

The Builder Magazine

June 1927 - Volume XIII - Number 6

The Most High of the Craft

By BRO. JOHN W. HOUSE, Canada

ONE of the most promising signs of life within the Craft is the deepening interest of the brethren in the basic principles of the Order. Like wise architects who plan their superstructures in direct relation to the strength of their foundations, Masons are estimating the value of the fundamental truths upon which their moral edifice is to be built. Quite naturally, some of the vital truths in our foundation are easy to estimate, others are obscure and covered with such huge growths of fungus that they almost defy estimation to any but the expert. The outstanding example of this latter class is the knowledge of the Most High which stands at the corner.

That this stone exists is, to a Mason, beyond doubt; but the nature of it is a matter of much speculation. The fungus is so thick that nothing short of indefatigable exertion will suffice to lay the stone bare. Indeed, most men are so occupied with the philosophies of the ages under the name of Religion, and modern popular vagaries, that they are unable to tell the difference between stone and fungus. Of those who see the stone, few look at it from all angles before passing an opinion with decision and finality. Still fewer, in our age of presumption, born of a popular elementary education, will accept the help of ancient Past Masters in their estimation of its strength and stability. We Masons, by virtue of our initiation, take our stand with this latter group, and look to our Alma Mater for nourishment with the celestial Ambrosia prepared by the great minds of the past.

The genius of symbolic teaching lies in the effort required to arrive at the truth, and in this respect Masonry is unexcelled. One has literally to ascend the winding stair in order to enter the sacred shrine of her deepest mysteries. The search for a correct estimate of her Most High attains fruition only after much wandering along the path of research, but we will take to the path.

At the very outset, we are hampered in our search by an ancient charge which forbids every topic of religious or political discussion. On analysis, this soon disappears. Religion, in the eighteenth century, was by no means the comprehensive term it is today. It denoted then, what the word really means, a system which binds men to a definite course of thought and action. It was applied to what we now term denominationalism, and as such, I think, the compilers of our ritual included it in this charge. In that they showed their wisdom. Taken in the technical sense of the word, Speculative Masonry and religion are synonymous terms, for both denote a system of teaching which binds men to a definite course of action. If religion means, what most men think it means, viz., anything pertaining to God, then by our own regulation Masonry is an absurdity. Eliminate a conception of a Creator who is the embodiment of life, and who takes, or gives to man as he will, and we cannot explain our Sublime Degree. How foolish to solemnly declare that the Spirit returns to God who gave it, if the mystery of death has not given us a definite conception of God who is able to give ! Evidently then, the regulation concerning religious discussion cannot have reference to all discussion concerning religious things, but rather forbids that theology which causes dissension among religious bodies.

TRUTH, WHAT IS IT?

In order to understand nature one has need of both a microscope and a telescope. With the former he sees the minute wonders of the world, and with the latter he views the glory of the heavens. The use of one instrument alone reveals only part of the Universe. So it with Masonry. Continual study of the history of the Order tends to obscure the modern interpretation of our symbols, and on the other hand, the continual necessity of learning and explaining our ritual dwarfs the comprehension of the great truths of our system. We must endeavor to use both instruments.

As we survey the vista of the ages, and linger awhile at each bright vision of our ancestry, or as we penetrate the mysterious secrets of our modern Craft, we become convinced that a common factor permeates all. The unsung Watcher of the Nile and the historic High Priest of Amen, the Cathedral Craftsman and our modern Master Mason, are all alike banded together by a bond of brotherhood in the quest of

something they call Truth. The significance and peculiarity of this word demands our attention for a while.

From the beginning of time philosophers have used the content of this word Truth as a mental football, and have invariably ended by kicking it into the metaphysical realm and losing it there. The Mysteries, however, clothe its ethic with a body and make it denote the Creator, in whom is embodied the Ideal of manhood and nature. As their God was, so was Truth, and in order to find the real standard of verity and life they concentrated all their energies in finding God. They succeeded in finding the moral nature of the Divine, and appropriated it; but they were baffled in their endeavor to lay hold of the very principle of life which was, and is, so sorely needed. Tradition informs us that they once had even this in their possession, but it was lost. They have spared nothing in their endeavor to regain this secret, lives have been wholly given to its pursuit in every age, corporate endeavor has been centralized in one grand effort to pierce the firmament and wrest the secret from the Creator Himself, but the Tower of Babel fell, and the principle of life is still a mystery.

The Omniferous, the All-producing Word has ever been the symbol of this Secret, and of necessity we find it looming large in all the Mysteries. The pathetic story of Isis lamenting her inability to find the generative organs of her lord Osiris, or the driving of Adam from the garden in Eden lest he should eat of the Tree of Life, dramatically portray ancient conviction with regard to this. The Hebrew Scriptures, nurtured at the bosom of Egyptian learning, continually use the term Word to denote the source of life and wisdom. The idea underlies that well-known phrase "God said, 'Let there be light,' and light was." The Omniferous Word came into operation and light immediately was. At the beginning of the Christian era this idea still prevailed, and we find St. John describing Jesus, who to him was the "resurrection and the life," as the Logos or the Word made flesh.

THE FUNCTION OF THE IDEAL

To the Ancients, this search for the Ideal in their God was vitally important to their system of morality. To them, morality was not an entity per se, but rather the natural

result of a definite cause. They believed that as men contemplated the Ideal, it became part of their being, and tended to change them into a likeness of itself. It may be noticed here, that contemplation is a dynamic with regard to morality. This idea underlies all moral teaching in the Volume of the Sacred Law. A vision of God precedes every commission to work, King Solomon places "the fear of the Lord" at the foundation of Wisdom, the preacher in Ecclesiastes says, "Wisdom," which he describes as the knowledge of the Lord, "maketh the face to shine." St. Paul, the philosopher of the Christian dispensation, conveys this same idea when he says, "We all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from Glory to Glory." The Temple symbolism, at its beginning, pointed nowhere to morality, but directed the mind to the glory of God and so enjoined moral action.

Turning now to the Craft as it is today, we find a system which can be definitely traced in its present form to about the year 1717. Whether that date is correct or not, does not matter for our purpose, neither is the question of its origin of any great importance. It is sufficient to acknowledge that our brethren who gave us our system, gave it in such a way as to most adequately reflect the clear light of Masonry. We today accept their gift, and proudly declare it to be the genuine article. Our landmarks are the test of genuine Masonry the world over, and therefore a close study of the actual tenets of the system, as we have it, will reveal what our brethren of 1717 considered the fundamental faith of the Craft wherever found.

MORALITY IN FREEMASONRY

When we look into our system, it is easy to see that our brethren considered that Masonry still embraced the ancient ethic of morality. All our work leads us to the feet of the Most High who is the embodiment of verity and life, and our morality is the outcome of contemplating His nature. Nowhere is morality enjoined until the candidate is supposed to have found that very quality in the being of the Creator. Unfortunately, we moderns have become accustomed to demand so little of a candidate that it is quite possible for a man to go through all the degrees without really advancing one step in the actual science of the Craft, and in consequence of this the average Mason gets things a little out of proportion. Morality is gradually usurping the seat of the Most High in the Center, and in doing so saps its own life

blood. Masonry, however, taking for granted a man's knowledge of nature and science, and only enunciating the results of such knowledge, puts the root of human morality in the nature of the Most High, and its dynamic in contemplation. A glance at our Ritual will make this evident.

At initiation a candidate is simply examined, bonded and prepared for his education in the mysteries. At the commencement of light, he is directed to that which is the written revelation of thy Divine nature, after surveying which he dons his working attire, takes the appropriate tools and commences labor. He penetrates the secrets of nature and science and discovers God at the center of all and ruling in justice and equity. After this revelation, he finds that he is needing the plumb and level to form his true square of morality. As a perfect Craftsman, he enters the confines of death, emerging with a holy confidence that the nature of the Most High is such that when time and circumstance permit he will restore to man the principle of life. This inspires the completion of his circle of morality in readiness for that day. Everywhere we find morality the consequence and reflection of the Divine Nature.

Now the knowledge of this relationship between morality and the Divinity supplies us with the key with which we can enter the secret recesses of the Divine Nature. Since morality is a reflection of the Most High, it necessarily follows that the God of Masonry can be correctly estimated by a study of the consequent moral system. This holds good in a study of every faith in the world, and a comparative study from sources, not opinions, leads to some startling conclusions. We declare our faith to be "Universal," and, popularly, that resolves itself into a belief that a Mason can accept any god as his God. But is this true? Can a Mason, for instance, accept a divinity whose consequent moral system enjoins cruelty and hate, and yet hold true to universal brotherly love? If the morality of such faiths as Buddhism, Confucianism, and so on, cannot be included in ours without contradiction, the gods from which it emanates cannot be the same as our Most High. Again any Volume of Sacred Law which contains moral directions in contradiction to our system cannot find a place on our Altar. Because our brethren of 1813 called the Bible by the vague name of Sacred Law does not do away with the fact that that volume must contain our morality. If anything in it contradicts our system, it ceases to be, for us, the "unerring standard of truth and justice."

Unless Masonry is a super-religion, infinitely transcending all religious beliefs of the world, which implies a special super-revelation of the Divine Ideal, our system must come from one or all of the existing systems of the world. If it is universal, it should be able to penetrate, without contradiction, all the Faiths of mankind, but it cannot do this.

ETHICAL DEFICIENCIES IN VARIOUS RELIGIONS

In truth, a part of our moral code is common to all religions and by the addition of a little local color a much larger portion could be so synchronized. Elastic conceptions like justice and uprightness are pillars of every great faith, but when the content of these words is properly understood, one realizes that they are not always used in the same sense. For instance, Justice looms large in the Greek Mysteries, as it does in our Masonic system, but when one hears Plato describe this virtue as "doing good to friends, and evil to enemies," one must admit that it is not Masonic justice that the Greeks embrace. Other moral precepts taught by Masonry not only will not fit all religions, but actually contradict them. Our concept of chastity, or temperance, would ruin the licentious orgies under the amiable patronage of Isis, Venus, or Bacchus. Mercy, with which we are commanded to reprehend, gives the lie to the venerable Confucius who, in spite of exhorting his followers to "apply the rule of the square to their actions," commands ruthless vengeance. "A man," he says, "should not live under the same heaven with one who had done him deadly wrong." Our positive uprightness is the direct antithesis of Hindu negative virtue, so is our universal benevolence to Moslem fanatical cruelty. Charity denies the selfishness which pervades modern materialism and pantheism. The greatest pillar of Masonic morality, viz., universal brotherhood, irrespective of "creed, rank or fortune," cannot fit into any religion but Christianity, without doing violence to it. It is sometimes believed that this was a belief of the ancient mysteries, but that is not true. The level simply represented inanimate earth, and not living men. It did not even symbolize the common lot of man in death. Christ alone, of all the founders of religions, revealed the level of mankind as we understand it. Adherents of other faiths, under the influence of modern education and communication, are unconsciously allowing its inclusion in their faith, but in doing so they do violence to their own system.

MASONIC MORALITY DERIVED FROM CHRISTIANITY

Without any doubt, our morality is Christian, and is only universal in the sense of our belief that it could be universal. That does not mean that it repudiates all other faiths, but on the contrary, it takes all that is good and great from every faith even as Christ did, and infinitely transcends them with Love. Then if we would know the complete nature of our Most High we should search the mind of Jesus of the Gospels.

It is very clear that our brethren of 1717 were not at all in doubt about the particular God whom Masons adore. They show this in four ways, first, by accepting, or inventing, the drama of King Solomon's Temple, secondly, by the specific signs they use for the Most High, thirdly, by the expression of their prayers, and lastly, by the acceptance of a system of morality which will only conform to the former ideas.

The Ancient Mysteries provide many dramatical representations of the search for truth. Most of them are much more vivid and awe-inspiring than ours, and yet our brethren chose an obscure tradition of the Jewish Temple. Evidently they considered that by so doing they were taking the system that most adequately fitted their conception of Truth. At the center of everything, the point from which a Master Mason cannot err, is placed a symbol of the divine name. This is not the sign for Buddha, Ra, Osiris, Jupiter, or a universal principle, but the technically correct symbol for the Jehovah of the Jews. The Yod or the Divine Tetragrammaton was used to denote the complete nature of Jehovah as distinct from the gods of Egypt and the East. That our brethren were aware of this technical significance is very evident by the exactness of their details, and yet the choice was made. The later inclusion of the doctrine of the Logos, that bright and morning star, shows beyond doubt that it was not just a case of fitting the right name into temple surroundings. The various prayers infinitely transcend any that were the outcome of ancient mystic thought. Even that masterpiece, the chant of Iknaton, lacks the very essence of our prayers, the belief in the personality of God. Ours are ludicrous if addressed to mere energy, and we who use them are foolish. They are evidently moulded by minds with a definite conception of Jehovah. If there was any loophole through which uncertainty could squeeze into our system, it was blocked by the choice of our morality of love. No god, and certainly no mere abstraction or force, can inspire such a system, except one the Father as revealed by Christ.

----0----

The Anti-Cerneau Movement in the American Grand Bodies

By BRO. CHARLES SUMNER LOBINGIER, Washington, D. C.

(Concluded)

CERNEAUIISM became a live issue in the Masonic circles of Nebraska as early as 1889. On May 1 of that year the Grand Commandery meeting at York adopted a resolution (75) specifying the Grand bodies recognized by it and mentioning by name and commander, the Northern and Southern Supreme Councils. An attempt was made by a Past Commander to have consideration postponed, and after its adoption he announced an appeal (76) which, apparently, was never carried out. The Grand Lodge met on the 19th of the following month and Grand Master France declared in his address:

Two laws of jurisdiction are universally recognized and adhered to by loyal Masons of all rites:

1. That two Grand bodies of the same grade cannot lawfully exist in the same state at the same time.
2. That the first lawfully constituted body established in a state and duly recognized by corresponding bodies, thereby obtains exclusive jurisdiction in such territory, and that any other body of the same grade or rite entering later within such territory, is in itself unlawful.

These axiomatic propositions have never, to my knowledge, been denied by any intelligent jurist. It may be claimed that this Grand Lodge has no right to take any action with reference to the higher degrees and higher orders of Masonry. However this may be, many grand jurisdictions have established a precedent by which it seems to me we can be safely guided (77).

The Committee on Jurisprudence approved the two propositions quoted above but

expressly declines to enter upon any discussion of the history, use or legitimacy of any bodies claiming to confer what is known as the Scottish Rite degrees, or to be committed to the recognition of any such body, or to the recognition of any body conferring any degrees over which this Grand Lodge has no control (78)

That report was adopted on June 20, 1889. Exactly one month later a new and more aggressive Grand Master, who had meanwhile taken office, issued an edict declaring

that the only legitimate and lawfully constituted Masonic authority of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite within the State of Nebraska is that of the Southern Jurisdiction for the United States, presided over by Bro. Albert Pike; that all others not acknowledging allegiance to the said eouthern Jurisdiction are UNLAWFUL AND CLANDESTINE, and their creation and maintenance is a menace to the peace, tranquility and harmony of the Craft (79),

and enjoining

all brethren within our Jurisdiction to refrain from joining any bodies of the so-called "Cerneau Rite"; and if any have already become members thereof, to withdraw from such membership and association (80).

On Aug. 6, following, the members of Nebraska Lodge, No. 1, "the oldest landmark of Freemasonry in the state," adopted a manifesto (81), in the form of resolutions, to the other lodges, protesting against the edict and in effect declaring it ultra vires. Two weeks later the Grand Master, to use his own language,

suspended the Master and Wardens thereof from the exercise of their official functions, took possession of the charter, records and seal of said lodge, and directed the Treasurer of said lodge to retain all moneys belonging thereto in his possession, informing him that I would hold him personally and officially responsible for the same until called for by proper authority (82).

Here truly was a challenge to the followers of Cerneau

who had, some of them, been highly honored by the Craft of Nebraska by the election to some of the highest offices and positions of honor in their gift, and who justly prided themselves that they were prominent in Masonic circles among us (83).

Such an issue could be settled only in the Grand Lodge itself, and it was there settled at the ensuing session. The Grand Master devoted nearly twentythree pages of his address to the subject, reviewing exhaustively the action thereon of the various Grand Lodges. He also recommended

that Alexander Atkinson, Master; Augustus C. Osterman, Senior Warden; and William D. McHugL, Junior Warden, be proceeded against and disciplined in the manner and to the extent that in your judgment the gravity of their offence merits, all the circumstances of the case considered. (84)

The address and the action preceding it evoked a long and acrimonious discussion, as the following excerpt from the proceedings, relative to a resolution to "unequivocally approve, sustain and endorse the Grand Master," will indicate:

Bro. Lininger, 3, moved that the resolution be referred to the committee on jurisprudence. Bros. Chapman, 6, and Holmes, 55 addressed the brethren. Bro. Holmes, 55, moved, as a substitute, that the resolution be referred to a special committee whose members shall not be Scottish Rite Masons--ruled out of order, the motion to refer to a standing committee having precedence. Bros. Hastings 19, Warren, 2, Chapman, 6. Dunham, 3, Rayner, 75, Crites, 158, Furnas, 4, Coutant, 11, France, 56, Lowe, 95, Dinsmore, 49, Ehrhardt, 41, Davis, 21, and Phelps 34, addressed the brethren. Bro. Lininger, 3, withdrew his motion. Bro. Wooley, 97, moved reference of the resolution to a special committee of five, none of whom should be Scottish Rite Masons, which motion was lost. Bros. Owen, 19, Coutant, 11 Lininger, 3, Wheeler, 1, Lininger, 3, France, 56, Martin, 46. Chapman, 6, Cleburne, 3, and Warren, 2. addressed the brethren. Bro. Rayner. 75, offered an amendment to the pending resolution; Bro. Warren, 2, moved that all new matter therein be stricken out, and Bro. Rayner erased it; Bro. Wheeler, 1, moved strike out the first preamble, which motion prevailed. (85)

An amendment recalling the edict, censuring the lodge but restoring its charter, was defeated by a vote of 336 to 151, and the original resolution of unequivocal approval was thereupon adopted

by three hundred and forty-five (345) yeas to one hundred and thirty-nine (139) nays. (86)

Thus ended what was probably the most strenuous contest over Cerneauism of the many which raged in the American Grand Lodges.

The Indian Territory Grand Master closed that portion of his address devoted to the subject before the Grand Lodge which held its sixteenth annual communication at Muskogee on Nov. 4, 1890, with these words:

Cerneauism has thrown some of our sister Grand Lodges and the Craft within their jurisdiction into a state of confusion which for a time seemed to threaten their very existence. Let us profit by their experience, and so legislate in advance that our Grand Lodge may never feel disturbance from this clandestine enemy (87)

The special committee to which this portion of the address was referred, and whose report was unanimously adopted, recommended

That the Grand Lodge of Indian Territory, A. F. and A. M., reaffirm the declaration of Masonic principles set forth in the address of Grand Master Bennett, touching Masonic occupancy of the territory controlled by it--Indian Territory and Oklahoma --and hereby instructs its subordinates that it recognizes as legal occupants of the Indian Territory * * * the A. and A. Scottish Rite Supreme Council for the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States of which Albert Pike is the present Sovereign Grand Commander (88).

The last Grand Master of the Indian Territory Grand Lodge, before its union with that of Oklahoma, issued a circular (89), on Oct. 27, 1908, apropos of the Bayliss pamphlet in reply to the Louisiana edicts, and characterized as clandestine all bodies in the state claiming to be Scottish Rite and not owing allegiance to the Mother Supreme Council. The Grand Lodge laws on the subject were directed to be enforced against all Masons connected with such bodies.

Grand Master Conklin, of California, in 1891, called the attention of the Grand Lodge, in his address before it at San Francisco on Oct. 13, "to a spirit of rebellion which has sprung up in the state of Ohio," and was, he said,

the legitimate result of a clandestine and spurious organization of a so-called branch of Scottish Rite Masonry known as "Cerneauism " Wherever these people have acquired a foothold they have shown the seed of discord, and the harvest of discontent and rebellion have not been reaped. Our expression of condemnation cannot be too emphatic (90).

This portion of the address was referred to the Committee on Jurisprudence which expressed itself in agreement with the Grand Master's position but considered it sufficiently covered by existing legislation (91). The report, however, added the following:

Relative to a Lodge of the Scottish Rite reported to have been established in Los Angeles under the jurisdiction of a so-called Supreme Council of New Orleans, Louisiana.

Upon being advised that such a lodge had been established in that city, the Grand Master issued a circular cautioning our brethren against recognizing or holding intercourse with any person connected with that clandestine and spurious body. We approve the action of the Grand Master, and are of opinion that no further action need be taken at this time (92).

