights should be suppressed. The suppression of the Knights, therefore, was not a case of hugging mugging between the Pope and the King as Mr. Starbuck would ask us to believe.

No less inaccurate, if we are to believe some of the most eminent historians, is Rev. Mr. Starbuck's statement that "Clement, a French Archbishop of no eminent repute, imposed on the long-resisting Cardinals by Philip's overmastering influence." Such a statement is contradicted by the fact that the solemn decree of election preserved in the Vatican tells us that the choice was made by secret ballot, that of the fifteen votes cast (and all were mentioned by name) ten voted for Bertrand (Clement V.) and that the other five joined the majority by "accession." Again Rev. Mr. Starbuck says the Pope was retained in France by the king under coercion, and "that in a

matter personal to Philip he was hardly capable of giving a sentence of ecclesiastical, much less of moral validity."

There are at least two mistakes in this statement. First, the Pope did not live in France under the jurisdiction of Philip, but in Avignon; secondly, it is of course a gross error to say that the Pope was hardly capable of giving a sentence of moral validity. Catholics, at least, can understand why the final sentence of the Pope in dealing with principles of morality or questions of faith, even though the Pope may be a much less worthy man than Clement V., is not only morally valid, but infallible.

We may be permitted to close this whole case of the Knights Templars in the words of the prince of modern historians, Cantu, as follows: "If therefore the wicked persecutions instituted in France tempt us to regard the Templars as innocents, and as victims of the Church, the calm with which the Church proceeded, the processes instituted during many years in Italy and in other lands, and without violence, allow us to suppose that many of the Knights were guilty, and that the king of France should not be compared with Clement V., who, by suppressing the Order, 'not de jure, but by way of provision,' saved innocent individuals, and disappointed the royal greed by assigning its wealth to the defence of the Holy Land."

—Editor Sacred Heart Review

THE SANCTUARY LAMP.

The sanctuary lamp is a conspicuous object in every Catholic church. It burns day and night before the Tabernacle in which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved to warn the faithful of the sacramental presence of Him Who is the light of the world and "Who enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world." It is a figure of the flame of divine charity that burns in the Sacred Heart of the Son of God. At night, its soft rays, streaming through the church windows remind the faithful passing by that He who watches over Israel sleeps not. The successor of the lamps of the old Jewish tabernacle and of the Temple which, however, burned only from night and till morning before the sanctuary of the Lord, it must be said as they were with olive oil. The old Mosaic law directed that the oil for the tabernacle lamps should be pure and clear, beaten with a pestle out of olives. When olive oil is not procurable, other vegetable oil may be used in our sanctuary lamps. Coal oil can be used only when vegetable oil is quite out of the question, and gas jets are forbidden altogether. When the Blessed Sacrament is removed from the tabernacle on Holy Thursday, the lamp should be extinguished lest the people be deceived. To allow the light to go out for a day is considered a grievous neglect of duty.

The sanctuary lamps in the Brompton Oratory in London—there are two of them, one on each side of the chancel—are singularly suggestive. They are reproductions on a small scale of the seven branched candlestick of the Temple, which is delineated on the arch of Titus at Rome. They are mounted in marble pedestal and each contains seven lights.—New World.

LOVE IS THE MAGNET.

Thomas a Kempis utters the following beautiful aspiration of the soul towards the fulness of divine teaching: "O Truth, my God, make me one with Thee in everlasting love." Truth is made efficacious by love. To know is a blessing, because knowledge leads to love. Faith is the foundation, love is the superstructure, the very sanctuary of the temple of truth. Bear this in mind when talking about religion with non-Catholics. Unless love draws them, love for God and even their affection for yourself, they will be only drawn in seeming. Let them once realize that the love of God is in your heart's depths, as well as at the end of your arguments, and in proportion to their earnestness of character they will advance towards the truth. It is in this gaining souls one by one by a kindly Apostle that the whole nation shall be converted.—The Missionary.

Scott's Emulsion is not a "baby food," but is a most excellent food for babies who are not well nourished. A part of a teaspoonful mixed in milk and given every three or four hours, will give the most happy results.

The cod-liver oil with the hypophosphites added, as in this palatable emulsion, not only feeds the child, but also regulates its digestive functions.

Ask your doctor about this.

50c. and \$1.00; all druggists, SCOTT & BOWNE, Chemists, Toronto.

EASY QUICK WORK. SNOWY WHITE CLOTHES.

**SURPRISE SOAP**  
MAKES CHILD'S PLAY OF WASH DAY

**CARLING'S GOLD MEDAL ALE, PORTER & LAGER.**  
These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

**"Famous" Baseburner**  
The Handsomest and Best Working Stove of this Class in America.  
The construction of the flues gives it a greater heating capacity than any other.  
Entire base radiates heat.  
Made in two sizes, with and without oven. Oven is made with three flues same as a cooking stove. Double heater attachment by which heat can be carried to upper rooms.  
Beautifully nickled.  
A Triumph of Art and Utility.  
THE McCLEARY MFG. CO., LONDON, MONTREAL, TORONTO, WINNIPEG, VANCOUVER.

**The Standard of Excellence**  
The average woman cannot discriminate justly between sewing-machines, so far as mechanical construction is concerned; but she can wisely judge their work.  
SINGER WORK IS ALWAYS GOOD WORK.  
This is why Singer Machines maintain their supremacy all over the world, making the Singer trade-mark a reliable standard of highest excellence.  
SINGER SEWING-MACHINES ARE MADE AND SOLD ONLY BY THE SINGER MANUFACTURING CO. OFFICES IN EVERY CITY IN THE WORLD.