On Oct. 17, 1891, the Washington Grand Master issued a warning to "all Masons who love, cherish and wish to preserve, our ancient landmarks and the purity of our Institution" to the effect

that one Oliver F. Briggs, and seven others, are within our Grand Jurisdiction organizing Lodges, purporting to be of Masonic origin, of the so-called "Cerneau Rite," a rite which has not been recognized by the laws of our Grand Jurisdiction, nor as I am reliably informed, is it recognized by the laws of any regularly constituted Grand Lodge of Ancient Craft Masonry in the United States, but, on the contrary, I find that it is alleged to be clandestine (93).

At the ensuing session of the Grand Lodge, on June 14, 1892, the Grand Master quoted this letter in his address and added:

Believing that this matter has nothing to do with Ancient Craft Masonry, I do not deem it expedient that any action be taken by the Grand Lodge (94).

The committee to which the address was referred recommended however

that the position taken by the Grand Master on the Cerneau Rite be concurred in,

and this was adopted (95). It was in the same year (1892) that the North Carolina Grand Master was able to say

Cerneauism has not yet made its appearance in this Grand jurisdiction, though I have reason to suspect that efforts will be made to introduce it.

In the absence of Grand Lodge action, have determined to interdict it. Now that the Grand Lodge is in session, I present the question to you for consideration. In my judgment this Grand Lodge should emphatically condemn it (96).

The special committee to which this was referred reported a resolution which was adopted, that

no lodge in this Grand Jurisdiction shall recognize or hold communication with the Cerneau body or its members, and shall discountenance the establishment of any of its branches in this jurisdiction (97).

At the thirty-fourth annual communication of the Idaho Grand Lodge, opened at Boise on Sept. 10, 1901, a resolution was adopted after being reported favorably, with one member dissenting, by the Committee on Jurisprudence, specifying what bodies were recognized, including

the Supreme Councils of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite for the Northern and Southern Jurisdictions of the United States, and the various bodies under their jurisdiction,

and declaring

that any Mason who is hereafter admitted in this Jurisdiction into any other orders, as Masonic, whether called the Rite of Memphis, or by any other name, is acting un-Masonically, and against the advice and consent of this Grand Lodge (98).

About a year later the Wyoming Grand Lodge adopted resolutions (99) recognizing the same Scottish Rite bodies and providing

That any Master Mason of this jurisdiction who has joined or who shall hereafter join or in any way affiliate with or recognize any so-called or pretended Masonic body of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, or any other body, commonly known as spurious, other than those specified in this resolution, shall be expelled from the lodge of which he may be a member; that any Master Mason belonging to a lodge of any other jurisdiction who has joined, or hereafter shall join, or in any way affiliate with or recognize any of said so-called pretended and spurious Masonic bodies, shall not

be entitled to receive Masonic courtesies from or be allowed to visit any lodge in this jurisdiction nor to receive a Masonic burial.

In 1903, at the twenty-ninth session of the Imperial Council, Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, a committee was appointed, consisting of William B. Melish, Harrison Dingman and Philip C. Shaffer, to codify the laws (100). Their work, which was completed and adopted two years later (101), provided for the first time that Scottish Rite applicants for membership therein must show

good standing in a Consistory * * * of the obedience of either of the Supreme Councils for the Northern or for the Southern Masonic Jurisdiction of such Rite in the United States and those Councils which are in amity with, and recognized by, them (102).

On Jan. 18, 1905, at the annual communication of the Grand Lodge of Connecticut, the Grand Master, in an address, called for ampler protection against "Clandestine Masonry," which, he said,

is rearing its serpent head in our midst as never before, and clandestine lodges are springing up in almost every Grand Jurisdiction (103).

Thus by the opening years of the twentieth century, nearly one-half of the American Grand Lodges, not to mention a number of other Grand bodies, had passed upon and rejected Cerneauism. On the other hand, as the Iowa Grand Lodge committee reported,

We do not find that any Grand Lodge of the United States or elsewhere, or any Grand Master, has ever recognized the Cerneau body of the Scottish Rite as legitimate or duly constituted nor do we find that any such Grand Lodge or Grand Master has taken any action to prohibit or prevent the conferring of the Scottish Rite degrees by the

Supreme Councils of either the Southern or Northern Jurisdictions of the United States (104).

Cerneauism seemed, therefore, at the end of its trail. But there were still sufficient adherents to make trouble and they were rallied for a desperate and final struggle by one, M. W. Bayliss, a Canadian by origin, having been born Nov. 8, 1848, at Picton, Nova Scotia (105). He removed to Providence, R. I., where, in 1869, he claimed (106) to have obtained the symbolic degrees in Mount Vernon Lodge, No. 4, and whence, in 1881, he was appointed a clerk in the Surgeon-General's office at Washington with a salary of \$900 per annum. His name appears first on the roster of the Peckham Cerneau Council's Washington Consistory in the list (107) of spurious bodies within the southern jurisdiction issued by Pike in 1884. In the following year we find Bayliss writing letters (108) to parties in the south, signing himself "33d Deputy Inspector General at Large," assailing the Mother Supreme Council and its officers and seeking to advance the interests of the Cerneau body presided over by Dr. J. F. S. Gorgas, of Baltimore (109). But he soon fell out with it and a bulletin which it issued about 1889, recites:

In December, 1888, charges were preferred against M. W. Bayliss, 33d, for a violation of his several oaths taken in his official position and as a Thirty-second and Thirty-third in the Cerneau Rite, and for Masonic treason. He was at once suspended and a copy of the charges with specifications was served upon him. He was duly summoned before impartial judges duly appointed to try him, but he did not appear, or make defense. And upon these, his own written letters to the enemy (which were allowed inspection), he was, on June 15th, properly found guilty and expelled from all offices, rights and privileges in the Rite. A copy of the facts found, and the judgment of expulsion was personally served upon him on June 18th, 1889.

The expelled was for a short time a member of the Council. In June, '87, he failed of a re-election and it is now apparent that hatred and treason toward the Rite (he has so often sworn to cherish and support) has ever since lurked in his heart (110).

Bayliss appears to have signaled his break with the Gorgas body by issuing a circular (111) in which he sets forth its connection with the repudiated Grand Orient of France; as a result of which, he declares, "this Sov. Gd. Consistory died Masonically," for

We cannot confer Scottish Rite degrees upon any except Master Masons in good and regular standing, and it follows that we cannot recognize as Scottish Rite Masons any whom we know to be clandestine Master Masons.

The Grand Lodges to which we severally owe allegiance have determined whom we shall or shall not recognize as Master Masons, and no one who is not a legitimate Master Mason can be a legitimate Scottish Rite Mason (112).

This was precisely the position he found himself combatting subsequently in the time of his greatest activity; for the burden of his and his followers' contentions was that the Grand Lodges had nothing to do with the Scottish Rite and that there was no propriety in their attempting to decide between its rival claimants.

Bayliss closed his manifesto with an appeal for

such action as would be necessary to place us before the Masonic World as Masons loyal and true to Ancient Craft Masonry, the foundation and mother of all Masonic Rites. Should such action not be taken, no alternative will be left me. I must remain loyal and true to Ancient Craft Masonry and sever my connection with the Rite (113).

No "such action" was ever taken but Bayliss did not sever his connection with Cerneauism; he merely changed from one clandestine body to another. For he tells us (114) that in 1896 (while still a clerk in the Surgeon-General's office, now receiving \$1,800 a year) he became the head of a body styling itself "the Supreme Council of the United States and its territories and dependencies (115), succeeding in that

capacity William H. Hershiser, who had taken the controversy into the courts of Ohio and had been expelled from symbolic Masonry there. For that body, Bayliss not only asserted (116) direct descent from Cerneau but put forth the modest claim that "all Scottish Rite Masons in this country are wrong except the body I have the honor of representing (117). He continued to find his favorite hunting ground in the south, for he testified at the trial of his action against the Grand Lodge of Louisiana:

I have been doing business in Arkansas; I have been doing business in Mississippi; I have done business in Maryland; I have done business in the District of Columbia. * *
* I have done business in New York; I have done business in Rhode Island, and in numerous other places (118).

His reference to Arkansas recalls the anomalous fact that the Grand Lodge in which Albert Pike was once an active worker was among the last and least positive to declare itself upon this important question. As early as 1889, indeed, the Arkansas Grand Master, discussing Cerneauism in his annual address, held

that this Grand Lodge, in its legislative and executive power, is supreme over the symbolic degrees of Masonry in this State, and therefore has exclusive right, not only to warn its members against dangerous association, but full power to promptly and forcibly discipline her disobedient children.

A careful review of Masonic history will unmistakably disclose the clandestine character of this pernicious growth. They have not only sought to occupy territory already in the peaceful possession of others, but they did once, if indeed they do not secretly now, claim authority to charter Blue Lodges (119).

This portion of the address was referred to a special committee of Past Grand Masters (120), but no action seems to have been taken at that session.

At the sixty-fifth annual communication of the Grand Lodge, held at Little Rock on Nov. 19, 1907, Grand Master Trieber reported the existence of a Cerneau body at Pine Bluff in that state claiming to be a Scottish Rite Consistory and asked that the matter, together with a letter from Bayliss, be referred to the Committee on Masonic Law and Usage (121). Such reference was made (122) but the committee pleaded insufficient time and asked leave to sit during the recess, which was granted (123). It met again at Little Rock on Feb. 25, 1908, and heard Mr. Bayliss as the Cerneau representative and George F. Moore and John Brodie in behalf of the Mother Supreme Council; after which it went into executive session (124). The results of its deliberations were the following resolutions which were reported to the Grand Lodge at its ensuing session and adopted:

Resolved, That it is not expedient for this Committee or for the Grand Lodge of Arkansas, to take any action affecting the status, or attempting to determine the authenticity of any organization of which Masons may become members, unless it should appear in point of fact that such other organization is immoral in its tendencies or subsversive of the principles of Masonry. * * *

Resolved, Further, that inasmuch as the southern jurisdiction of the Scottish Rite Masons has been in active operation in Arkansas for fifty years to the exclusion of all other branches of the Scottish Rite, it is the sense of this Committee that it will be conducive to harmony if those Masons under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Arkansas desiring the Scottish Rite degree should affiliate with the southern jurisdiction. (125)

Bayliss appears (125) to have claimed this as a victory; but he was then making his last stand and anything short of complete rout was welcome. Moreover in the same year, 1908, the Bayliss body suffered the loss, by renunciation, of two of its most prominent members --James H. Curtin, who had been Secretary-General (127), and Joseph Cristosi, Grand Seneschal and member of the Committee on Foreign Relations (128). To offset such defections, heroic measures were necessary, and they were not, of course, confined to Arkansas. About the same time he was offering to confer degrees in North Carolina, and there he seems to have changed front; for the Grand Master who was appealed to by prospective candidates and referred the matter to the Grand Lodge, announced:

I understand the claim of the Supreme Council of the United States of America, its territories and dependencies, to be that it is not a Cerneau body (129).

The special committee of the Grand Lodge which considered the matter reported adversely to the claims of the Bayliss Council (130), and certain passages in the report were made the basis of a libel action by the Bayliss Council against the North Carolina Grand Lodge in 1914 in the Forsyth County Superior Court (131). Evidence and argument were heard for several days before Judge C. C. Lyon and a jury and the former then dismissed the proceeding on the ground that the matter complained of was of qualified privilege and that no malice had been shown (132).

About the same time Bayliss commenced another action for libel in the District of Columbia Supreme Court, this time against the Mother Supreme Council, on account of an article on "Recent Cerneauism" (133), which its official organ had published. To its plea of justification, plaintiff presented a demurrer thus challenging its legal sufficiency. The demurrer was overruled, and after being set for hearing upon the merits the cause was finally dismissed in 1915 on motion of plaintiff's counsel.

The Texas Grand Master devoted something less than a page to "Clandestine and Spurious Organizations" in his address at the seventy-fourth annual Grand Lodge communication in that state, on Dec. 7, 1909, at Waco, observing that, while as yet no effort had been made by such organizations to establish bodies there, he was led to believe that one would be, and believed "that this Grand Lodge should go on record in the most emphatic manner as to what Masonic organizations and bodies are legitimate (134). The Committee on Jurisprudence, to which this portion of the address was referred, presented a report which was adopted,

that as Blue Lodge Masons we have no knowledge of Scottish Rite Masonry beyond the Master's degree, and as a Grand Lodge we are not called upon at this time to decide upon questions of regularity arising between different bodies of another rite, nor claiming jurisdiction over the Craft degrees. Like the Grand Master, we, as individuals, have a decided opinion upon the question, and regard so-called

Cerneauism as spurious and clandestine, but we advise the Grand Lodge to keep out of this controversy until the concrete question is forced upon us by an attempt to establish this rite within our jurisdiction. We do not apprehend that any member of our Fraternity in Texas will be imposed upon by this illegitimate scheme, masquerading under the name of Freemasonry (135).

Meanwhile, Bayliss emissaries had been active in Mississippi (136) and the Grand Master there caused the issuance of a circular warning the lodges that the branch of Masonry represented by the former was clandestine (137). That action was approved by the Grand Lodge (138) but it proved unready to follow the ruling to its logical consequences. For when a member who defied it, by not only retaining membership in that branch but attempting to organize bodies, was tried and expelled by his lodge, the Grand Lodge, adopting the report (139) of its Committee on Complaints and Appeals, set aside the action and assumed to restore the offender. The succeeding Grand Master, however, issued an emphatic and elaborate edict (140) reiterating even more strongly the pronouncement of clandestinism and declaring that the Grand Lodge had acted "very unwisely" and that the purported restoration gave the offender no other status than "that of a non-affiliate." This time the Grand Lodge reversed itself and approved the edict (141). More than that it adopted an illuminating report (142) of its Committee on Law and Jurisprudence to which the whole question had been referred at the preceding session (143), and which included a series of resolutions which in effect proscribed Cerneauism and provided the ceremony of expulsion for those who should hold any connection therewith (144).

At the annual communication of the Grand Lodge of Tennessee, opened at Nashville on Jan. 28, 1914, Grand Master Comstock in his address (145) called attention to the invasion of Bayliss representatives, reviewed the action of other Grand Lodges, and recommended specific recognition of legitimate higher bodies and legislation against all others. The report (146) of the Committee on Jurisprudence, to which the subject had been referred, embodied resolutions defining the bodies entitled to recognition, among which was "the Supreme Council * * for the Southern Jurisdiction," declaring all others to be "mischievous intruders, menacing Masonic peace and harmony" and announcing that "any member * * aiding or abetting" them "thereby subjects himself to Masonic condemnation."

This appears to have been the last effort of Bayliss. He died on Feb. 15, 1919, and with him the organization which he represented and in fact largely constituted. Cerneauism in the United States had run its course. On few controverted subjects have the American Grand bodies gone on record so generally and so positively. The case was well summed up by Grand Commander Richardson when he declared:

There is nothing plainer than that the verdict of Masonic mankind is against Cerneauism, and no human power can alter or change that verdict (147).

NOTES

(75) Neb. Grand Com. Proc., 1889, pp. 1052, 1053.

(76) Neb. Grand Lodge Proc., 1889, p. 13.

(77) Ibid. p. 57

(78) Ibid. 1890, p. 163.

(79) Ibid.

(80) Ibid. pp. 164-166

(81) Ibid. p. 167.

(82) Grand Master's Address, Ibid., 1890, p. 161.

(83) Ibid. p. 167.

(84) Ibid. 213.

(85) Ibid. 215.

(86) Proc. Ind. Ter. Grand Lodge, 1890, p. 15.

(87) Ibid. 46

(88) Reprinted, *New Age*, ix, 549.

(89) *Cal. Grand Lodge Proc.*, 1891, p. 11.

(90) *Ibid.* p. 219.

(91) *Ibid.*

(92) *Wash. Grand Lodge Proc.*, 1892, p. 32. See this warning quoted in the *Manifesto of the Washington Bodies*, Oct. 22, 1891. *Off. Bull. Sup. Coun.* X, 563-566; also in *N. Y. Council of Deliberation Proc.*, 1908, pp. 73, 74.

(93) *Wash. Grand Lodge Proc.*, 1892, p. 33.

(94) *Ibid.* 46

(95) *N. C. Grand Lodge Proc.*, 1892, p. 13.

(96) *Ibid.* p. 47.

(97) *Idaho Grand Lodge Proc.*, 1901, pp. 50, 54, 55.

(98) *Wyoming Grand Lodge Proc.*, 1902, pp. 66, 67.

(99) *Proceedings*, 1903, p. 90.

(100) *Ibid.* 1905, p. 115

(101) *Shrine Code*, July 1, 1905, *Const. Art. X*.

(102) *Conn. Grand Lodge Proc.*, 1905, p. 37.

(103) *Ia. Grand Lodge Proc.*, 1889 pp. 327, 328.

(104) These and other biographical data are taken from the War Department records through the courtesy of Surgeon General Ireland.

(105) *New Age*, XVI, 93.

(106) *Off. Bull. Sup. Coun.*, VI, 588.

(107) Reprinted, *Ibid.* VII 601-607.

- (108) *New Age*, XI, 280.
- (109) *Ibid* 285, 286.
- (110) *Ibid*. 282-284.
- (111) *Ibid* 283.
- (112) *Ibid*. 284.
- (113) Testimony in *Bayliss v. La. Grand Lodge*, *New Age*, XVI, 609.
- (114) *Ibid*. 89.
- (115) *Ibid*. XVII, 103.
- (116) *Ibid* XVI, 411.
- (117) *New Age*, XVI 89
- (118) *Ark Grand Lodge Proc.*, 1889, p. li.
- (119) *Ibid* 22
- (120) *Ibid*. 1907, pp. 19-21.
- (121) *Ibid*. 22.
- (122) *Ibid* 77
- (123) *Ibid*. 1908, p. 48.
- (124) *Ibid*. 48 49.
- (125) Testimony. *New Age*, XVI, 61d.
- (126) *New Age*, IX, 76.
- (127) *Ibid*. 83.
- (128) *N. C. Grand Lodge Proc.*, 1909, p. 41.
- (129) *Ibid*. pp. 148-150.

(130) New Age, XXI, 225.

(131) See Letter of A. B. Andrews representing defendant, Ibid. 218, A transcript of the proceedings is in the Library of the Supreme Council.

(132) New Age, VIII, 464.

(133) Texas Grand Lodge Proc., 1909, pp. 41 42.

(134) Ibid. 152, 153.

(135) New Age, XVI, 486

(136) Miss. Grand Lodge Proc., 1911, p. 15.

(137) Ibid. 105

(138) Ibid. 123-125.

(139) Ibid. 1912, pp. 33, 34.

(140) Ibid. pp. 160, 161.

(141) Ibid. 138-142.

(142) Ibid. 1911, pp. 126, 127.

(143) The outcome was materially aided by addresses (New Age XVI, 492, 598) in behalf of the report by Melville R. Grant, 33d then recently elected Sovereign Grand Commander in Mississippi, and Charles F. Buck, 33d, Sovereign Grand Inspector General in Louisiana Tenn.

(144) Grand Lodge Proc., 1914, pp. 84-87.

(145) Ibid. 126-129.

(146) Allocution, Trans., Sup. Coun., 1909, p. 66.

The Development of Papal Power in the Catholic Church

BJ BRO. FERDINAND OUDIN, Illinois

A STUDY of the Middle Ages becomes in the very nature of things a combined study of the Papal system and of the Holy Roman Empire, for the two are inseparable. During this period the Pope and Emperor were either at war with one another, or else conspiring together to overthrow some other ruler of church or state. Gregory I (the Great) is usually considered as the first medieval Pope, he was a man peculiarly suited to impress the world at this transition period. He was the son of Gordianus, a wealthy patrician, possessed vigor and administrative ability, and was reared in a time when little culture was left in Rome.

In 573 Gregory served as Prefect of Rome, this was at the time when the Lombards over-ran Italy and all but captured Rome. Desolation was everywhere, and no doubt these conditions were what finally convinced him that the end of the world was near; a belief that, in his sermons and writings, repeatedly comes to the surface.

In 578 Gregory was sent by Pope Pelagius II to Constantinople, to ask the Emperor for troops to defend the Roman See. During the eight years there he was still further strengthened in his belief of the coming desolation by the general corruption of the clerics and the fierce dogmatic discussions among them. His return to Rome in 586 was without troops, but he brought back with him an arm of St. Andrews and the head of St. Luke, which according to the belief of the Church was a far greater treasure. His austerity may be judged from an anecdote, told by himself, according to which one of his monks appropriated a small sum, violating his vow of poverty. Gregory refused the dying man the consolation of the sacraments, and had him buried in a dunghill.

Pelagius II died in 590 and the Romans rushed into the monastery where Gregory stayed and brought the news that Gregory was to be his successor. He felt himself unequal to the task and fled, but being the ablest man in Italy he was brought back to

Rome and made Pope. He was a strict disciplinarian and did much to correct the evils of his clergy, and on occasions would direct the movement of troops that he sent out against the Lombards. Much of his time and ability was needed to control the vast Papal incomes and expenditures, for there were now immense estates and patrimonies scattered all over Italy, Gaul, Dalmatia and Africa; some of these were brought to the Papal See by himself, for, as mentioned before, he came of a wealthy family. An estimate of these holdings sets them at anywhere from 1400 to 1800 square miles. Gregory, however, deserves his title, "the Great," for his enormous wealth was used by him for the furtherance of the Church through charity and justice.

A picture of the corruptness of the Church, however, may be seen through some of his letters; in one of them he says: "I hear that no one can obtain orders in your provinces without paying for them." This refers to the practice of simony which even at so early a period was prevalent among the higher clergy, many of whom had been ambitious laymen who had purchased a bishopric and then lived a vicious and luxurious life by extorting illegal fees. In 599 he issued a letter to all the clergy, forbidding bishops to have women in their houses and ordering priests, deacons and subdeacons to separate from their wives. Information came to him that the clergy of Sardinia and Corsica were very corrupt and that Januarius, Metropolitan at Cagliari, was intemperate and avaricious, so Gregory gave orders for the latter to appear in Rome and stand trial.

Conditions in Italy were anything but suitable for the development of a spiritual Pope and so Gregory found that if he wished to succeed in some measure to reform the world, and especially his clergy, he would have to resort to force. He appointed military governors, and a considerable part of his correspondence was with military men, stirring them to action and outlining campaigns. His almost fanatical desire to convert everyone is illustrated by his instructions to the Archbishops, to raise the rents and taxes of those pagans who would not renounce their gods, and when this did not suffice, he enjoined physical persecution; slaves were to be punished with "blows and tortures" while free tenants were to be imprisoned, "In order that they who disdain to hear the saving words of health may at least be brought to the desired sanity of mind by torture of the body." Here he legislated for the medieval age. While he denounced simony he did not deem it inexpedient to grant the pallium to Bishop Syagrius of Autun when requested to do so by the willful Brunehildis, Queen of Austrasia, and withhold it from the learned and devout Bishop of Desiderius of Vienne who had gained her dislike for having upbraided her improper actions. Gregory, usually so well informed, could not help knowing the character of the

woman whose influence he attempted to win, and it is not surprising that simony, drunkenness and vice continued among the Frankish priests and monks.

Now it was not only the Pope who meddled in secular affairs, as often as not the King or Emperor would interfere with those of the Church. The Archbishop of Salona, a very lax prelate, died and the Pope tried to fill the vacancy by having the archdeacon, a vigorous priest, elected. But neither the clergy nor laity desired a change of morals in the episcopal palace and procured an order from the Emperor permitting them to elect their own favorite. Gregory charged bribery and excommunicated the new Archbishop. In another case the Emperor wanted to replace an invalid bishop with a more vigorous man, to which Gregory refused his consent.

GREGORY'S MISSIONARY ZEAL

Gregory's zeal for the extension of the Christian faith led him to establish the first Hierarchy in England. It is said that in his early days he saw a number of very fair complexioned youths among some slaves that were brought to Rome. They looked so angelic that he decided to convert the land, "Angel-Land," from which they came. He purchased a number of these youths and trained them as missionaries to return to their home land and preach the Gospel. He also, through the friendly relations established with Gaul, gained entrance to the court of Ethelbert, King of Britain. To this court he sent a mission of monks under St. Augustine, who in a few years converted the King, changed the temples into churches and had the King's subjects driven into them to attend Mass.

On March 12, 604, Gregory died, having striven hard during his life to correct the evils of the clergy and laity but with little success. He did, however, greatly strengthen the Papacy, making it a power that under proper leadership might have done great good in the world.

Two centuries pass by without much change, then Zachary, a most genial and diplomatic Pope, changed the Papal policy. At this time the strife between the

Lombards and the various Dukes of Italy raged especially strong; the Pope stood to gain nothing by aiding the Dukes, the rightful Lords of Italy, so made overtures to Liutprand, the King of the Lombards, and loaned him his small army to aid him in suppressing the obstinate Dukes, and received in return four towns as patrimony, enriching the Papacy thereby.

PAPAL INTERVENTION IN GAUL

A little later came the notorious intervention of the Pope in the secular affairs of the Franks. Pippin, the mayor of the palace, turned to the Pope for moral council regarding his designs on the throne of Childeric III. Zachary was not slow to see his advantage, and so went much farther than the request called for and ordered the Franks to elect Pippin their King. This act established Rome's claim that she conferred the kingdom on the father of Charlemagne. Zachary's act was further strengthened by his successor, Stephen II, who in 753 went to France and induced Pippin to "take up the cause of the Blessed Peter and the Republic of the Romans" and anointed Pippin and his sons, pronouncing an anathema on all who would displace the family of Pippin from the throne. The grateful Pippin swore to secure for the Popes the Roman Duchy, "divers cities and territories," and the exarchate of Ravenna. This act is historically known as the "Donation of Pippin," and a latter renewal of the same as the "Quiercey Donation."

We may now pass directly to the Pontificate of Hadrian I, who diplomatically gained further patrimonies for the Papacy. In 773 Charlemagne came to Rome to celebrate Easter. Hadrian made hurried though elaborate arrangements for the reception and entertainment of his illustrious guest. In the *Libei Pontificalis* is a detailed description of this visit, in which we are told of the great piety of the Emperor; the writer further tells us that on the Wednesday the Pope and King met in the presence of the body of St. Peter and that there Charlemagne assigned to St. Peter and his successors forever the larger part of Italy, as we know it today. On this is based the Papal claims to the temporal power in Italy.

THE POPE AS A TEMPORAL RULER

The remainder of Hadrian's rule was so taken up with looking after the temporal rights of his See, that little time was left for spiritual duties. He was really more King than Pope. In the meantime the other prelates were not all in accord with the Pope's plans. We hear that shortly after Charlemagne's return to France, Leo, Archbishop of Ravenna, had seized the cities of the Archate, turned out the officials appointed by the Pope and by the use of troops took over the rule of the district. Hadrian did a good deal for art and charity, but this mostly in the confines of Rome. On the whole, his vast resources were used in laying the foundation for the future material grandeur of the papacy, and in supporting armies in the field to protect it against his rivals. He also is one of the first to establish nepotism, appointing his nephew Paschalis, a desolute and brutal man, to one of the chief papal offices. It was this Paschal who soon after Hadrian's death attempted, on the floor of a church, to cut out the eyes of Pope Leo III, Hadrian's successor.

Stephen V, successor to Leo III, occupied the papal throne for only one year. His short rule, however, was such that Charlemagne came to Rome to judge him on serious charges. He acquitted the Pope, who shortly after, on Christmas morning in the year 800, surprised Charlemagne by placing an imperial crown on his head. So now the Popes could also claim that they made Emperors.

THE POPE AS OVERLORD OF KINGS

The next seven Popes were men of more or less mediocrity, showing alternate flashes of spirituality and violence, but in general they indicated a papal degeneracy until 858, when Nicholas I became the wearer of the tiara. He was the son of a Roman notary, and fairly well educated according to the standards of his day. His was a gradual rise from the lowest rank in the church. His service had been such as to make him well liked, and so upon the death of Benedict III he was unanimously chosen to succeed him. On Sunday, April 24, 858, he was consecrated in the presence of Emperor Louis II. Soon after his ascension to the papal chair he showed that a different type of Pope had come to rule the church. He took his office very seriously, and sincerely believed himself God's representative on earth. To him all creatures were equal, be they beggar or king, bishop or monk, and he felt himself to be

responsible to God for every wrong committed on earth. He gave kings their right to rule and considered them his subjects; and leading bishops, no matter how powerful, were expected to obey him or be deposed. No council or diet must be held without his approval. He left to the Emperor the rule of men's bodies, but he controlled their souls. To his credit be it said that he regulated his own life as well as that of those immediately near him with the same moral strictness. Then also the conditions were such as to require the rule of such a master. The prelates were many of them court favorites, members of princely families, arrogant and avaricious, who set up a sort of feudal aristocracy in the church, and oppressed priest, monk and people, even putting themselves against the very prince whose vassals they were. Nicholas I was the right man for the times, who did much to improve the morals of the world. But no matter how beneficial the centralization of spiritual power or how religious his purpose may have been, it cannot be gainsaid that at times he resorted to principles that set a dangerous precedent for more unscrupulous successors. He died in 867, having administered stern justice according to his light for nine and one-half years.

THE "IRON CENTURY"

We shall pass over the next century giving our attention to the tenth, that Baronius has forever branded "the iron century." It may be considered as opening with Pope Sergius III, who reigned from 904 to 911. Many causes united toward the decadent conditions of this century. It was an age of violent characters, uncontrolled; a constantly growing number of small principalities, the heads of which were in bloody rivalry. The Papacy's nominal independence from worldly princes, with its inability to protect itself without their aid, caused the Popes to dangle the imperial crown before the eyes of the rulers of Italy, France and Germany, trying to find a monarch who would protect the Church but not govern it. All this of course led to political intrigue and revolting practices. The morals were at their lowest. It is recorded that a nephew of Bishop Arsenius abducted the daughter of Pope Hadrian II and being pursued, murdered her and the Pope's wife. On one occasion the Pope had one of his officials blinded and caused the widow of another official to be driven with whips, naked, through the streets of Rome.

During the iron century these corrupt families came more into light and the domination of the Papacy by the immoral Theodora and Marozia are just one of the

many instances of corruption. Liutprand, Bishop of Cremona and an attache of the court of Otto I, a frequent visitor at Rome during the time of Pope John XI, says that Theodora was all-powerful, that she was "a shameless whore" and mistress of John X, in whose promotion to the See of Ravenna and later to that of Rome she was instrumental. That her daughters, Marozia and Theodora, were more shameless than she, and that Pope John XI was the son of Marozia and Sergius III, an unscrupulous man who resigned from a bishopric, returning to the rank of deacon, thereby bettering his chances of receiving the Papacy. He ruled as Anti-Pope in 898, was driven from Rome being charged with responsibility of the death of his two predecessors.

This immoral condition did not obtain only in high places, but judging from what Bishop Ratherius of Verona says, existed along among the lesser luminaries. Writing of the prelates he tells us, that they dress gorgeously, ride out to hunt on richly caparisoned horses, returning at night to sumptuous banquets, with dancing girls for company, with whom later they retire to beds inlaid with gold and silver.

But whatever vices John X may have had, he was not neglectful of his duty to the Papacy, for when he heard that the Saracens were still devastating Italy he formed a great league to combat them, and marshaling his own Roman militia, he rode at their head, besides Alberic of Camerino. There had been many fighting Popes, but John X was the first to take the field in person.

During John's later years there was considerable strife between the Papacy and the laity. John called his brother Peter to Rome and gave him so much power that it infuriated the nobles and former supporters. In 928 the Pope was taken from the palace and cast into prison, where he died the following year, whether of natural causes is not known.

INCONSISTENCY OF FAITH AND PRACTICE

As we read the history of the Middle Ages we are continuously confronted by seeming absurdities; men, stained with vice, proclaim full and sincere devotion to a

religion that never departed from the purity of its moral teachings. This leads us to the conclusion that such persons have been either fools or hypocrites. Yet so to conclude would be erroneous, for we know that a man's action little conforms to the general maxims laid down for his guidance, and that he can hold to a belief without applying its doctrines. So though his thoughts are influenced his actions are not governed by them. This condition of mind was of course more apparent during the Middle Ages; men were more impulsive, more violent and reckless. Then also the moral code was of low order, so that what today would be a heinous crime, was then overlooked if not actually condoned.

Therefore, though all believed in the rights of the Empire, none would yield to those rights if they ran counter to their own passions or interests; but resistance to the Pope, the Vicar of God, was considered a mortal sin that few would care to commit. So in order to strengthen the imperial prerogative and give it a practical efficiency it became imperative to prop it up with the authority of feudalism, with a king at its head who with the support of feudal lords might combat the Popes. The Pope, however, considered himself above earthly rulers so it became imperative that Pope and Emperor be in accord. This condition led to continuous strife; sometimes the Pope being the stronger would select and crown an Emperor, at other times the Emperor holding the upper hand would place a Pope on the throne.

An account of the turbulent reign of Pope John XII will illustrate this condition. Otto I, Emperor and King of a feudal monarchy, could not enforce his regal authority in his capital, Rome; he could only rule it as Emperor. Here he never was safe from insult or revolt, so when after his coronation he returned to North Italy to subdue Berengar and his son Adalbert, Pope John XII, a restless youth of 25, renounced his allegiance, negotiated with Berengar and even sent envoys to induce the pagan Magyars to invade Christian Germany. Of his action the Emperor was soon informed, but affected to despise them. On his return to Rome he found the city gates shut and defended by a party that was furious against him, for John was not only Pope but the heir of Alberic and as such the head of a strong faction of nobles and a temporal prince of Rome. They, however, could not withstand a siege, and John fled into the Campagna to join Adalbert.

POPE JOHN XII TRIED AND DEPOSED

Otto convoked a synod in St. Peter's and elected himself temporal head of the Church. He made inquiries into the character of the Pope and the assembled clergy brought in a tempest of accusations. Bishop Liutprand, who acted as interpreter for the Emperor, enumerated these in his writings, most of the accusations having to do with breaches of canon law, but he tells us also that

Bishop John, of Narnia and John, cardinal deacon declared—that he had defiled by shameless acts of vice the pontifical palace; that he had openly diverted himself with hunting; had put out the eyes of his spiritual father Benedict; had set fire to houses. . . . All present, laymen as well as priests cried out that he had drunk to the devil's health.

Upon being solemnly assured by the clergy and people that Pope John XII had committed all these crimes and even greater ones, the Emperor had a letter despatched to him, recounting the charges, and asking him to appear at Rome to clear himself by his own oath. But John refused; so then at a later deliberation over which Otto presided the Pope was deposed by the assembly because of his reprobate life, and with the Emperor's consent Leo, the chief secretary and a layman, was raised to the apostolic chair. After several revolts John XII returned to Rome but his career was soon ended by what was said to be a blow on the head given him by the devil.

The people now chose a new Pope, Stephen IV, in defiance of the Emperor. Otto thereupon suppressed the republican form of government and entrusted the governing of the city to his nominee, Pope Leo III, to act as viceroy, and who was not presumed to set up any claims to independence. Leo also confirmed the Emperor's veto on Papal elections which the citizens had yielded in 963.

THE FIRST REFORMATION

Ten Popes and Anti-Popes followed each other during the next 30 years and saw the people sink lower and lower into corruption from which Pope Gregory VII, better known as Hildebrand, endeavored to lift them. That feudalism which was encouraged by the Papal See, and which saved Europe from the barbarians, began now to inject itself into the Church. The spiritual offices became inheritable property of the ruling houses, and disassociated from religious duties. Bishops practically became barons in cope and mitre, and kings looked upon them as officials bound to serve them. Fortunately for the Church, at this time a strong reformatory movement developed, usually referred to as the "Cluniac Reformation"; it had found its beginning in the Monastery at Cluny, Burgundy, and rapidly spread through the Benedictine monasteries throughout the empire. These various monasteries, through their abbots, who were responsible to the arch-abbot of Cluny, formed a unity of organization that exercised a control over a large portion of the religious world. This organization under the jurisdiction of Rome began teaching a doctrine of the high power of the Apostolic See. Their ideal was the separation of the Church from the State, the Pope to be the ultimate source of jurisdiction, the universal bishop, no cleric was to have any rights of his own that were not derivative from the authority of the chair of Peter. With this reformation Hildebrand was closely associated and from it sprung two centuries of conflict between Pope and Emperor. Then also the Pope's decree of celibacy for the clergy caused another great upheaval.

THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE

To what heights of power the Papacy had risen during Gregory's VII Pontificate may be gleaned from contemplating the abjectness of Henry IV who opposed the decrees of 1075 against simony and lay investitures, writing an accusatory letter to the Pope in which he demanded his abdication from the Papal throne. This letter was delivered at the great synod held at Rome in 1076. It caused a tumult. Henry was excommunicated and deposed in turn. The war thus declared between Pope and king waged for some time, but gradually the simoniacs deserted the king's cause and he finally had to plead for the Pope's pardon. Henry had to humiliate himself; for three days he waited, barefoot and fasting in the snow, outside the castle gate, in the dress of a penitent. The Pope admitted him on the fourth day, and the king threw himself at his feet with the cry, "Holy father, spare me !" The ensuing peace, however, settled nothing.

The spirit of religion, originally mild and loving, was now gradually assuming a character of extravagant and fervid devotion. The zealots sought the establishment of a heaven on earth, where the Pope acted as the Vicar of God, the immaculate priesthood being the angelic hosts and the Church heaven itself. The layman from the Emperor down was thus subordinated to this Papal system. The Empire, the Church, the whole world was to be governed by this great theocracy of which the Pope was the head. The "Sachsenspiegel," the ancient code of the Empire, says:

God sent two swords on earth for the protection of Christendom and gave one to the Pope, the spiritual; to the Emperor, the temporal one

The "Schwabenspiegel" was compiled at a later date, to fit in with the Papal scheme and to replace the earlier law, the sense of which was completely changed; thus

God, now the Prince of Peace, left two swords here on earth on his ascension into heaven, for the protection of Christendom both of which he consigned to St. Peter, one for temporal, and the other for spiritual rule. The temporal sword is lent by the Pope to the Emperor. The spiritual sword is held by the Pope himself.

The subordination of all the rulers of earth to a supreme Pontiff and the combining into one vast community all nations, was a grand and sublime idea; but as Henzel said,

unfortunately for its realization, the ecclesiastical shepherds allowed too much of earthly passion and of sordid interest to cling to them in their elevated and almost superhuman positions.

The zenith of Papal power was reached during the Pontificate of Innocent III. The eighteen Popes who occupied the chair of St. Peter between the death of Gregory VII (Hildebrand) and the election of Innocent were for most part men of high character

who depended upon false Decretals, letters, canons and charters, that were accepted throughout the Church, to enforce their claims of the right to dispose of earthly kingdoms as well as to control the entrance into Heaven.

THE RULE OF INNOCENT III

The struggle between the Popes and the Romans had now lost its ardor, the nobles looking toward the Popes with greater respect. Then also Peter's chair was occupied mostly by men of illustrious Roman families. From one of these came Lothario de' Conti di Segui, whose mother belonged to a family which included several cardinals. He was well educated in liberal arts, theology and canon law. On January, 1198, he ascended the Papal throne, taking the name of Innocent III. During his eighteen years' rule he supervised the affairs of the world, nothing of importance occurred that he did not intervene in. During this time there was hardly a secular ruler from prince down to baron that he did not excommunicate, and most of the countries were at one time or other placed by him under an interdict. His work as he saw it was the ruling of the world, and his prodigious energy and high ability brought the Papacy to its highest pinnacle. He had a strong dislike, almost hatred, for the Germans who would not bend under his yoke. He sent men and money to cities located in Papal fiefs, under the rule of the German Emperor, to be used in their fight against him. He also followed precedent in adding to his realm by inducing Constance, widow of Henry, to make Sicily a fief of the Roman See, and compelled this country to pay annual tribute to the Pope and give feudal service when called upon. Innocent encouraged the French adventurer Walter de Brienne, who had married a daughter of Tancred of Sicily, and who claimed Lecce and Tarentum as his wife's legacy, to bring French troops and help wage war more effectively against the Germans. During Innocent's pontificate the struggle for the imperial crown was waged by the followers of Phillip of Swabia and the supporters of Otto of Brunswick. Into this struggle the Pontiff entered seeing a possibility of eliminating the Hohenstaufens who he regarded as foes to the Papacy; while Otto professed loyalty to Rome. When the various parties finally came to settle their differences at the point of the sword, the Pope complained, and declared that only he could be the judge as to who should be Emperor. He sent warning to the German prelates not to choose an Emperor that was not his choice. In the meantime Otto had himself proclaimed Emperor at Cologne in 1198 and swore that he would defend the Papal possessions and in 1201 he was proclaimed by the Papal Legate.

The gigantic power that the Papacy built up was attainable only by undermining the German Empire, and the success of the Roman Pontiff in this can be traced to the treasonable defection of the great vassals of the crown, who being unable to assert their independence under the Empire, confederated with the Pope, whose power as Italy's temporal head might serve to counteract that of the Emperor. Had the unity and power of the Empire been maintained under the Emperor, civil and mental liberty would probably have reached a much higher plane sooner than was obtained under the Papal system. And so, as Menzel says:

By the destruction of the Hohenstaufen, the Popes at the head of the Italians gained a complete victory over the emperors who until now had been at the head of the nations of Germany but the means of which they made use in the pursuance of their schemes were exactly contrary to the tenets of the religion they professed to teach, nor was their vocation as vicegerents of Christ upon earth at all compatible with the policy by means of which, leagued with France, they pursued their plans in Italy, and continually injured, harassed and degraded the Germans as a nation. For this purely political and national purpose, means were continually made use of so glaringly unjust and criminal that the measure of offense was at length complete and called forth that fearful reaction of German nationality known as the Reformation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Histoire de la reformation by D'Aubignes.