**Catholic Home Annual, 1899**  
PRICE, 25 CENTS.  
ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY  
F. P. Guillof. "THE DOCTOR'S COMPROMISE."  
Maurice Francis Egan. "THE IMPOSSIBLE."  
Marion Ames Taggart. "THE PASSING OF PIPPA."  
Clara Mulholland. "A WISDOME MAID."  
René Bazin. "DONATIENNE."  
Very Rev. Ferrel Gierard, C.S.S.R. "THOUGHTS ON THE THIRD AND FOURTH COMMANDMENTS."  
Rev. Daniel Murray. "PENANCE THE KEY TO HEAVEN."  
Rev. A. A. Lambing. "THE MIRACULOUS MEDAL."  
Besides other illustrated articles, the notable events of the year with numerous illustrations, the calendars, astronomical calculations, etc.  
**Our Boys' and Girls' Annual**  
FOR 1899.  
Contains Stories, Games, Tricks, Interesting Items, etc., with a large number of Pretty Pictures.  
PRICE, 5 CENTS.  
Subscribe for the New Illustrated Catholic Monthly: "Our Boys' and Girls' Own."  
75 CENTS A YEAR IN ADVANCE. Send for Free Sample Copy and List of Premiums.  
The easiest way to remit for subscriptions is to send 75 cents in postage stamps to Benziger Brothers, 35 & 38 Barclay Street, New York.  
**BENZIGER BROTHERS,** CINCINNATI, NEW YORK, CHICAGO.  
313 Main St. 35 and 38 Barclay St. 211-213 Madison St.

FIVE-MINUTE SERMON.

Twenty-First Sunday After Pentecost.

FORGIVENESS.—NO FORGIVENESS OF GOD WITHOUT FORGIVENESS ON OUR PART.

"But I say to you, love your enemies (Matt. 5, 44).  
Our Lord pronounces, indeed, terrible denunciation in the conclusion of the gospel of to-day, also shall My Heavenly Father do you, if you forgive not every one of your brother from your hearts." (Matt. 5, 35)  
The generous Lord had so magnanimously remitted to his servant an enormous sum of ten thousand talents, i. e., according to our money, about \$19,000,000 because the latter had been entreated. The servant, however, would not give respite to his fellow-servant for the trivial sum of a hundred pence, despite his entreaties and promises of remittance. Therefore Lord became enraged, gave him over to the torturers, until he would pay last farthing. He will not be able to pay in all eternity and will therefore remain forever in the power of torturers.

In this occurrence, my dear Christians, is also pronounced our sentence if we tread under foot the sacred command of our Lord Jesus Christ, referring from our enemies and offering forgiveness which is demanded of our Lord. We are that servant, whom the Lord remitted the enormous sum, will we not forgive our fellow-brother his trivial offenses against you? Do you wish to take revenge, we God has acted so generously towards us? Judge for yourself, will our implicability our Lord will one hand us over to the torturers for eternity?

The Judge of the living and the announces hell, eternal damnation, vengeance, not only in the gospel to-day, but on many other occasions. Thus, for example, we read in the gospel of St. Mark: "If you will forgive, neither will your Father, is in Heaven, forgive you your (Mark 12, 26). St. John, the apostle of love, says: "He that loveth abideth in death. Whoever his brother is a murderer, and, know, that no murderer hath eternal abiding in himself." (1 John 3, 15) The Holy Ghost has already in the Old Testament: "He that seeketh to revenge himself shall find vengeance from the Lord, and He surely keep His sins in remembrance (Eccl. 28, 1.) What are these a many similar expressions from the mouth of God other than so many voices which solemnly call to either forgive, or renounce a pardon, or suffer forever in hell. But more than this! So impudently exalted in the eyes of our Lord is the command to love our enemies. He not only most forcibly inculcates in His admonitions, but He vouchsafes to remind us of it, even in prayer. In the Our Father we are taught: "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us." O vengeful and giving Christian, have you seriously meditated on the significance of these words? Have you reflected that in this petition you pronounce your own condemnation? say to God: "Forgive me, O God, forgive others, that is to say: myself, O God, as I hate others! I avers to me as I am to my enemies, forget my sins as little as I forgive injuries—curse me, O Lord, curse my offenders!—injure me the same malice with which I injure him! Beloved Christians, is not a terrible prayer? And yet the consequence of every Our Father ascending to Heaven from a reverent heart and from hostile lips. Calypsepheme God more—and call yourself a greater woe, and a prayer?"

How sad, therefore, is the condition of a Christian who will not forget! Every sinner is indeed able, but no sinner can be more than he who can hope for no forgiveness—and this is certainly true with the vengeful Christian. ever he may do for the salvation of his soul will profit him nothing. I pray ever so much, fast ever so long, give alms ever so profusely, austerities, let him practice the penances, yes, even like St. Lawrence on a glowing grid-iron, die the death of a martyr, there is no more forgiveness for him, but he must experience what the apostle St. Paul said: "For judgment without to him that hath no mercy." (Rom. 2, 13) Let him approach the tribunal of penance, for him the priest power of absolution, for him the representative of God and in the hour of death the Judge will say: "Out of you I will judge you," you servant! You did not wish to therefore, you, too, will find no need. "Depart from Me, you into everlasting fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels (Matt. 25, 4) Yes, depart from that ocean of fire, where there hating, cursing and lacerating eternally!

Revengeful Christian, apply yourself! If you remain in placable enmity, I have warned you and you know the end. If you, however, to experience God reconcile yourself to your brother Jesus will reconcile Himself. Love your enemy, and God will love you. Let the angel of peace live among the angels in that land of eternal love, where no envy, no malice ever enters where all are brothers, eternal in love. Amen.