Romanism in the Light of History by R. H. McKim.

Crises in the History of the Papacy by J. McCabe.

The Church and the Roman Empire by A. Carr.

The Papacy and Modern Times by W. J. Barry.

The Holy Roman Empire by James Bryce.

History of Germany by Wolfgang Menzel.

Empire and Papacy in the Middle Ages by Greenwood.

Italy by J.S.C. Abbott

----o----

The Vatican Talked

BY DR. LEO CADIUS

IN the April, 1927, number of THE BUILDER I find on page 126 a review of Ian Ferguson's book The Philosophy of Witchcraft. The following observation of the author on the stifling of thought by the Church is quoted:

The dim stirring of the intellect was evident in the speculative fields of astrology, a subject with heretical boundaries and for which Galileo was to die.

On this passage the reviewer comments:

Galileo of course did not die of anything but of a "slow fever" in old age, many years after his condemnation by the Inquisition, not for speculative astronomical theories, but for venturing into the realms of theology and attempting to prove his scientific doctrines by Scripture. He was indeed most leniently treated, and the imprisonment to which he was condemned amounted to no more than residence in the household of a Cardinal who was his warm friend.

In the Catholic Encyclopaedia (under Galilei) the English Jesuit, John Gerard, is not quite so lenient with the Roman Inquisition. Says Father Gerard:

. . . Then followed a decree of the Congregation of the Index dated 5th March, 1616, prohibiting various heretical works to which were added any advocating the Copernican system. In this decree no mention is made of Galileo, or of any of his works, neither is the name of the pope introduced, though there is no doubt that he fully approved the decision, having presided at the session of the Inquisition, wherein the matter was discussed and decided. In thus acting, it is undeniable that the ecclesiastical authorities committed a grave and deplorable error, and sanctioned an altogether false principle as to the proper use of Scripture.

Now when a Jesuit condemns the action of the Roman Inquisition, while a Protestant Freemason minimizes its culpability, it would seem that broad-mindedness, religious tolerance and good will are fairly progressing. One feels encouraged to hope that a few more sharp angles in religious controversy that have caused friction and strife may be cleared away, or at least be rounded off and smoothed down. I shall discuss here several pronunciamentos by recent popes that have aroused great animosity against the Roman Catholic Church. They will continue to engender distrust and hatred of her until the Vatican, in a Syllabus of Papal Errors, expresses its official regrets for them.

I. THE SYLLABUS OF POPE PIUS IX

This is a collection of errors condemned by this Pope and issued on the 8th of December, 1864. It had been prepared during the twelve preceding years by three successive commissions of theologians. These errors had been dealt with and proscribed singly by the Pope in his various Encyclicals, Consistorial Allocutions and Apostolic Letters. The Syllabus is a resume, in skeleton form, of these objectionable theses. As the then papal secretary of state, Cardinal Antonelli, explained in his concomitant letter, it was published chiefly for the guidance of the Catholic bishops some of whom, by chance, may never have read above Encyclicals and other papal documents.

Denzinger, in his *Enchiridion*, warns that in order to obtain the true sense of the *Syllabus*, it is necessary to consult the respective papal documents from which each condemned proposition is taken. Interpreted apart from the context, the *Syllabus* is bound to be misunderstood. As a matter of fact, countless readers have misunderstood it Gladstone and other discerning minds among them.

It may be a propos to suggest here that non-Catholics who are not theologians are venturing on slippery ground when they enter the field of Catholic theology and Canon law. Even Protestant theologians will do well to watch their step. Our Catholic theologians may often be lacking in ordinary common sense, and also in the ability to grasp the larger aspects of a problem. But they are trained dialecticians and thoroughly at home on the wide field of theology. A scholar who is not familiar with those grounds, nor trained in Aristotelian philosophy, takes his chances in engaging in a theological controversy with them.

I fully agree with Hillaire Belloc, the distinguished English Catholic literateur, that there is bound to be a conflict between the Vatican and the Washington government. When it comes, the Federal Government will make a bad mistake if it neglect to enlist the services of a few Catholic theologians. (No, I am not offering my services. I disclaim being a theologian!) Without them, it is almost certain to muddle the issue, aggravate unnecessarily a situation precarious enough, and probably arrive at an impasse. While, if the subject is broached cautiously, with the assistance of Catholic theologians, the Government may count on the support of the American Catholics and the Vatican will have to yield.

THE OBSCURITY OF THE SYLLABUS

A very common error in regard to the *Syllabus* is the following: the Pope condemns this thesis; therefore, it would seem, he holds that the opposite is the truth. This is not the case. A man who disclaims being a pro-German, does thereby not declare himself to be the opposite, that is, an anti-German. He may be a neutral.

The Pope proscribes proposition 55: "the church and state should be separated." From this many have inferred that he insists on the union of state and Church. This is a hasty conclusion. He merely maintains that Church and state do not necessarily have to be separated. The Lutherans in Germany and in the Scandinavian countries, the Anglicans in England, the adherents of the Reformed Church in Holland and Switzerland, will cordially agree with him. For these denominations are supported by the state.

Union of Church and state has invariably hampered the free development of the Church. Very frequently it meant the servitude of the Church under the state. The Roman Church is possessed of a perfect organization, of an extraordinary vitality, of an inexhaustible spiritual fecundity. She has a genius for creating, by her symbolism, ceremonial, ecclesiastical seasons, and external practices, a religious atmosphere in which religious interests tower over all other considerations and gradually permeate every phase of national life. A free Church in a free state has always ended in the triumph of the (Roman) Church and her ascendancy over the state. American patriotic zealots who fear that the papacy is aiming at the union of state and Church in this country, are haunted by an imaginary spectre. They will soon be wishing that the state find some means of checking the rapidly growing power and prestige of the Roman hierarchy.

CHURCH AND STATE

It is true, hoary theologians of the old school are still hugging the dream of an ideal Church married to an ideal Catholic state. But their bubble has burst. Archbishop Dowling of St. Paul has happily expressed it in declaring that this dream has been relegated to the limbo of defunct controversies.

In the first three centuries of the Christian era, the time of the persecutions, the Church, figuratively speaking, lived under ground in the catacombs. After that, beginning with Constantine, came the period of union of state and Church. The

emperors, kings and other Christian rulers usurped all sorts of rights and prerogatives in the government and affairs of the Church. She had to submit under duress.

In the United States, she is completely free from interference by the state. She flourishes in this splendid isolation. The Vatican may look calmly forward to an unprecedented triumph in this country, to the richest pasture in its entire history. If some people fail to see it, it may be due to the fact that nobody is so blind as he who does not want to see.

If the papacy is opposed to the separation of state and Church in some countries, as for instance in Austria, it is because there the state has confiscated the major portion of the vast possessions of the Church, accrued mostly from the offerings and pious legacies of the faithful in the course of many centuries. From this confiscated property the state is doling out a pittance for the support of the Church. A separation of state and Church would imply a discontinuance even of that scanty allowance, a complete spoliation of the Church. Naturally she objects to that.

In such a state, like Austria, the Church also quite reasonably objects to the state according equality to the Protestant denominations, that is, by subsidizing them from her own confiscated funds.

A regrettable intolerance, however, it is that in Catholic Spain Protestant houses of worship are prohibited from having steeples, a disability the Catholics are also subjected to in the German Protestant state of Mecklenburg.

For the rest, be it readily admitted that the Vatican has claimed unwarranted prerogatives for itself that are prejudicial to the freedom of conscience and to the just rights of the state. However, as it happens, the Syllabus advances no such claims. For the correct interpretation of the Syllabus it is necessary that before each condemned proposition be supplied its contradictory, namely: "it is not true that . . .," for instance, that Church and state should be separated.

THE LIGHT OF REASON PROSCRIBED

A stumbling block to many has been the proscription of proposition 14:

Everybody is free to adopt and profess that religion which he, guided by the light of reason, holds to be true.

Is the condemnation of this thesis not clearly tantamount to a denial of the principle of the freedom of conscience? It would seem so. In reality, however, it has nothing to do with a person's civic right of choosing his own religion. It is as purely a matter of speculative theology, as is the controversy between Presbyterian fundamentalists and modernists.

The thesis had been advanced, in 1848, by a Peruvian priest, Vigil, a rationalist, in his *Defensa*. He held that human reason, uninfluenced by what Christian positivists call the light and facts of Divine Revelation, is a sure and safe guide to religious truth. Vigil's theory had been dwelt upon by Pope Pius IX in his Apostolic Letter *Multiplices inter* of June 10, 1851; also in his Allocution *Singulari quadam* of Dec. 9, 1854. In the latter, the Pope advises that in the search for religious truth we must, besides using our reason, also pray to God for light. Mere reasoning, unaided by prayer, may not lead us to the right goal. The *Syllabus*, therefore, merely condemns Vigil's theory anew. Every Protestant fundamentalist will subscribe to the Pope's condemnation of it. It has absolutely nothing to do with the individual's civic right to select whatever religion he prefers.

THE SYLLABUS A BLUNDER

Here we see where the fatal blunder of the Syllabus lies: it should not have proscribed certain propositions in their bald, naked form. A safer way would have been to dispose of them in a more elucidated form which indicated their objectionable features or fallacies. For instance, the thesis of Vigil might have been condemned by the following counter proposition: "It is an error to hold that human reason, unaided by prayer, and disregarding the facts, and light of Divine Revelation, is a safe guide to religious truth." Vigil's thesis could then have been appended to this declaration. It would have been clear then that its proscription did not touch the question of the freedom of conscience.

Brevity may be the soul of wit, but it may also lead to confusion and misunderstandings.

We still remember the famous remark of the German Chancellor Bethmann-Holweg, in August, 1914, that the treaty of 1839, guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium, was "a scrap of paper." What the Chancellor meant to say, according to the German version, was this:

In the treaty of 1839 the Belgian government pledged itself to strict neutrality. But by entering a secret alliance with France, it has violated its pledge and rendered the treaty of 1839 a scrap of paper.

Accepted in its ordinary sense, the thesis of Vigil: "Everybody is free to adopt and profess that religion which he, guided by the light of reason, holds to be true," states a true enough principle. What the Syllabus objects to is the meaning Vigil had injected into the expression "the light of reason."

But it is exactly because the thesis on its face value enunciates a true enough principle, that the Syllabus blunders in proscribing it in this bald form.

AN ILLUSTRATION OF THE METHOD

Let me offer an analogy. Three plus one is four. From this plain truth a Mr. Wag draws the conclusion that three apples and one pear make four apples. He is stating a fallacy. But it would assuredly be an odd procedure on my part, if I went to disprove that fallacy by starting out: "It is not true that three plus one is four," even if I then appended a paraphrase explaining in what sense it is not true, namely, that three articles of one kind plus one article of another kind do not make four articles of one kind. This is what the Syllabus has done in several cases.

In regard to the question of the freedom of conscience, let us assume, for the sake of argument, that the Pope, in proscribing the thesis of Vigil, meant to deny a person's civic right to choose whatever religion he preferred. Could an American citizen consistently criticize the Pope in that? Let us see. The Mormons adopted and professed, in the light of their reason, a religion that encouraged the practice of polygamy. Uncle Sam soon induced them to see that practice in a different light.

However, as we have seen, the thesis of Vigil does not bear on the question of the freedom of conscience.

The condemnation of proposition 55, regarding the separation of state and Church, might have been worded as follows:

It is an error to hold that Church and state must necessarily be separated.

That one word "necessarily" would have implied that the Vatican does not always insist on a union of state and Church.

Equally liable to be misunderstood is proposition 80:

It is an error to hold that the pope may and must reconcile himself with, and adapt himself to, Progress, Liberalism, and Modern Civilization.

In the Catholic Encyclopaedia, under Syllabus, the Jesuit, A. Haag, defines the pontiff's attitude:

[This thesis] is to be explained with the help of the allocution *Jam dudum cernimus* of 18th March, 1861. In this allocution the pope expressly distinguishes between true and false civilization, and declares that history witnesses to the fact that the Holy See has always been the protector and patron of all genuine civilization, and he affirms that, if a system designed to de-Christianize the world be called a system of progress and civilization, he can never hold out the hand of peace to such a system. According to the words of this allocution, then, it is evident that the eightieth thesis applies to false progress and false liberalism and not to honest pioneer work seeking to open out new fields to human activity.

CIVIL AND CANON LAW

Another proscription that has been objected to is that of the following thesis:

In the case of conflicting laws enacted by the Two Powers [the state and the Church] the civil law prevails.

If press reports are true, the Calles government in Mexico has expressed its willingness to permit the Catholic clergy the exercise of its pastoral functions under certain conditions, one of them being that the clergy get married.

Bavaria, two-thirds Catholic, has a union of state and Church. Both the Catholic and Protestant Churches are supported by the state. Let us suppose now that the Catholic majority in the Bavarian diet passed a law demanding that the Protestant clergy observe celibacy, under penalty of being prohibited from the exercise of the functions of the ministry. Would that law rightfully prevail over the law of the Protestant Church permitting her clergy to be married? May the state enact any law it sees fit? Or is there a limit to the authority of the state?

SEPARATION OF NATIONAL CHURCHES

The Syllabus declares:

It is an error to hold that national churches, withdrawn from the authority of the Roman Pontiff and altogether separated, can be established.

The Roman Catholic Church is an international organization, a world Church. A strong faction in the Protestant Episcopal Church favors a union (fusion) with the Roman Church. How can the latter continue as a world Church, if each nationality is (dogmatically) free to separate itself completely from the main body and its central government?

The Syllabus does not advocate the use of external force, say a league of Catholic powers, to compel a nation, for instance Poland, to remain within the Roman communion. Catholic theologians may have, in theory, claimed for the papacy the right to employ external force to compel submission to the Holy See. However, as it happens, no such foolish claim is advanced by the Syllabus.

Dogmatic insistence on a one and undivided world Church in union with the Roman Pontiff contains no challenge to religious freedom. Unjust, obviously, is the system by which the Italians have for over four centuries monopolized the supreme government of the world Church. Unjust also is the over-centralization of power by which the Vatican arrogates to itself the right of nominating the bishops in the United States. But as long as the American Catholics, who are more Roman than the Pope himself, are pleased to make a door mat out of themselves, the Pope naturally wipes his feet on them.

Again the Syllabus asserts:

It is an error to hold that the Sacrament of Matrimony is only something accessory to the contract and separate from it.

In this many have seen a challenge to the sovereignty of the state. The issue, however, is purely theological. It does not touch the right of the state to enact marriage laws nor does it question the validity of civil marriage.

The Roman catechism teaches that the marriage contract, or exchange of conjugal vows, constitutes the essence of the Sacrament of Matrimony. The officiating priest acts as the official witness of the Church and as the minister delegated by her to impart her blessing to the couple. He does not confer the Sacrament on the couple. The man and woman, by exchanging the marriage vows, confer the Sacrament on each other. This marital contract is the Sacrament of Matrimony, and the Sacrament of Matrimony is the contract, and not a mere accessory to the contract. The blessing of the Church is the accessory.

THE ROMAN VIEW OF PROTESTANT MARRIAGES

It would require a long dissertation to cover the practical aspects of that doctrine in reference to the spiritual life of the faithful. The Roman Church holds that a Protestant couple, that is when not disqualified by a divorce or any other impediment, receives a Sacrament, be the marriage contracted before a minister or a civil officer.

A recent cause celebre, fully reported in the newspapers, is a case in point. It is supposed that the annulment of the Marlborough marriage by the Sacred Rota implied a discourtesy to the Anglican Church and an affront to the sovereignty of the state.

The Protestant denominations have made their marriage regulations without consulting the Roman Church. The latter cannot be expected to consult the three hundred Protestant denominations in passing and enforcing her marriage regulations. At the time of the Reformation the Pope refused King Henry VIII of England an annulment of his marriage to Queen Catherine. The Anglican Church granted that annulment. The Vatican has no special reason to view with favor the findings of an Anglican matrimonial court. The Vatican has a long memory.

As regards the injured sovereignty of the state, it must be remembered that the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough had obtained a divorce from the state. Each contracted a second marriage under the laws of the state. These two (second) marriages the Anglican Church rejects, she declares them invalid. But the parties are no longer under her jurisdiction, having become members of the Roman Church, which for a certain reason--be that reason solid or not does not matter here--recognizes them as valid. How can a member of the Anglican Church that rejects these two marriages contracted under the laws of the state, accuse the Roman Church, that recognizes these two marriages, of putting up an affront to the sovereignty of the state? I am unable to follow the argument.

For the rest, though it is not to the point, most of the American Catholics who have followed the Marlborough case seem to be under the impression that the Sacred Rota in Rome has sadly blundered in granting the annulment. They fail to see how the Duchess could for more than twenty years have remained under duress and force in

keeping up marital relations. They do not grasp certain fine distinctions drawn by the Roman lawyers. Vatican prestige has been impaired.

THE SECULAR POWER OF THE POPE

The Syllabus, then, does not encroach on the reasonable rights of the state, nor on the freedom of conscience of the non-Catholics. There is one proposition, however, the insertion of which tends to restrict unjustly the freedom of conscience of the Catholics themselves. This is the condemnation of proposition 75:

The abrogation of the civil authority (secular power) which the Pope possesses would be very conducive towards the freedom and prosperity of the Church.

In 1870, the Pope lost his civil authority. Who will deny that the Church since then has gained immensely in power and prestige? Not necessarily because the Pope is deprived of the secular power, but somehow or other the Church has gained, in leaps and bounds. Maybe Dollinger was right, after all, in calling the secular power the Achilles heel, the weak spot, of the Church.

The late Jesuit, Hugo Hurter, in the eighth edition of his *Compendium Theologiae Dogmaticae* [Textbook of Dogmatic Theology, Vol. I, No. 153]--it is extensively used in American seminaries--maintains that the Pope in promulgating the Syllabus spoke *ex cathedra*. Hence the Syllabus is endowed with dogmatic force. A Catholic, therefore, who holds that the papacy is vastly better off without the secular power, commits a sin against faith. This is a rather sharply peppered morsel to force down the patient throat of the faithful. It is one of the many instances of the tendency of our ruling theologians to multiply dogmas.

Papal infallibility is supposed to confine itself to matters of faith and morals. Even on that field it is narrowly circumscribed. What has the civil authority, the possession of

Central Italy, to do with the teachings of Christ? It is interesting to note here that in the opinion of Cardinal Newman, as quoted by Governor Smith, the Syllabus has no dogmatic force.

Pius IX is said to have been a kind, guileless soul, an unassuming aristocrat, a poor judge of character, but gifted with a sense of humor and ready wit, as is well illustrated by the following little pleasantry. During a conference with the French ambassador, the Pope, taking snuff, offered it to the distinguished diplomat. "Holy Father, this is a vice I have not got," the Frenchman declined with a mischievous smile.

"If it was a vice, you would have it all right," the Pontiff retorted.

The Pope's sense of humor seems to have been asleep when he inserted proposition 75 into the Syllabus. For he surely was sufficiently familiar with Church history to know that the administration of secular power has been the occasion of an almost uninterrupted carnival of graft, corruption and scandal. Unscrupulous ecclesiastics and certain privileged noble families had fattened on it all along. It is one of the most unedifying chapters in the long history of the Church.

This secular power continued to be a source of graft and scandal to its very last day. The man to whom Pius IX entrusted its administration was his secretary of state, Cardinal Antonelli. The Cardinal, who was descended from an impoverished family, left at his death a fortune of about eight million dollars, an immense sum for those days. Nobody knows how many more millions he may have quietly disposed of before his death. There hardly existed any doubt that the great "statesman" in administering the secular power did not forget his own pocketbook. The Jesuits have been severely criticized for antagonizing this financial genius who in his policies was an absolutistic reactionary.

SALVATION OUTSIDE THE CHURCH

Let us select one more example to show what a misleading document the Syllabus really is. It proscribes proposition 17:

We may at least hope for the eternal salvation of those who live outside the true Church.

By true Church, of course, is meant the Roman Catholic Church. Does the condemnation of this thesis not clearly imply that only Catholics can go to heaven ? It would seem so. In reality, however, it does not mean to assert any such thing. It does not at all intend to state that all non-Catholics are excluded from heaven. This is evident from the context of the above mentioned allocution *Singulari quadam*.

According to Catholic doctrine, anybody may save his soul who lives up to his sincere religious convictions. God will judge everyone by the light that has been given him. A Protestant ruler who, misguided by an erroneous conscience, puts 50,000 Catholics to death for the sake of their religion, honestly believing that he is doing a service to God, may go to heaven, provided that in everything else he obeys the dictates of his conscience.

The English language labors under one great defect: it has no fixed consistent rule of pronunciation. For example, the "oo" is pronounced differently in food, in flood, and in floor. This inconsistency has elicited from a Frenchman the bon mot: the Englishman writes "ass" and pronounces it "donkey." Of the Syllabus of Pope Pius IX it may be said that it says "pepper" and means "salt." It represents the result of twelve years of arduous labor by three successive commissions of theologians. It is true, the (third) commission that drew it up in its final form, appended to each proposition the true meaning of it and referred to the respective papal document dealing with the subject. But it should have been foreseen that the Syllabus might some day be broadcasted in its naked form--with or without evil intent--and be misconstrued and create prejudice against the Church. As a matter of fact, even the average priest has difficulty in arriving at the true sense of it. For the explanatory paraphrases and the respective papal documents are difficult to obtain. An explanation of the Syllabus

appeared serially about two years ago in the Catholic periodical *Our Sunday Visitor*. I do not know whether it has been reprinted in booklet form.

THE EFFECTS OF THE SYLLABUS

We do not know whether the Syllabus can boast of any noticeable success in crushing the errors of pantheism, rationalism, communism and other anti-Christian doctrines. But we do know that in its inevitably misleading form it has confused millions of minds. Well meaning, intelligent people could not help waxing wroth at what seemed to them the flaunting intolerance and defiant arrogance of the papacy.

Twelve years of conscientious toil our Vatican theologians spent on equipping an arsenal of weapons for the use of the enemies of the Church. One wonders whether things could not have been managed differently. If not, would it not have been the lesser of two evils to consign the Syllabus to the fire instead of promulgating it?

The Syllabus has stirred up a considerable amount of hatred of the Catholic religion. Such hatred often leads to discrimination against Catholics in business, in the appointment to lucrative positions, in the political and academic career. God alone knows the number of innocent Catholics whose prospects of prosperity and advancement have been blighted by this unfortunate document which even today is still extensively cited.

In theory, and by intention, the Syllabus is an inoffensive document that respects the freedom of conscience and the just rights of the state. In practice, it has proven itself to be a glaring misrepresentation of the Catholic faith. It is called the Syllabus of Errors. It is--de facto, not de jure--a colossal error itself.

It was a wise custom of the Middle Ages to assign to the rulers a court jester. This privileged character opened their eyes to many a salutary truth that nobody else dared

to make them acquainted with. It might have proved a great benefit to the Church, if the popes had employed such a mentor. The right kind of a court jester might have prevented a great harm to the Church if, on the even of Dec. 8, 1864, he had stepped up to His Holiness and said: "Holy Father, let me promulgate that Syllabus."

(To be continued)

----o----

THE REFORMATION

The terms "Reformation" and "Protestantism" are inherited by the modern historian; they are not of his devising and come to him laden with reminiscences of all the exalted enthusiasm and bitter antipathies engendered by a period of fervid religious dissension. The unmeasured invective of Luther and Aleander has not ceased to re-echo, and the old issues are by no means dead.

The heat of controversy is, however, abating, and during the past thirty or forty years both Catholic and Protestant investigators have been vying with one another in adding to our knowledge and in rectifying old mistakes; while an ever-increasing number of writers pledged to neither party are aiding in developing an idea of the scope and nature of the Reformation which differs radically from the traditional one. We now appreciate too thoroughly the intricacy of the medieval Church; its vast range of activity, secular as well as religious, the inextricable interweaving of the civil and ecclesiastical governments, the slow and painful process of their divorce as the old ideas of the proper functions of the two institutions have changed in both Protestant and Catholic lands, we perceive all too clearly the limitations of the reformers, their distrust of reason and criticism--in short, we know too much about medieval institutions and the process of their disintegration longer to see in the Reformation an abrupt break in the general history of Europe. No one will, of course, question the importance of the schism which created the distinction between Protestants and Catholics, but it must always be remembered that the religious questions at issue

comprised a relatively small part of the whole compass of human aspirations and conduct, even to those to whom religion was especially vital, while a large majority of the leaders in literature, art, science and public affairs went their way seemingly almost wholly unaffected by theological problems.

--[James Harvey Robinson.]

----o----

EDITORIAL

R.J. MEEKREN, Editor in Charge

E.E. Thiemeyer, Research Editor

BOARD OF EDITORS

LOUIS BLOCK, Iowa

ROBERT I. CLEGG, Illinois

GILBERT W. DAYNES, England

RAY V. DENSLOW, Missouri

GEORGE H. DERN, Utah

N.W.J. HAYDON, Canada

R.V. HARRIS, Canada

C. C. HUNT, Iowa

CHARLES F. IRWIN, Pennsylvania

A. L. KRESS, Pennsylvania

F. H. LITTLEFIELD, Missouri

JOSEPH E. MORCOMBE, California

ARTHUR C. PARKER, New York

J. HUGO TATSCH, Iowa

JESSE M. WHITED, California

DAVID E. W WILLIAMSON Nevada

THE VATICAN AND ITS DISCIPLINE

THE article by Dr. Leo Cadius (which we need hardly say is an assumed name) will be read we believe with a great deal of interest. The author informs us that he would have preferred to have published it in a Roman Catholic journal, but that he knows of none in America that would dare to present so frank a criticism of the policies and methods of the Vatican, and that it is for this reason he has "invoked the courtesy of a Masonic periodical to give it publicity."

The subject matter fits in so well with the series of articles that we have planned, that it was felt advisable to make room for it, and we trust that the authors of the articles it has temporarily displaced will accept our apologies for the delay thereby involved.

One point arises in the statement made by Dr. Cadius which seems worthy of consideration, which is that apparently free criticism is impossible in the Roman

Church. The difference between free and unfree institutions and countries is always marked by the presence or absence of free speech and free criticism of rulers and their policies.

* * *

THE SIN OF FREEMASONRY

A CORRESPONDENT, whose letter we reproduce in this issue, has broached an aspect of the "Serious Question" that we raised last month which in the article was taken for granted. The subject is complex, and so much obscured by prejudices and confusion of thought that it is obvious that it can only be treated in broad outline, leaving details for further discussion. We therefore make no apology for having made this particular assumption, even if in the event it be judged a mistaken one.

The point raised is really one of fact, and yet unfortunately not on that account at all easy to determine, at least in such wise that all will be satisfied. The question is this, is it, or is it not a fact that, according to the rules and regulations governing the Confessional, a Roman priest has no right to demand the revelation of any secrets known to a penitent as a condition of giving absolution? It seems as if it should be comparatively simple to find out what the answer is, yet there are all sorts of difficulties in the way of establishing it. For one thing there is the cloud of distrust and suspicion with which most Protestants regard the whole subject, for another the general non-accessibility of authoritative evidence on the subject. Roman Catholics when questioned tell us that they are bound only to confess their sins, not to reveal secrets, whether their own or those of other people. But most Protestants believe quite simply that this is not the truth.

Now people, normal people at least, do not tell lies merely for the sake of doing so. The underlying assumption, then, must be that the Romanists not only wish to put the matter in as favorable a light as possible for external consumption, but have something to conceal. All witnesses being thus suspected, it follows that the only

resource remaining, apparently, is to go to the works of Roman Canonists, Theologians and Casuists; to the various manuals and the rules and regulations governing the matter. Here, however, we again meet obstacles, for most people insurmountable. Aside from the fact that these are all written in a language unknown to a great majority of people, most of them are difficult of access. They are not as a rule to be found in public libraries nor to be obtained of booksellers. And besides all this they are very technical, as hard indeed to understand, for those not trained in scholastic forms of presentation, as a work on advanced chemistry or the higher mathematics would be to the ordinary intelligent reader. To what source then are we to seek?

A considerable proportion of the Fraternity are personally acquainted with some priest of the Roman Church, perhaps with more than one, and it may be have at some time raised this very question in conversation. The answer has probably been that to insist on the revelation of a secret belonging to others would be to cause the penitent to commit another sin, providing that such secret was not in itself sinful. This sounds plausible enough, but suspicion once aroused knows no bounds. The proviso may cover a good deal. Freemasonry is a condemned institution, its secrets are sinful, and hence must be confessed. The reply that the sin consists in becoming a member of We forbidden society and not in having knowledge of its formal and ceremonial mysteries will not be convincing at all. Most Masons who read, perhaps some who do not, know of John Coustos, who in 1743 was imprisoned by the Inquisition at Lisbon and repeatedly tortured in an attempt to force him to reveal these secrets. He was told that such revelation was required as evidence of good faith. Would not a similar demand be made today of a Mason seeking reconciliation with the Roman Church? The fact that this is strenuously denied will probably do no more (for so suspicion works) than confirm the belief that it would be.

Suppose then that the enquirer consults such means as are readily available as to the practice of Confession; as for example the various encyclopedias. These tell us that though the penitent is encouraged to confess all faults, the only ones for which Confession is obligatory are those classed as "Mortal sins." But again rises the question, would not Freemasonry be regarded as a mortal sin? Naturally it is not found in the formal list, Pride, Avarice, Anger, Gluttony, Unchastity, and so on, but it might be included under Indifference spiritual apathy - or deliberate disobedience. It has been stated, apparently on good authority, that the sin of being a Freemason is one reserved to the bishop, that it is too serious to be reconciled by a priest, except of

course in articulo mortis, at the death bed of the penitent. An offense so reserved must surely be as deadly as anger or gluttony – or so it would seem in the layman's eyes.

Thus it seems that we arrive at an impasse. We cannot believe the only people who can tell us about it, and thus we either believe the opposite of what they say, or remain in a state of suspicious doubt. Perhaps the only thing to do is to try and get a fresh point of view. We are all familiar with wholesale denunciations of the Roman Church, its doctrines, organization, methods and objects. Most people discount this sort of thing quite heavily, yet, it has some effect on them. A little logical analysis may help. If we take such denunciation as entirely true then the Roman Church is but a "Synagogue of Satan," an organization of evil men working purely for evil ends - there is no good in it at all. But common sense simply recoils from this. Our Roman Catholic neighbors are on the whole as decent people as those who are Protestant; it is impossible to include them in such a sweeping condemnation. Our fathers had a better method, they admitted the virtues of "Papists" but they held that these very virtues became sin in view of the "idolatry" and "error" of the Roman Church. The argument sounds strange to us, but was quite consistent once the premises were granted. We, however, do not grant them, and so we have no right to the conclusion. We, rightly let us hope, hold that life and actions are of greater weight than using the proper formulas to express our beliefs and so must allow our antagonists the merit of their personal good actions and virtuous lives. Neither have we the logical right to judge them by their black sheep - if at least we would not have them judge us by ours.

What does this lead to? Perhaps our thoroughgoing suspicions may have taken us too far; perhaps after all we should give some credit to what Roman Catholics tell us of their own institution. Let us remember how consistently, and ludicrously, they suspect us. How they imagine a great world-wide machine constantly seeking to overthrow all religion, or to replace it by some false "liberal" theistic creed worse than no religion at all. They refuse to believe what we say; every statement we make becomes, under the influence of their suspicions, merely added proof of what they believe of us. Is not the parallel possibly instructive?

Let us consider the circumstances under which the question we began with would arise. There are two quite distinct cases. The Romanist, who in disobedience to the rule of his Church, becomes a Mason, and the Mason who becomes a convert to the

Roman Church. The latter is comparatively simple. Freemasonry in his case is merely a part of the life of general sinfulness from which he has turned, and which is all removed by baptism. The first case is more complex. In his defection and disobedience the penitent has committed a very grave, that is, mortal sin, which he must confess in order to obtain absolution and reconciliation. How does one confess the sin of Freemasonry? How would one confess the sin of anger, or of gluttony? We are told that it is not necessary for the penitent to say who he was angry with, or when he ate too much, or what he gorged himself on. Would not admission of the fact that he had been a member of the forbidden Fraternity, and was sorry for it and had left it, be sufficient? Or would he have to tell all the secrets as evidence of good faith? In sins of a sexual nature we are told that the priest is forbidden to ask even the names of the parties concerned - even as evidence of real contrition. On what grounds should there be any difference in the two cases?

When we trace the history of the Papal ban on Freemasonry, the circumstances strongly point to the probability that it was in the first instance due to quite other than religious grounds. It was occasioned by the formation of a lodge in Rome when the Pope was a temporal sovereign. His government of the Papal states was autocratic and despotic in the highest degree, and his objection to the Masonic lodge was the objection that all despots have to any kind of oath-bound secret society. Being a spiritual ruler as well as a temporal one, he backed the political act of suppression by spiritual anathema. And the despotic rulers of Roman Catholic countries availed themselves of the latter to supplement their own political prohibition of Masonry. It was most probably for political reasons that the attempt was made on different occasions to force individual Masons to tell all they knew about their Society - the Inquisition where it existed was always as much political as religious, if not more so. In fact, as articles to be published in THE BUILDER Will show, though camouflaged under the appearance of religious and doctrinal controversy, the opposition to Rome has always received its driving power from political, national and economic motives. None of which could possibly have had any effect but for the constant tendency of a worldwide international organization, with the traditions of Imperial Rome behind it, to mix politics with religion, and to use the latter to further ends inspired by the former.

Yet after all our question remains unanswered, and we can only say that our readers must come to their own conclusions as best they can, though we hope this discussion may in some sort assist them. Our own conclusion, whatever it may be worth, is this:

that a confessor would really have no right to, demand the revelation of Masonic secrets as the condition of reconciling a penitent Roman Catholic guilty of this sin; but that possibly some individual priest might seek to satisfy his curiosity by insisting upon it. What would happen in such a case would depend probably on the character and intelligence of his penitent - his knowledge of his rights under the Canon law of the Church.

* * *

A NOTABLE CONFERENCE

LAST month a small, but we believe, very important meeting was held at Detroit. It was called by the brethren entrusted with the direction of Masonic education in Michigan, actively aided and abetted by those concerned with the same task in New York, among whom of course was Bro. H. L. Haywood, former editor of THE BUILDER.

The meeting was absolutely informal and unofficial, and nothing in the way of organization was contemplated, no arrangements even being made to call another one, though everyone present felt that it had been so helpful that other like meetings should be called in the future if at all possible.

Under the circumstances no resolutions could be passed, and no formal conclusions were arrived at. The results were largely intangible, but not for that less valuable. It is really almost a general rule that the greatest values are intangible. There was an interchange of ideas, and experiences, discussion of methods and objects, and the inspiration of personal contact with others engaged in the same work. It made us wish that some means might be evolved whereby members of the N.M.R.S. could be brought together periodically, if not nationally at least in local or regional meetings. There is no doubt that enthusiasm would be increased and much good result therefrom. This is one of the things that must be kept in mind and perhaps the future may bring it to pass.

* * *

A MATTER FOR RESEARCH

A MUCH respected brother, and one who has been a faithful member of the Society from its beginning, recently expressed his opinion in conversation that THE BUILDER in taking up the T.B. campaign was exceeding the proper limits of a research journal.

In an editorial article as long ago as March, 1926, we touched upon this point, admitting that such advocacy was not specifically a matter for the Research Society to deal with. But we said, and repeat, that such advocacy requires no apology, as we are all Masons before we are students, and that the problem is one that all American Masons are of obligation bound to consider, including members of the Society and readers of THE BUILDER.

Now, however, we feel inclined to go further and to insist that it is a subject proper for Masonic research. In the nature of things the larger part of the field of such research is quite closely connected with some aspect of the history of the Fraternity. History is of course a much wider subject than lists of dates and bare recapitulations of the order of events and succession of persons. Still though the historical bulks so largely, there are other things open to and needing investigation, in order that we may know what to do, and how to do it, in respect to present day problems.

The T.B. problem is one that needs such investigation. First it has to be established that there is a real need. Though we do not take responsibility for the North East Corner, we believe that the facts that have been presented there have established at least a prima facie case for the existence of the problem.

If this be so, there is next the question how it is to be met. In such a complex question opinions naturally vary, and it is only by open discussion that these opinions, and the respective arguments in their favor, can be constructively criticised. THE BUILDER is not committed to any mode of approach. We are satisfied, however, that a problem exists, and that the Craft must find a solution or be stultified. We have lent such assistance as we have been able to the N.M.T.S.A., because the need seemed urgent, and this was the only definite move to meet it.

However, there is no doubt that in the minds of a number of brethren, many of them in positions of great influence, there exists a feeling of opposition. Let us say to these that we would be most glad to offer our pages to any expression of such opposition. If it can be shown that there is really no problem, that the number of tuberculous Masons is negligible, that there is no call for special assistance in the Southwest, that the problem is local and not national, or if there are any other arguments or statements of facts which would present the matter from another viewpoint, or throw new light upon it, we certainly hope that some presentation of this side of the case will be made. Then in the light of what has been said pro and contra those without first-hand information may come to their own conclusions.

* * *

MANKIND AND THE DEITY

(Communicated by Bro. N.W.J. Haydon, Canada.)

In view of the discussion that has been proceeding in THE BUILDER on the subject of the Conception of God, initiated by the article of a "Lay Brother," the following extracts from an address by Bro. Rabbi Isserman of the Holy Blossom Synagogue, Toronto, Canada, may be interesting:

Liberal Judaism teaches that revelation was, and is, limited to no one people; that God did not reveal Himself to Israel only - that He did not speak only to the sacred men of

the Jews. That is a narrow notion of God, which makes Him partial to any of His children, which makes Him reveal Himself to one and not to others.

God is not niggardly and miserly. To all peoples does He reveal Himself. In all lands has He made Himself known. To all men has He sent prophets - to the Chinese, Confucius and Laotse; to the Hindoos, Buddha and Krishna; to the Persians, Zoroaster; to the Mohammedans, Mahomet; to the Jews, Moses; and to the Christians, Jesus.

God is the property of all mankind. His Spirit is found in the Bible, but it is found in the sacred literatures of other peoples in the psalms of the Babylonians, in the texts of the Egyptians, in the Vedas of the Hindoos, in the Gathas of the Persians, and in the Holy Law of the Buddhists. All peoples have Bibles - all people knew God - to all people revelation came.

This should be recognized, the beauty of all faiths. We should know that God strives to make Himself articulate among all peoples. We should be ready to welcome to Jewish pulpits fine Mohammedans, Buddhists and Hindoos as we should fine Christians.

----o----

Government is a contrivance of human wisdom to provide for human wants. Men have a right that these wants should be provided for by this wisdom. - Burke.

----o----

THE NORTHEAST CORNER

Bulletin of the National Masonic Tuberculosis Sanatoria Association

Incorporated by Authority of the Grand Lodge of New Mexico, A. F. & A.M.

MASONIC TEMPLE, ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.

OFFICERS AND BOARD OF GOVERNORS

HERBERT B. HOLT, Grand Master, President

RICHARD H. HANNA, Vice-President

JAFFA MILLER, Vice-President

ALPHEUS A. KEEN, Secretary

JOHN W. TURNER, Treasurer

FRANCIS E. LESTER, Vice-President

WILBUR L. ELSOR, Executive Secretary, Mesilla Park, N.M.

ARIZONA - Lloyd C. Henning, Holbrook.

ARKANSAS - Claude L. Hill, Grand Master, Booneville.

FLORIDA - Cary B. Fish, Grand Master, Sarasota.

GEORGIA - Dr. J. P. Bowdoin, Past Grand Master.

IDAHO - Will H. Gibson, Grand Master, Boise.

KENTUCKY - G. Allison Holland, Grand Master, Lexington.

MINNESOTA - Albert F. Pray, Grand Master, Minneapolis.

Mississippi - John R. Tally, Grand Master, Hattiesburg.

Missouri - Wm. W. Martin, Grand Master, Doniphan.

MONTANA - Dr. W. J. Marshall, Missoula.

NEW JERSEY - Benjamin F. Havens, Junior Grand Warden, Trenton.

NEW MEXICO - Herbert B. Holt, Grand Master, Las Cruces.

NORTH CAROLINA - Dr. J. C. Braswell, Past Grand Master, Whitakers.

NORTH DAKOTA - Dr. J. S. Lamont, Dunseith.

OKLAHOMA - Gilbert B. Bristow, Past Grand Master, Roosevelt.

RHODE ISLAND - Howard Knight, Past Grand Master, Providence.

SOUTH CAROLINA - Charlton DuRant, Grand Master, Manning.

SOUTH DAKOTA - L. M. Simons, Grand Master, Bellefourche.

TENNESSEE - Andrew E. McCullagh, Grand Master, Maryville.

TEXAS - Dr. Felix P. Miller, El Paso.

UTAH - Fred M. Nye, Ogden.

WASHINGTON - Morton Gregory, Grand Master, Tacoma.

WISCON - Fred L. Wright, Past Senior Grand Warden, Milwaukee.

WYOMING - Frank S. Knittle, Grand Master, Casper.

ROBERT J. NEWTON, Editor, Manager N. M. T. S. A., Las Cruces, New Mexico

Property Versus Lives

It has been reported that \$115,000 was collected for the relief of Masons who were in distress because of the great Florida hurricane.

An appeal is now being made for help for Masons who are in distress because of the Mississippi flood.

And yet in neither disaster has it been claimed that the lives of any Masons, or relatives of Masons, were lost.

The National Masonic Tuberculosis Sanatoria Association has called the attention of the Craft to the fact that it is estimated by the National Tuberculosis Association, the outstanding authority on the subject in America, that approximately 4,309 Masonic lives are lost each year from tuberculosis.

An additional and larger number of relatives of Freemasons die every year of tuberculosis.

The Tuberculosis Association estimates that there are nine living cases for every annual death.

The Sanatoria Association has compiled a list of 2,225 tuberculous Masons and 814 sick relatives of Masons, of which number 1,693 Masons and 321 relatives were in the Southwest seeking health.

The National Masonic Tuberculosis Sanatoria Association has made an appeal for \$65,000 with which to buy a Tuberculosis Sanatorium located in the city of El Paso and for additional funds with which to operate the hospital.

This appeal was sent to every Grand Master, every State York Rite body, to all Scottish Rite bodies, to all Shrine Temples, Grottoes and to State Eastern Star Chapters.

The answer to this appeal, which was for immediate action, has not been encouraging. Apparently the officers of these bodies will wait to submit it to their respective meetings.

This brings out the strange fact that Freemasonry can function promptly to relieve distress due to property loss caused by flood and hurricane and yet cannot function to relieve distress caused by sickness which endangers life itself. It cannot function to render aid to Masonic families, whose homes will be broken up by long-drawn-out illness. It cannot act to save a brother, who for lack of such action will lose his life.

An average contribution of only five cents per capita of American Freemasonry would buy the El Paso Sanatorium and pay operating costs for one year. This institution will care for about one hundred patients. It will furnish a practical working example of the plan for hospitalization of Masonry's unfortunates. Men and women suffering from tuberculosis, and cared for in a Masonic hospital, will have their disease arrested and will return to their families. In a very short time it will be demonstrated if there exists a need for additional beds. If so, plans can then be made for meeting that need, in the Southwest and in other parts of the country. Freemasons, like Missourians, need only to be shown. If they find that the expenditure of some few thousands of dollars will save Masonic lives, will restore fathers to their families, and will save the Fraternity from assuming the support of children who would otherwise be orphaned by tuberculosis, then American Freemasonry will contribute all necessary funds to provide for hospital care for all of Freemasonry's unfortunate sick.

If Freemasons, everywhere, will urge upon the officers of Masonic bodies a prompt and generous response to the appeal for funds with which to buy and operate the El Paso Sanatorium, it may yet be possible to carry this plan of the National Masonic Tuberculosis Sanatoria Association into effect.

* * *

WHAT IS YOUR LIFE WORTH?

Much has been said about the loss of lives due to tuberculosis, that ancient enemy of the human race. The number of those who die and of those living who are suffering with the dread disease has been told and retold. But such figures make little impression. One dead child run down by an automobile before our eyes makes a deeper impression upon us than the tale of a thousand slain by some gruesome epidemic, if that thousand are dead in some remote place, or if they are scattered over a wide territory and in many cities and towns.

There is another angle to the loss from tuberculosis which may make a greater appeal to some minds. That is the money loss. Just what is the economic loss to America from a death caused by tuberculosis?

The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company has recently carried some national advertising in which an average American family is pictured, a father, mother, two boys and a girl. The caption reads, "Broke - but Worth \$79,100." The advertisement reads, in part, as follows:

As a useful American, Dad, at 30, can figure himself as actually worth \$31,000 today - for that is the present value of his future earnings less his personal expenses. Dad is one of thousands who are earning \$50.00 a week - an average Dad with average health and average expectation of life. If Dad is frequently sick or if he dies young, he

will be worth less than \$31,000. With better-than-average health and longer life, he should be worth a great deal more. His family will be better protected, better nourished and given a greater chance for future success if Dad keeps well.

Mother's contribution to the family wealth - her time and energy, to say nothing of her love and devotion, her care of the home and the children and her work in molding their characters - can never be measured in money. But at a very conservative estimate, the money value of her services must be at least half that of Dad's - \$15,500.

That rosy-cheeked, four-months-old baby boy is worth \$9,500 this minute, while big Brother, seven, and little Sister, five, are worth \$16,000 and \$7,100 each as future productive citizens.

The National Masonic Tuberculosis Sanatoria Association asked the statisticians of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company to make an estimate of the economic loss to America caused by the death of a tuberculous Freemason and of the total loss caused by the deaths of four thousand three hundred and nine Freemasons, which is the estimated annual loss to the Fraternity from this one disease.

The reply to this request gave the figure of \$21,600 as the average economic value of each life lost by tuberculosis and the total economic loss as over \$93,000,000.

Following is a letter written by Alfred J. Lotka, Supervisor of Mathematical Research of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, in which he sets forth the method used in arriving at these estimates:

The figure of \$21,600 for the average value of the lives lost by tuberculosis in the United States is based on two sets of data. First, the deaths actually reported in five-year age groups from birth to the end of life, according to the United States Census Bureau. As a matter of fact, the 1924 figures were used at the time, as the 1925

figures were not yet available. They have since become available but their use in place of the 1924 figures would have no appreciable influence on the result.

Second, a scale of values of a man at several ages of life developed in this Bureau was computed on the basis of the case of a man who at his maximum earning capacity earns \$2,500 a year. The value of such a man to his family was computed as the present worth of his future net earnings, that is to say, total earnings minus expenditure on his own personal maintenance. A series of articles was published in our Bulletin on this subject, and you will receive a set of the Bulletins in question together with this letter. Applying the values thus computed to the deaths from tuberculosis at the several ages of life, the figure \$21,600 is obtained as the average value of a person thus dying. The figure was given to Mr. Drolet on the express understanding that it was a tentative estimate and on page fourteen of his address the figure is, in point of fact, expressly stated to be a tentative estimate.

Perhaps it will be proper to draw to your attention that the value of a man thus computed is the value of his dependents, wife and children, who benefit from his net earnings. The term, "value of a man," is vague unless it is stated in regard to whom that value is considered; his value to his employers, or to his employees, or to his competitors, are all distinctly different concepts and would have distinctly different quantitative measure. You will find reference made to this point in the opening article of the series in the Bulletin of November, 1926.

* * *

TUBERCULOSIS HOSPITALIZATION IN THE UNITED STATES INSUFFICIENT

In the discussion of the subject of Masonic relief and hospitalization of tubercular Freemasons, the suggestion has been advanced that sick Masons should be cared for in existing hospitals. If there were a sufficient number of tuberculosis hospital beds in the United States this plan might be worthy of adoption. In a paper read before the

meeting of the National Tuberculosis Association, at Washington, on Oct. 5, 1926, Godias J. Drolet, Statistician of the New York Tuberculosis and Public Health Association, presented a statement showing a great shortage of hospital beds in this country. The following is quoted from his address:

After considering, as far as known, the extent of the tuberculosis situation in the United States, we can now study more usefully the record of the present facilities and of remaining obvious needs.

According to the latest list of sanatoria and hospitals made by the National Tuberculosis Association, we see that in the 48 states and the District of Columbia there is now a grand total of 73,715 tuberculosis beds available; 53,510 being for civilians; 5,479 for the insane in state institutions; 1,325 for prisoners in various penal institutions, and 13,401 for those under the care of the Federal government through the Veterans' Bureau and the Army and Navy Departments, or for Indians.

The number of beds available in each state is shown on table 4, where they have been contrasted at the same time with the number of tuberculosis deaths. We have also figured there, on the basis of a bed for each death, the shortage remaining or the excess of beds in certain older communities as well as in health resorts. From this comparison we find that there is still a shortage in the United States of more than 25,000 beds. In only 11 states are there sufficient tuberculosis beds, according to this rule.

There are several states where more than 1,000 beds are still needed. Among these should be mentioned Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia - most of them, as may be noticed, in the South. Furthermore, in many states the shortage existing would be considerably higher were we to remove, as not available for local residents, several important Federal institutions, which figure in this study.

Then again, in certain communities where they might well afford more and find it an investment in saving lives, we should not wish to have it accented too complacently that only one bed is needed for each death. For instance, there are sections of the country where morbidity is higher than elsewhere or where cases run a more acute course and are in greater need of institutional facilities. Again, the figuring of beds on the basis of mortality ignores the fact that nowadays we ought to be able to find cases in the earlier stages of the disease and that sanatorium treatment in the country, instead of hospital care in the city, is in continued and increasing demand. We may, therefore, well need yet a still greater number of sanatorium beds for the more timely treatment of favorable cases.

* * *

THE WORDS OF A PROPHET

The writer of the Report of the Committee on Foreign Correspondence of the Grand Lodge of Missouri has this to say about the national movement for relief and hospitalization of Masonry's T.B's:

The Tuberculosis Sanatoria Association is, perhaps, the most significant movement before the Masonic public, and unless we are very much mistaken, this enterprise will soon capture the imagination of the entire Fraternity. If it succeeds in doing this, we may look for the largest outburst of Masonic philanthropy that has ever been witnessed in this or any other country.

* * *

CASES

No. 5. Husband, bank clerk, out of work. Been sick two years.

No. 6. Husband just lost one eye. Now out of work. Been sick five years.

No. 7. Landlady says patient told her did not know where his next money is coming from.

----0----

The Precious Jewels

BY BROS. A. L. KRESS AND R. J. MEEKREN

(Concluded)

LAST month we had arrived at the problem of what was the origin and explanation of the Diamond which in the three Catechisms we have named the Grand Mystery Group, and the Examination, is named as one of the jewels of the lodge, which all, with variations already discussed, agree that they are

Three, Square Ashlar, Diamond and Square.

These are again referred to in the Examination and also by Prichard in the passages quoted at length last month [page 153]. It will be noted that the Examination in this verse retains the same order as in the catechetical answers, while Prichard, apparently for the sake of the rhythm, puts the Diamond first. It may be of some importance to note this: the consensus of the evidence is that the Ashlar was named first. The bearing that this point has on the final argument will appear later.

In the previous article we gave several possible explanations of the term Diamond (or Diadem according to the Institution MS.) none of which seem at all satisfactory. The suggestion now to be made is little more than a conjecture, and we only offer it tentatively. On reference to the tables on page 165 it will be seen that the square ashlar takes the place of the Dinted Ashlar of Group I and the Perpendashlar of Group III, and the Square we interpreted as equivalent to the Square Pavement of the other groups. Diamond therefore comes in the place occupied by the Broached Dornal of the other two. We, therefore, for lack of any better derivation, suggest that Diamond is another corrupt form of Dornal in spite of the fact that it is a very considerable jump to take and that intermediate forms are not very obvious. It has already been suggested that the "Porch, Dormer," mentioned by Prichard (and others) is derived from this expression and Brobed (or Brohed) Mall, but each of these is much closer to the conjectured common original than Diamond. We must suppose that the adjective "broached" was first dropped by forgetfulness in oral transmission, or perhaps by carelessness of some copyist, if (as may be possible) a link in this particular tradition was a written document, and that then "Dornal" standing by itself was subject to further changes. It would be most likely quite incomprehensible to non-operatives, and probably to working masons too by that time; so that its final rationalization into a diamond is not incredible. The fact that a diamond is actually a precious stone would naturally have an effect, as it would fit in with the tradition that it was a stone that was spoken of, and also agree with its being called a jewel. It is always easy to substitute a known word for one that is strange or even unfamiliar. Uneducated people in England are still to be found who say "sparrow grass" for "asparagus," and in the old Catechisms themselves we have an example of this sort of thing. The unknown word "Maughbin" which is mentioned twice in the Examination and appears again in the Essex MS. (where it is called the "Universal Word") reappears in the Trinity-College MS. as "Match-pin." Under all the circumstances the suggestion then that the Broached Thurnel here reappears in the disguise of a Diamond does not seem altogether unworthy of consideration.

Another suggestion however has been made by Bro. E. H. Dring which it seems necessary to discuss (1). This is that "dinted," or "dented," as a descriptive of the ashlar, and the "diamond" are all corruptions of "perpend." The argument is as follows:

The accented syllable or dominating sound in perpent or perpend is the second, pent or pend, and it is this sound that has always caught the ear of brethren. The word itself being unfamiliar and the unaccented first syllable being slurred over the scribe wrote down indented or dinted. . .

And in regard to diamond the same writer thinks it is

. . . entirely due to an editorial attempt to correct a corrupt form of "perpend,"

and quotes the doggrel verse from Prichard

With diamond, ashler and the square

which he thinks "clinches the question ."

Now in regard to "dented" or "dinted" ashlar as derived from an elided form 'pend ashlar, there seems on the face of it a good deal to be said; and furthermore it would make no difference to our tentative classification, for we have been led by another path to equate the dinted and perpend ashlar, each being the worked and finished stone. But we fear we must question the whole argument. The dictionaries seem to agree that the first and not the second syllable is the accented one, and we submit further, which anyone may test for himself by varying the stress, that in the phrase "perpend ashlar" it would be very unnatural, and contrary to the genius of English speech, to accent the second syllable. From which it results that the slurring or elision, if it occurred, would be in the second syllable, and lead to such forms as "perp'n ashlar" or possibly even "perp' ashlar." Such a form as this last could well have been the basis of an attempted correction making it read "perfect ashlar," as p and f are very easily interchanged (2).

The case for deriving diamond from the suggested corruption 'dend ashlar, is weaker still, although we must admit that the transition in itself from 'dend to diamond is no greater jump than from dornal, perhaps even less. But this conjecture has to meet the objection that all lists spoke of a rough stone and a worked stone; if diamond is the perpend stone, then in the lists where it appears we would have two worked stones. The quotation which clinches the matter for Bro. Dring is really quite inconclusive, for as we have seen the consensus of the documents which speak of a diamond puts the square ashlar first, and as we have already noted the different arrangement in Prichard has no weight as it seems entirely due to the rhythmic requirements of the attempt at versification. Besides p is not easily or naturally taken for d, as it may be for f or v.

Assuming that so far our argument has been accepted, we have now left unexplained only the "Danty Tassley" and the "Blazing Star," to which Group IV was reduced (3). The former certainly does look like a corruption of Indented Tessel, and might well be taken to mean such an indented ornamental border to a pavement as was spoken of in the Study Club last month. If so, then Group IV of the first table would have to be interpreted as referring to something quite different from the three preceding ones; it would, that is, be a description of the floor as a whole, the square pavement with its indented tessellated border and the ornamental pattern in the centre, diamond or star shaped. This is so plausible that it has long been accepted, officially one might say; and as we have seen, in Prichard it appears as the "furniture" (in later works the "ornaments") of the lodge. But another explanation is also in the field, advanced by no less authority than Albert Mackey (4). Prichard's "Indented Tarsel" is supposed to have really been a tassel, and explained by a reference to the looped and knotted cord with tassels at the two ends which appears at the top of the old French charts, and which later became the four tassels at the corners of the English Tracing Boards.

The term dented, or indented, does not, however, seem a particularly appropriate designation for the rounded bends and loops of a cord, though Mackey accepts it. The printed works that appeared much later in England, and which are obviously translations from the French, speak of a "lacy" or "laced tuft." This seems very puzzling at first, though a tuft might be the same thing as a tassel. Only what had operative Masons to do with tassels, or lace ?

When, however, we go to the French works we find, corresponding to what Prichard says relative to the "furniture" of the lodge, the following question and answer; the substance of which was included as the last item in Group IV of our tabulation:

D. Combien y-a-t-il d'ornements dans la Loge?

R. Trois.

D. Quels sont-ils ?

R. Le Pave mosaïque, l'Etoile flamboyant, et la Houpe dentelée,

which translated would be:

Q. How many ornaments in the Lodge?

A. Three.

Q. What are they?

A. The mosaic pavement, the flaming (or blazing) star and the laced (or indented) tuft (or tassel).

Solomon in All His Glory, a work published in England in the year 1766, which is obviously little more than a translation from French works later than the one above quoted, does actually have

The Mosaic Pavement, the indented tuft and the flaming star

as the ornaments of the lodge, and another work published in the same year has

Mosaic Pavement, Blazing Star and Indented Tuft,

listing them, however, as "furniture," as Prichard does. In the answer to the following question, however, blazing is changed to flaming star as in the quotation from the previous work.

Dentelee in 18th Century French might possibly have meant laced, in the sense of adorned or trimmed with lace, or more likely indented or toothed. As indented seems even more inappropriate when applied to a tassel than to a cord, the translator, we presume, chose the other meaning in spite of its utter lack of significance. Those inclined to accept Mackey's view, as we suppose his revisers do at least, seeing that the article stands in recent editions without change or comment, may be asked where did the cord and its two tassels come from originally? Of course it has in these places probably been equated with some recollection of the "cable tow," "cable rope," or "tow line," through a series of growing misapprehensions. The French forms, as we have seen, came originally from England, and as the Broached Thurnel was turned into a Pointed Cubical Stone, so the Indented Tarsel became the houppie dentelee (5). We are really back at the beginning and can discard the tassels entirely, as well as the lace !

So far attempted explanation has all been along the line that Danty Tassley was a corruption of Indented Tessel or Tassel. Let us suppose instead that this was itself an attempt to rationalize the more meaningless form; that is, let us assume that danty tassly is the original and see what can be made of it. In the tabulation it would seem as if it ought to correspond to the squared stone. Let us write it a little differently, as dantyt assly. It begins now to look like our old friend the dinted ashlar. As the derivation of the English word in its many forms is from the French aisselle, assly is really nearer the original than asher, astler or ester, all of which variants we have already come across. Dinted in Scotch dialect would be "dintit" or "dentit," as the English inflexion, "ed," marking the past tense, is represented in North Britain by "it," or in older spelling "yt." An example of this use of "y" in place of "i" is found in the quotation from Trevisa, cited in a previous article (6), where the very word is spelled "dentyng." The change from the "i" or "e" of the first syllable into "a" is a very easy

one to make, especially in a case such as this where obsolete and unintelligible phrases were passed along by word of mouth (7).

Thus excepting for the third item the last of our groups falls into line with the others. But it must be confessed that the Blazing Star is, so to speak, a very hard nut to crack.

In the earliest designs and charts intended to depict Masonic symbols a five-pointed star is to be found, in a few cases it is represented as having seven points, and in some others, eight. The French design already referred to, which is one of the earliest if not actually the first known to us, shows a five-point star with flames issuing from the re-entering angles, and the letter G in the center. (The last feature is quite common in later designs.) Mackey describes it as a straight pointed star superposed on one with wavy points. Other examples show a circle of rays all about it. It sometimes appears in the form of a pentagram, but is probably in such cases not so much intended as the "Blazing Star" but as a mnemonic for the number five, or an allusion to the F. P. of F.

When the Star appears in more modern designs it is very frequently a six-point star formed of two triangles, or based on the hexagon; sometimes it has seven points. In spite of all this profusion of pictorial evidence there is nothing to lead us to suppose it is older as a concrete symbol than the allusions to it in Prichard and the Sloane MS. Like the diamond among the emblems on the coffin lid shown on page 136 last month, it is simply putting an oral tradition into pictorial form.

So long as Danty Tassley was supposed to be an indented border to a square pavement, the star could be accepted as an ornamental design for the center. But since it turns out that the former may in reality be the squared ashlar, this explanation of the star begins to look very dubious; and in any case what has a star, blazing or flaming or whatever else it may be, in common with a pavement and an ashlar? And when we come to think of it "blazing" is a very curious epithet to apply to a thing with which the lodge had to be furnished. It is barely possible that it was not blazing in the sense of burning, but the other word which remains in modern English as a pioneer's term for marking a new path or trail. To blazon is to publish or describe. The same Flemish guilds which spoke of their testival dramatic performances as land-jewels

(lantjuweelen (8)) also called their banners "blazons." It is hardly probable, however, that this had anything to do with it, it is thrown out merely as a passing suggestion.

What is required to make Group IV fit in with the rest, as it seems it should, is to interpret this phrase in the sense of some kind of stone--which to fall into its right place should be a rough or partly worked stone. It seems rather a hopeless thing to attempt. Had only the Trinity College MS. survived no one could possibly have reconstructed "Maughbin," an utterly unknown word in derivation and meaning, from Matchpin, which, though equally meaningless in fact, is actually a compound of two perfectly good English words. In fact, the Blazing Star presents even greater difficulty, for it lent itself quite easily to symbolic interpretation as Matchpin emphatically did not. All we can suppose is that it may be another rationalization of some corrupt technical term; and this leaves us quite helpless, unless by chance the suppositious original phrase, or some intermediate form, should turn up somewhere in another connection.

In order to exhaust all possibilities it may, however, be noted that if the Diamond in Group III be a corrupt form of Dornal then all the lists except those in this last group mention the Broached Thurnel. Supposing that Group IV did actually come from the same source as the others, and boldly assuming that Blazing Star is derived ultimately from this phrase, is it possible to imagine any feasible intermediate stages through which it may have passed? It is not impossible for one thing that "Br" should be turned into "Bl"--some races and many children find difficulty in properly pronouncing "r" after a consonant and substitute "l" in its place. One corruption of "broached" is "boasted" in which the liquid sound has been dropped altogether. If then Thurnel could have taken some such form as Tarnel there might conceivably have arisen some such phrase as Boasted tarnel, which would in repetition be very apt to lose the "ed" by elision and become perhaps Boast' arnel. Final syllables, when not stressed, are also very easily dropped, and this would bring us to Boast' arn, which is near enough to our unexplained term to be its origin under the circumstances of transmission by oral tradition. However, this is all no more than the purest and most unmitigated speculation, and probably worth as much, and no more, as such speculations usually are--that is, nothing.

We have stated that Prichard's catechisms were compilations. The result of the present investigation certainly emphasizes this. Under the names of jewels and furniture we have found no less than three variant forms, and yet another that is unclassified; all of which are related to forms found elsewhere. In the whole group of documents these objects go variously under the names of jewels, furniture and ornaments. The last term probably arose from an interpretation of the fourth group which explained them as the parts of an ornamental flooring, it is to forms of this group that the term ornament has always been restricted. Furniture would arise naturally as a description from the requirement that the lodge had to be furnished with them. Jewels seem to be their original and proper appellation. We must confess, though, that we are far from being fully satisfied with the result of the discussion at the outset as to the original interpretation of this term, or what the ideas may have been that were in the minds of those who first employed it in this connection.

There is one more point to be considered before taking leave of the subject. We stated earlier, and those of our readers who have the advantage of being able to refer to the text of the documents can easily verify it, that in most cases, almost without exception in the more archaic forms, the jewels are mentioned in close connection with certain lights. These last require consideration on their own account, but there is one more quotation, which, obscure as it is, seems to give us a sidelight on this juxtaposition, and perhaps to point to its not being altogether fortuitous. In the Sloane MS. we read

Q. W'ch is the Mast'rs place in the lodge?

A. The east place is the Master's place in the lodge and the jewell resteth on him first and he setteth men to work; w't the m'rs have in the forenoon the wardens reap in the afternoon.

This follows a statement that the lodge stood East and West. It seems probable from the general connection that the "jewell" here spoken of is the sun. Especially as elsewhere the Master is placed in the East "waiting at the rising of the sun to set his men at work." This opens up an entirely new vista, the exploration of which must be reserved for a later occasion.

It will be remembered that in a preceding series of articles on "The Form of the Lodge" we saw reason to believe that the earliest times lodges were held in or about a specially marked enclosure out of doors, and that this marked-out space was a "long square," and oriented "due east and west." As a result of the present discussion it emerges that there were three things of sufficient importance or value to be regarded as necessary furnishing for a "just and perfect lodge," and the first of these is a square floor or pavement, the others being two stones. Is there more in this than appears? The importance of a standard test block can be seen, but why mate it with an unwrought stone? Was the whole thing a last faint echo of the immemorial consecrated area and the two sacred pillar stones? It is a curious coincidence at least.

NOTES

(1) E. H. Dring *Evolution and Development of the Tracing or Lodge Board*. A.Q.C. xxix, page 259 and 325, note 1. On page 307 a letter from Prof. Craigie, editor of the *New English Dictionary*, is quoted. Craigie would take the "dinted" ashlar as equivalent to broached ashlar, which supports the conclusion drawn from our tabulation of results in the last article.

(2) According to the *New English Dictionary* the modern technical term is "parpen," *perpend* being noted as obsolete. The present Scots dialect form is *pairpal*, representing an older *parpal*. In the numerous variations of the word given it would seem that the dental ending is not original, and may have been introduced for euphony when commonly combined with a word beginning with a vowel, such as *ashlar*. The following are instances of some of the forms:

1429 Pro xxxii ped' de perpoynt, xvijs.

1429 lxxxij et di' fott of perpendaschler vyd.

1470 Yone perpall wall....

1558. . .to big (build) within the said church parpall walls of stone.

1579. . .they were squared parpine, as thick as long.

1688 Perpin are less than the size of ashlar.

1712...making a parpin.

1756 The ashler . . . is parpin ashler.

1781...is sawed out . . . into . . . perpen-ashlar.

(3) A regrettable error was allowed to pass the proof reading in the last article. Prichard gives the form "Indented Tarsel", not "Indented Tessel," as appears in the table at page 155. We must ask our readers to make the correction.

(4) Mackey's Encyclopedia, vide Tarsel and Tessellated Border.

(5) So the 1745 edition of the L'Ordre des Franc-Masons Trahi. As the spelling varies in the different editions it may be as well to give the exact reference. The later editions of this work do not, except for such minor variations, differ materially from the first.

(6) THE BUILDER, April, 1927, page 120.

(7) In the investigation embodied in these articles the authors desire to acknowledge their indebtedness to Bro. Dring. In the article above cited he makes the equation of Dinted Ashlar and Danty Tassley. We have previously given him credit for having first arrived at the true origin of the word Thurnel, and he is also entitled to that of first pointing out that the perfect ashlar was properly a perpend. This last point, however, came to us first indirectly through Bro. W. L. Songhurst in the form of a bare statement, which led us to look up the word in various dictionaries. We also had interpreted Danty Tassley as Dentyt Assly before having any opportunity to consult Bro. Dring's important, and in truth epoch making, paper. We have differed with him in some matters, in most of which we believe he has directly or indirectly been misled, in company, it is to be feared with other Masonic scholars, by the supposition that the later editions of Prichard's work were amplified with matter taken from French workswereas in reality, if there was any influencing at all it was the other way about. For as we have pointed out [THE BUILDER, March, 1927, Page 90], the second edition, published a few weeks after the first, in the same year, 1730, contained all the matter that these brethren suppose to have been borrowed or assimilated after 1770. As the earliest French works extant are later than 1740 Prichard could not well, in 1730, have been influenced by them. For the rest we feel that our independent interpretation of Danty Tassley as the same thing as the Dinted

Ashlar is an additional argument for its soundness, even if we have not the honor of being first to propose it.

(8) A. Q. C. xiii, page 79.

----0----

RUSSIAN FREEMASONRY

The following brief account was written for THE BUILDER by a Russian Mason now living in Paris with many others of his countrymen. For very good reasons it is not expedient that his name should appear. It has been generally supposed that Masonry was non-existent in Russia, and it is very interesting to learn that it survived in some form through a century of prohibition and persecution.

A well-established tradition claims that the first Russian Free Mason was Peter the Great. He was initiated by Sir Christopher Wren in one of the English Lodges in Amsterdam. There are, however, no documents to prove it.

The history of Russian Freemasonry can be divided into three periods.

I.--1731-1771. Membership is confined to foreigners residing in Russia, a few officers of the Guard and a few Statesmen. The tendency is mystic, the influence negligible.

II.--1772-1794. There are Three Mason's bodies.

(1) Yolaguine's group--St. Petersburg--work: selfperfection, moral uplift, struggle against the ideas of Voltaire. Disappears about 1780.

(2) Swedish Rite--St. Petersburg--Prince Gagarine, Grand Master-joins on to preceding and shares its fate.

(3) Grand National L.--Moscow--led by Novikoff and Schwarz working under a strong influence of the Moscow Rosy Cross. Fraternity and of the Order of the Martinists. This group exercised a very strong influence of its period and of the future in Russian Freemasonry and was a potent intellectual factor in contemporary society. It chiefly attached itself to educational and charitable work and carried these on a vast scale until it fell under the general ban on Freemasonry imposed by Catherine II in 1794.

III.--1801-1822. Irregular Russian G. L. "Wladimir to Order" in 1810 fell under the Swedish Jurisdiction. This G. L. as such had little influence, but counted many influential people among its members.

As a reaction against the influence of Higher Degrees there was founded in 1814 in Paris, under the auspices of the Grand Orient of France and out of the federation of 5 military L. L. a new Grand Lodge, "Astree."

At the end of Napoleonic wars and with the return of the army to Russia this M. body grew to the extent of having 40 Lodges under its jurisdiction.

Under French influence these Lodges turned their attention to politics and ended their career in the turmoil of the attempted revolution in December, 1825.

During the whole of the XIX century Russian Freemasonry remains if not completely dormant at least entirely hidden and entirely negligible

The revival of interest in spiritual matter which coincided with the beginning of the XX century brought about a revival of interest in Freemasonry.

A few prominent Russian intellectuals joined French Lodge. Professor Bajenoff joined in 1884 in Paris the L. of the S. R. "Les Amis Reunis".

M. Iablotchkoff--the world famous electrician was the founder of the Lodge "Cosmos" A. A. S. R., in Paris.

In 1906, in Paris, about fifteen rising Russian politicians joined French L. L.

On their return to Russia these Bro. of whom the greater part had joined L. L. under the G. O. of France, formed two L. L.--one in St. Petersburg, "The Polar Star," and one in Moscow. These L. L. were installed with great ceremony in May, 1908, by two representatives of the G. O. of France.

Up to 1906 six L. L. were founded.

After an interval in their activity occasioned by police restrictions these L. L. were reopened in 1911. They worked under the G. O. of France, had practically no Ritual and had an avowedly political aim in view, namely that of the overthrow of Autocracy. There was a "Supreme Council" (?)--an exclusively administrative body whose members were elected for three years.

This Masonic organization had no regularity and enjoyed no recognition abroad.

In 1913-1914 it had about 42 Lodges, chiefly composed of members of the "Cadet" party.

The first revolution in March, 1917, was doubtlessly inspired and manipulated from these Lodges.

All the members of Kerensky's Government belonged to the Masonry.

After the Bolshevik revolution the greater part of the members of these Lodges emigrated abroad.

After a long spell of inactivity they at length succeeded in forming again under the auspices of the G. O. of France a new "Polar Star" Lodge in Paris. This up to now claims but few members and enjoys no recognition outside of the G. O. of France. Its President is Bro. W. Avksentieff, who is also the President of the Russian Socialist-Revolutionary Party and a former Minister of the Kerensky Government.

There also existed in Russia English, Italian and German Lodges as well as an organization of the Martinists.

----o----

A NEW RESEARCH JOURNAL

THE past month is marked by the appearance of the second number of The Mountaineer Mason, published by the Masonic Research Society of West Virginia. There is and doubtless always will be a field for Masonic periodicals of high standards and no greater compliment could be paid to the editors of this new publication than to state that they are to be congratulated upon the quality of their magazine. It helps to fill a gap that is at the present time altogether too wide. THE BUILDER is pleased to welcome The Mountaineer Mason into the Masonic publications' field and extends wishes for its continued success.

----0----

THE LIBRARY

The books reviewed in these pages can be procured through the Book Department of the N.M.R.S. at the prices given, which always include postage. These prices are subject (as a matter of precaution) to change without notice; though occasion for this will very seldom arise. Occasionally it may happen, where books are privately printed, that there is no supply available, but some indication of this will be given in the review. The Book Department is equipped to procure any books in print on any subject, and will make inquiries for second-hand works and books out of print.

THE STORY OF THE CITY COMPANIES. By P. H. Ditchfield. Published by Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston. Cloth, table of contents index illustrated, 325 pages. Price, \$5.25.

AS Masons we are inclined to speak with reverential awe concerning the Landmarks of the Fraternity. Strange as it may seem, present day Freemasonry is inclined to supplant the most ancient of these traditions with modern innovations. There is apparently a growing tendency on the part of Freemasons generally to lose sight of the fact that as an institution the Fraternity has an existence which antedates the union of the Four Old Lodges. Innovations brought into being by the founders of the present governmental system and by their successors are now hallowed with two centuries

and more of age - nevertheless they were at one time "innovations in the body of Masonry."

It is, therefore, with the utmost interest that we read of the Great City Companies of London which today are found to occupy positions in a way analogous to Freemasonry, in that they are no longer trade guilds in the Medieval sense, but which, nevertheless, are carrying on as they did centuries ago. In the work under review the Mason's Company receives but a scanty notice, naturally enough. In the first place it was one of the minor companies, and in the second its records are very incomplete. It may, however, be assumed with comparative safety that its aims and ideals were not very different from those of the other companies. The migratory character of the work of its members would doubtless account in large measure for its lack of prestige.

Of vital interest to present day members of the Craft is the fact that Charity was a most important feature of their work. Further that education formed then, as it does still, a feature of their work second only to the relief of distressed members of the Company. In actual expenditures of money the educational institutions endowed by the Great Companies were more important even than the relief of distress. Perhaps in the earliest days the interest in education was confined solely to efforts to teach the apprentices of individual companies the secrets of their trade and that the branching into general fields came later. It seems, at any rate, that one of the principal duties which these Companies assumed was the enlightenment of their members, first in trade secrets and then in general knowledge. In America, and the present day in other countries as well, general education finds abundant expression in the public schools and privately endowed institutions. That phase is now almost beyond the active interest of any company or fraternity although the City Companies of London still have a great interest in this kind of work and some of England's most notable schools are Company institutions. On the other hand education within our Speculative Craft has been sadly neglected. Here one of our most ancient landmarks has been shunted to a side track and is handled in much the same way as one would pick up a hot iron. Reading the Story of the City Companies one becomes convinced that Freemasonry does not hold in as high regard as some of our oratorical brethren would have us believe the Ancient Landmarks of the Order.

These points of similarity would be ample recommendation of the present work to modern Freemasons. There are other features which add to its importance, however. The histories of the Companies give us a new perspective into the life of our ancestors. There is pictured a London utterly different from that of today and the insight into old customs which, like our "Landmarks," have in most cases been continued to the present day, forms a feature worth more than passing notice.

The book is splendidly printed on heavy paper and in a type reminiscent of the 18th century printers. The style is readable and the book not too long. Dr. Ditchfield is to be congratulated on his work and to the publishers is due the credit for the attractiveness of the volume.

* * *

ANTIQUITY OF THE HOLY ROYAL ARCH, THE SUPREME DEGREE IN FREEMASONRY. By F. DeP. Castells. Published by A. Lewis & Co., London. 291 pages.

AFTER reading this book, the reviewer looked twice to see if by chance the title page bore the name of Dr. Oliver. For the dear Doctor at his worst never wrote more exasperating history than that which Bro. Castells inflicts on us in his latest book. The reader emerges from it dazed, bewildered and in this case with a distrust of his whole hypothesis. For how can anyone put any dependence in anything a Masonic writer may say when that writer in three separate places cites the shopworn, exploded tale of some Jews in Rhode Island holding a lodge in 1658? Not content with the citations only he says: (p. 100.)

An American Mason wanted to ignore the record at Rhode Island because he could not conceive Masonry prior to 1717. But the original document was traced and neither its age nor its style could be questioned. It had every characteristic of truth; it was written with no ulterior purpose; it harmonised with all the facts of the case;

while incidentally, and quite undesignedly it accounted for the evident Hebrew influence in Freemasonry.

If Bro. Castells has any information to prove what he says he will do American Masons a great favor by letting us in on his secret.

Bro. Castells' theory is that the Royal Arch is derived from Kabalistic sources; that Freemasonry is largely a Hebrew product (p. 112); that as early as the 15th century the Royal Arch was part of the Third Degree (p. 169); that because we [i. e., English Masons] call it the Holy Royal Arch of Jerusalem it proves ipso facto its Jewish origin; that the three degrees are the outgrowth of the Royal Arch and beside it are comparatively modern. He says, "This we fear will come as a shock to many of the accredited exponents of the Craft." I doubt if Bro. Castells realizes just what a shock it is to some of us. Still we could manage to stand it if only his position were substantiated.

Bro. Castells assures us that "all along we have refrained from theorizing. We have eschewed fables and romance; we have scrupulously avoided building on mere conjecture. We simply bold up to the brethren the Mirror of History that they may judge for themselves" (p. 8-9), and yet he makes statements like the above and like this one:

Now the suspicions of many writers centre on Chevalier Ramsay, whom they consider the inventor of the Royal Arch. . . . Ramsay himself seems to have been a strong believer in the French Royale Arche as the non [sic] plus ultra of Masonry; but alas! for Gould and others, he has nothing to say in support of the Modern theory that our Supreme Degree originated in France; he simply does not know whence it has come, although if anyone could have thrown any light on the problem it was Ramsay.

Where did Ramsay ever say he was a believer in the French Royal Arch or that he had even heard of it? How could he know anything about it when it was probably not in existence, in France at least, when he died?

I have said Bro. Castells' style was exasperating. Nothing else describes it. His sentences open with "presumably," "probably," "far more likely," "or at least." His conclusions are loosely drawn and usually unwarranted by his evidence. As an example:

Take for instance the Mason Word. Whatever it may be the mere fact that the Masons of the eighteenth century said that it was as old as the Tower of Babel, or at least the time of Solomon implies that it was Hebrew.

Historically, the book is of no value, since one cannot depend on the author's critical faculties. Some of his symbolic interpretations are however ingenious, and from this point of view his work may merit some consideration.

A. L. K.

* * *

WERDANDI UND FREIMAUEREREI. By Alfred Abendroth. Published by Alfred Unger, Berlin. Paper, table of contents, 215 pages.

THIS is a valuable contribution to human knowledge. The book presents to the reader a recapitulation of the salient features in human history and the unfolding of philosophy and history; a scholarly interpretation of mental, moral and spiritual aspects in the evolution of Man in his ascent to the realm of the Super-man.

But there are two sides to all things, even in the moral, mental and spiritual realms. The large, large majority can see one side only and the student of life sympathizes with Ralph Waldo Emerson, who when speaking of his teacher Plato, exclaims joyfully: "A man was born who could see both sides."

The author belongs not to the class of Plato. Some features in our book are of interest to the psychologist demonstrating ad oculos the force of predilection and prejudice; how love and hate can and do shape the opinion and sway the judgment of an earnest and well-meaning scholar. Our author is an Aryan, a Teuton, a German. He endows this Aryan, Teuton, German with highest attributes and potentialities, not only in the human but also the cosmic realm. As an illustration, the following literal translation will serve:

The latest investigation of race and language derives the Greek Aristos (Best), as also the word Aryan, from Alder (Sun, God). This establishes the inherent right to rule over all other peoples and races and finally to become the link to a new race, to the Super-man, to Super-humanity.

Again:

Scientific research has established the fact that the figure of Christ is a symbol of the rising and setting of the September 25th newly-born Sun, the common property of the "Aryan" race, and that the Lamb of God which carries the sins of the world from the beginning of time is a personification of the ideally constituted "Aryan" whose test or mission is the salvation of the human race, etc. In the conscientious and laborious performance of this, his Divine Mission, he has received and is receiving nothing but ingratitude as his reward.

Our writer has a fine religious sense, but his Teutonic Philosophy makes him an outsider of the various religious creeds as established today. He recognizes, however, the figure, the personality of Jesus of Nazareth, as the highest, the noblest representative of "Beauty, Wisdom and Strength." One of the features here is

disagreeable: "Jesus of Nazareth is thought by some to have been or rather to be a Jew, a Hebrew, an Israelite, in short a Semite," and our author writes:

The first followers of Christianity and Jesus himself were colonists of the Northern part of Palestine, of the heathen province of Galilee, whose inhabitants belonged to the great Phoenician and other Non-Jewish, Indo-Germanic, Aryan stock. Galilee always remains foreign and strange to the real genuine Jew.

The most noble Aryan Hellenism and pure Christianity constitute the two poles of Humanity and of Civilization.

Our author presents in glowing language (too lengthy for translation) the spiritual heights disclosed in the teachings of Jesus and concludes, "We see that these doctrines are filled with the most beautiful, the most humane principles, etc.," and

The latest scientific investigation has established the fact that these doctrines were the property of the Secret Order of Essenes, and these Essenes occupy the same religious position as the Pythagoreans, Eleusyan Mysteries and the Neoplatonists.

Who were these Essenes?

Mirabilissime visu! Most wonderful to behold, to the mind of an Aryan author, a German scholar, trying to draw a truthful picture of human life and history, and of the influence of Freemasonry upon human destiny, there appears the Secret Order of Essenes. Of additional interest to every Freemason should be this fact: The real name of these Essenes, that is, the appellation by themselves, for themselves, of themselves was Banaim, which term in English means "Builders." The Roman Pliny calls these Essenes, or rather "Banaim", "The Most Wonderful People on Earth."

Our author next gives us a wonderful exhibition, a brief recapitulation of the Evolution of Science, Philosophy and Religion, a brief outline and scholarly interpretation of the leading doctrines of Descartes, Leibnitz, Newton, Kant, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and the contributions in these realms by men who belonged to the Order of Freemasonry. While the eyes of our author are German, these eyes have pity but never hate or contempt for anything that is Non-German, Non-Aryan.

The ending of the book presents another surprise to the psychologist. Our author, such a strong nationalist, would naturally be expected to be, if not a royalist at least a conservative. But no, our author advocates a new arrangement of society and arrangement known by the name of Socialism. He presents the reader with the most beautiful picture of the future: The Socialistic Cooperative Commonwealth. He proclaims his endorsement of the ideals presented by Thomas More, William Morris, Edward Bellamy and of the doctrines and principles enunciated in the works of St. Simon, Karl Marx and Bernard Shaw.

This work is certainly of interest and should be translated, for while in the opinion of this critic our author did not enter the inner shrine of either Religion or Freemasonry, yet he presents valuable hints which might enable some to find and enter this inner shrine.

L. F. S.

* * *

ERLAUTERUNG DER KATECHISMEN DER JOHANNISFREIMAUREREI. Vol. IV. By Robert Fischer. Edited by Ernst Paul Kretschmer. Published by the Verlag des Vereins deutscher Freimaurer. Cloth, 12 mo., table of contents, index, 157 pages.

THIS little book, the last volume of Bro. Fischer's "Explanations of the Catechisms of St. John's Freemasonry," presents us with a most scholarly position of Freemasonry, of its principles and contributions to civilization, and with sketches of leading Masonic personalities. It gives us the period, in some instances the exact date, of the founding of various lodges in different parts of Europe, England, Scotland, France, Sweden and Germany. Strange as it may seem, the United States are not mentioned.

Our author takes what seems to this critic a strange and false attitude towards the Order of Knights Templar and the Essenes. He writes, page 70:

The acts of the higher grades were based upon the tradition that Freemasonry is the Spiritual continuation of the Order of Templars and that in the Order of the Templars there existed a secret doctrine which contained a free and liberal interpretation of Christianity. . . .

For the tradition that the doctrines of Freemasonry are connected with the Order of Essenes there exists today no proof. . . .

The position of the author is negative; he has no proof!

The conception of Relativity in some respects is a modern discovery, but some aspects of Relativity have existed since the beginning of time. Proof has no reality; proof necessarily belongs to the realm of subjectivity. What constitutes conclusive proof to the mind of one man is not even evidence to the mind of another. The force of physical evidence, the cogency of a logical argument depends upon the degree and the kind of understanding of the individual.

The Academic Francaise, the highest authority of science at the time, in the year 1830 decreed that for the theory of evolution there was no proof, decided in favor of the

negative furnished by Cuvier and against the positive evidence presented by Godfroi St. Hilaire.

In mathematics we have the axiom: If A equals B and B equals C then A equals C. Some kinds of human mind may ask and in the experience of the present writer have asked, "Why?"

William James in this connection calls attention to the fact that two tunes not distinguishable from one another may be definitely distinguished from a third.

In the opinion of the reviewer there is a most intimate, a most far and deep reaching connection between Essenism, the Knights Templar and the Order of Freemasonry.

L. F. S.

* * *

THE ADMIRAL AND OTHERS. By Peggy Temple. Published by E. P. Dutton & Co. Illustrated, 138 pages. Price, \$1.60.

THIS inconsequential story by twelve-year-old Peggy Temple, comes as a refreshing breeze to the average reader, tired of the sameness of much present day fiction. The youthful author writes with a gay abandon no seasoned writer would dare give himself up to, and her very original little tale is enlivened and enriched throughout by her quaint humor and her delightfully absurd, though wonderfully alive, characters.

The Podds family, consisting of Jack and Mary (the parents), Milly and Tim (the children), are entertaining an odd assortment of guests at their home - Sunflower Cottage, Cornham. There are the Admiral and Mrs. Derbertson, the Honorable Mrs. Paperie Arnolds, and George Hazelham, an old friend of Jack.

An arrogant, blustering sort of person, the Admiral, and meddlesome to an alarming degree. Tim develops a mild case of chickenpox, and the family is trying to keep the news from their guests. The Admiral is suspicious, however, and in trying to locate Tim's room, to see for himself, bursts in upon Mrs. Paperie Arnolds, who, thinking herself secure in the privacy of her bedroom, has tossed her wig upon the floor and is "lying inelegantly on her bed." Poor little Mrs. Derbertson sees her husband retreating hastily from the irate lady's room and reproaches him gently: "I don't like it my dear . . . it's not what I hoped of you, Henry," and watches him scuttle away with a "rather curious little smile on her rather obstinate little face."

One could go on quoting delicious bits endlessly. The Admiral no sooner finds out that Tim has chickenpox than he insists it must be smallpox, and sends for the sanitary inspector, the medical officer, and a skin specialist. He is so unpopular with these dignitaries when they find they have come on a fool's errand, that he thinks it best to run away until the affair blows over, and he has to be searched for like a runaway boy. Despite the ignominy of hiding in boot-cupboards and dodging his pursuers, the Admiral maintains his arrogance to the end of the chapter, and his closing speeches are every bit as aggressive as his opening ones.

A delightful little story. Not the work of a prodigy, yet the subtle humor and satiric touches make it an extraordinary bit of writing for one so young, and perhaps it is safe to prophesy there will be other tales from the pen of this youthful observer.

M. P.

* * *

THE POPE OF THE SEA. By Vicente Blasco Ibanez. Published by E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. Cloth, table of contents, 362 pages. Price, \$2.65.

OF all modern writers perhaps none can lay greater claim to distinction than Ibanez who beyond question is the foremost exponent of Spanish literature. His works nearly always approach the "best seller" class in popularity though they are on a much higher plane than the books usually belonging to this class.

This latest effort from his pen is one of the most enjoyable bits of modern fiction it has been my pleasure to read. There is an indefinable charm in the style, perhaps due in no small measure to the capability of the translator. Too frequently a work of fiction loses the characteristics of the author when it passes from one tongue to another. To one who has read Ibanez in the original there is immediately apparent a feeling that the same masterful expression has been instilled upon the translator of this present volume and that the subtlety of expression which characterizes the Spaniard has come over to the English version.

The story is very simple and could be told perhaps in a quarter of the space occupied by the present work. The plot is only an incident, a distraction from the biography of Pedro de Luna, the Pope of the Sea. It is the means by which the plot is brought to a climax and one of those rare instances where an incident so far as plot is concerned forms the major interest of the novel.

The life of this Medieval Pope, the last to be elected during the Babylonian Captivity of the Church of Rome, is as fascinating as a melodrama. It is interwoven with the lives of two very modern young people in a most intriguing manner. The difficulties to be encountered in writing such a tale are enormous. To carry us from the France and Spain of the present century back to Avignon and the Medieval period, vacillating constantly between the two, and maintaining the interest of the reader, is a task that should be set before none but a master. How well Ibanez; has fulfilled his task can not be told. The book must be read to appreciate it. Suffice it to say that the

author has proven his reputation and added another masterpiece to an already long list.

Perhaps the highest recommendation that can be given to the present work is that it is equal, if not superior, in every respect to *The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse*.

* * *

MUSIC FOR THE WORKING OF THE CEREMONIES OF THE CRAFT DEGREES OF FREEMASONRY. Compiled by Samuel Smith, P.M., P.D.G.W. Published under the auspices of the District Grand Lodges of Scottish, Freemasonry' in Natal, South Africa. Limp cloth, 29 pages.

THIS is a severely practical little book and should be very useful to lodge organists. It has appropriate selections for every part of the ceremonies where music can be used with effect, including those of installation, which selections, it may be added, have been made with great taste and judgment. A very useful feature is the addition of blank ruled pages for writing down other tunes. Though inexpensively bound it has one great virtue that many music books do not possess - it will stay open at the place required. It is a very praiseworthy production, and both Bro. Smith and the Scottish Craft in Natal are to be congratulated on its production. The proceeds of the sale of the work are to be devoted to Masonic charities of Natal.

* * *

A SHORT HISTORY OF ORIENT CHAPTER, ROYAL ARCH MASONS, No. 79, G. R. C., TORONTO. Privately printed.

THIS pamphlet adds another link to the constantly lengthening chain of histories of individual bodies. It is entertainingly written and there is much that will be of value to future historians of the Royal Arch in Canada. Had we been supplied with documents of this character relating to the history of early lodges both in England and America doubtless the work of modern historians would be much simplified. It is gratifying to know that so many lodges, chapters, etc., are printing short histories of their organizations.

* * *

NEW BOOKS RECEIVED

Saltacres, by Leslie Reed, published by E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. Price \$2.15.

A New Translation of the Holy Bible, by James Moffatt, published by Geo. H. Doran and Company, New York. Price \$5.25.

Freedom of the Mind in History, by Henry Osborn Taylor, published by The Macmillan Company, New York. Price \$2.40.

Spanish Alta California, by Alberta J. Denis, published by The Macmillan Company, New York. Price \$3.75.

----O----

THE QUESTION BOX

and CORRESPONDENCE

THE IOWA MASONIC LIBRARY

The writer of this is librarian of the Scottish Rite Bodies of this city.

Would you have any objection to informing me as to who is the owner of the 35,000 volume Masonic library mentioned in your circular; where it is located; if any printed catalog of it exists which can be procured?

W. B. S., California.

The library referred to is that at Cedar Rapids, Iowa. It is now in course of being re-cataloged, and it is, we understand, the intention to print the catalog when the work is completed. You will find the Curator, Bro. J. Hugo Tatsch, ever ready to assist in any way possible with information should you care to write to him

* * *

THE RED CROSS OF CONSTANTINE

On page 31, of the January, 1927, issue of THE BUILDER, is an inquiry from E. E. G. of Pennsylvania about the Red Cross of Constantine. I suggest that the proper person to whom he should be referred is Philip C. Shaffer, 1337 Spring Garden St., Philadelphia, Pa., who is Grand Recorder of the Grand Imperial Council of Pennsylvania.

I could give more data, but Bro. Shaffer by virtue of his office is the proper one to supply it. I may add that Bro. Geo. W. Warvelle of Chicago, Ill., is now National Recorder of the Order. Hiram E. Deats, N. J.

* * *

THE SITUATION IN MEXICO

I have read with interest the two articles in the May issue of THE BUILDER, and having lived a good part of the last thirty years on or near the Mexican border my impressions might be interesting to some of your readers.

To begin with we cannot compare Mexican Masonry with that in the United States, there is about as much difference as there is between the average American and the average Mexican. Our Masonry is supposed to be and usually is strictly non-political while in Mexico it is in practice usually political.

As regards the condition of Mexico under the Dictator, Diaz, that country as a whole probably enjoyed a greater measure of peace and prosperity, security, development and general progress under his iron rule than during any other period of her existence.

The leopard cannot change his spots and it really does not seem to make much difference whether your Mexican is a Mason or a Catholic so far as his political activities and policies are concerned. They usually exploit rather than build. If you wish to get anywhere or accomplish anything, you generally have to see someone or use some influence.

Foreign capital and energy built Mexico's railroads but do not own them now. Foreign capital and brains developed her mines but they found a way to take them too; her oil fields were developed in the same way and you see what is happening to them.

Her so-called Constitutions of 1917 were not the crystallization of the ideals of the whole Mexican people. Probably not more than a half dozen interested individuals had anything to do with the drafting of that document; it may mean nothing or everything. It probably depends on the expediency of the occasion. Judging the future by the past, why not suppose that the wealth, lands and property of the Church has attracted the interested attention of those in power? Religious freedom or intolerance probably does not enter into it except indirectly, as means to an end.

President Calles has undertaken a pretty big job and it remains to be seen how far he gets with it. It appears that the wisest and most successful rulers of past ages did not interfere with the religion of the people. The British Empire the most successful of modern colonizers, probably owes its success to this policy. While we cannot, of course, accuse President Calles of doing this, it does to all intents and purposes work out that way in practice.

There has always been a certain amount of intolerance, if not fanaticism, in all churches. Any of them given absolute power would no doubt use it. Religious tolerance in this country as far as it goes is probably due to the fact that no church or sect dominates.

There is no question but that policy of the Church in Mexico has been mercenary and has not worked toward the education or enlightenment of the masses; but to be constructive we must have something better to offer in its place. Has its influence been all bad? What would the average Mexican be without any religious or Church influence? The human heart craves spiritual solace, but can you imagine the average Mexican sitting down and reading his Bible and getting any spiritual comfort? Will it not have to be prepared for him in a different way? I will say that I have no solution, but feel that Masonically we should keep out of the quarrel.

R. J. W., Colorado.

* * *

SECRET LANGUAGE OF STONEMASONS

In reference to the communication on this subject in THE BUILDER for last month we give the following letter from a well known Irish Masonic student:

"I have never heard of the separate language mentioned by Donn Byrne, nor have I ever met with any representative of the white-bearded, red-eyed fraternity who appeared to be full of suspicion toward an inquiring stranger.

"If the statement has any foundation, and I suppose it is bound to have or the author would not have made it and backed it up with exemplifications as he does in the next paragraph after the quotation given by Bro. Dyer (pity Bro. Dyer stopped short of it, but in case you have not seen it I give it, it helps), I do not believe the reference is to Freemasons.

"However you may inform Bro. Dyer that I have cast a very wide net in the Ulster Press, and if I catch anything I will gladly pass it on."

W. G. Simpson, Ireland.

For the benefit of those who have not seen it we give the further quotation from the National Geographic Magazine referred to above:

The interesting part of this is: that in England, besides the 9vpsies, there are tribes of itinerant tinkers who use many of these reversed Irish words in their jargon, which is not Romany. "Lapac" for a horse is the Irish "capall"; "rohob" for road is the Irish

"bohor"; "ees" is the Irish Saoi, a magistrate. This dialect is called by themselves "Shelta," which I suppose is "Celtic." These English have otherwise nothing Irish about them.

We hope that Bro. Simpson may be able to discover further information on this very interesting survival.

* * *

THE SERIOUS SIDE OF THE QUESTION

The subject matter of your recent editorial entitled "A Serious Question" is indeed worthy of discussion and investigation. If someone is at work on it, I have a suggestion to make as to a phase of the problem that seems to have been completely overlooked in your first presentation. Whether or not my point has any bearing on the main question, it is a point that I am sure will be prominent in the minds of many who hear of Masons converted or returned to the Roman Church.

There is a widespread belief that the requirements of the Roman Church include a confessional of very great thoroughness - that the priest asks what he will and the convert must answer truthfully and fully in order to receive the absolution for which he seeks. However much this may be evaded by the writers in the Roman Church, the belief prevails throughout the country that the priests thus learn not only the private affairs of their flock but also the secrets of any society to which the Catholic brother may have belonged.

Now these, as you say, may be mostly "official secrets long since betrayed," and their revelation may be nothing to cause alarm. Nevertheless every Mason knows there is good reason why he should not go to Confession to a Roman priest. Your remark that any brother may withdraw from the Fraternity legally and formally, has no relation to

this matter. It is a matter of grave concern should a brother Mason reveal the secrets he has obligated himself to keep, no matter if it has been done by others before him. Regardless of other men's actions he violates his vows. It is not legal. You write "On what may be called the legal . . . aspect of the case there is nothing for protest." In case of a Confession, I think there is reason to protest. It is an indignity, it is a betrayal. No suggestion of baseless fears or the infiltration of religious or political antagonism is going to relieve our hearts of the shock of such a betrayal. It should not be treated lightly nor evaded.

I look forward with considerable interest to your future discussions.

F. F. G., Minnesota.

This letter raises an issue that was only touched on in the editorial referred to. It certainly does need further elucidation, and this we hope to be able to give later on. We have also given the point more extended notice on an earlier page.

* * *

A MATTER OF OBLIGATION

THE BUILDER and the Grand Lodge of New Mexico have been active for some time in urging the members of the Masonic Fraternity to finance the erection of a hospital in the State of New Mexico for tuberculosis patients among the members of the Fraternity. Their invocation of the different Grand Lodges in this matter has thus far not shown any results that make this noble deed a possibility. Being myself a Freemason and having taken the matter up with many brethren who without exception approved the enterprise, I take the opportunity to manifest in this article my Masonic opinion on this matter.

We Masons of this country are morally obliged to assist our suffering brethren. It is, furthermore, our honest duty to erect a hospital where these poor unfortunate brethren, or members of their families, can be taken care of and cured. It is not a temporal law that forces us to help these unfortunate humans, it is a moral law, the law upon which our Order has been erected, that obliges us to erect a hospital in order to manifest our Masonic ability. It is the duty of the Grand Lodges to take this matter up and secure the necessary funds right now in order to uphold the moral standard of the Order. Charity is the first virtue of a Freemason, and the building of a tuberculosis hospital is nothing else but an act of Charity and Virtue. I congratulate both THE BUILDER and the Grand Lodge of Now Mexico, for asking the Masonic Fraternity for financial assistance in their noble work. Whom should they ask? Who is morally bound to respond to their call? Nobody but we Freemasons of this great and noble country, the United States of America. Why are the Grand Lodges so unresponsive? We have been building Masonic Temples that have cost millions of dollars. Are we not able to build a hospital for tuberculosis patients?

It is the general belief among Masons that the brother who obtains the Third Degree is a Master Mason. I doubt it. My opinion is this: when a brother has obtained the Third Degree he has only the foundation whereupon he, the newly raised brother, must build a moral Masonic building. This moral Masonic building is called CHARITY. By doing charitable work a brother becomes a Master Mason, he then has done his Masonic duty as a Master Mason. Now you Freemasons of this great country are you real Master Masons? Show the world that the Masonic Order is a true Brotherhood, by helping these our brethren who suffer with one of the most fatal diseases known to medical science.

Here is another point which must not be overlooked: We Masons believe in God, the Architect of the Universe. We thank Him for everything He has given us. In this country there is a spot of God's earth created by this God we believe in, to cure tuberculosis patients, owing to its climate. This spot of ground I am speaking of cannot be used by tuberculosis patients unless we Masons who believe in God erect a hospital there which these unfortunate humans can make use of, in order to treat them in conformity with the discoveries of medical science. Now then, brethren of the Masonic Order in the United States of America, is our belief in God merely verbal, or is it both in word and in deed? If we believe in God in deed, we are enforced by

obligation to act right now, and show the world that Masons believe in God in deed, and not alone in words. Of course a hospital cannot be erected or purchased without funds. If we, however, bear in mind that we have in this country over three millions of Masons, and that if every Mason donates only twenty-five cents, we would have \$750,000. This sum would be enough to erect a hospital and there would be enough money left, the interest of which would take care of the upkeep of the hospital. The individual lodges could advance the money to be paid by their members and collect it later from them. This is, however, not possible unless the different Grand Masters take this matter up immediately. Will they do it?

What does it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith save him? If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it had not works, is dead, being alone. Yea a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: Shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works. Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well; the devils also believe, and tremble. But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?

Hoping to hear in THE BUILDER from Grand Masters and Grand Lodges answers in favor of this noble enterprise.

A Freemason from Missouri.

* * *

FLORIDA AND THE 1842 CONVENTION

I have read with great interest Bro. Eriksson's article on "The Effects of Anti-Masonry on the Masonic Fraternity." It is the most thorough and comprehensive that I have ever seen. I would not have missed it for a great deal. I am much interested in the subject as my grandfather was Deputy Grand Master of Vermont during this time and was elected to the Grand Mastership of that state in January, 1847. My father being one of the first candidates raised to Masonic light in his lodge at its resumption of labor after enforced suspension for a period of ten years from this cause. Both bearing the same name as myself, who am third to wear it.

I notice one minor fact that Bro. Eriksson omitted, not that it is of much consequence (except for historical accuracy), that is, that the Grand Lodge of Florida was not in attendance at the Convention of 1842. Bro. J. P. Duval, P. G. M., and J. G. Jones were delegates from this lodge, and in 1843 Bro. Thomas Hayward, Grand Lecturer, attended as a delegate.

Philip C. Tucker, Florida.

* * *

A SUGGESTION

In view of the numerous - and to the critical student, preposterous - claims that are being advanced in current books and Craft magazines about the origins and antiquity of Freemasonry, it is refreshing to read W. Bro. Lionel Vibert's paper. "Freemasonry Before Grand Lodges," which appeared in the Transactions of the Lodge of Research, Leicester, England, in the volume for 1923-4. (This should not be confused with his able little book, Freemasonry Before the Existence of Grand Lodges, published some years earlier.) I recommend it to you for republication in THE BUILDER, as I doubt if many American Masons will have access to it otherwise.

J. Hugo Tatsch, Iowa.

This suggestion of Bro. Tatsch is certainly a very good one. The paper is one deserving the widest publicity.