

not as man seeth," for if he is a true Mason he of all men should have the grandest conception of Infinite Power and Wisdom that earthly mortals may hope to aspire to. The dogma of a personal God is not in Masonry, or of it, and even one of the "profane or outer world" can see, from the nature of the work on which we are employed, that such cannot be. "The use made of the Bible in Masonic ceremonies as well as in Masonic ritual," can only be variously estimated according to the various lines of thought of different members of the Institution. For example: The Christian neophyte, in taking his OB, accepts the Book as a whole, Old and New Testament combined; the Jew accepts only the Old; the Mahomedan accepts neither, but will be bound by the Koran; the Bhuddist requires the Rig Veda, and the Parsee would (I am credibly informed by an eye witness) consider himself insulted by having the Sacred Volume presented to him, and will only give *his sacred word of honor*. If this is so (and I believe I am fully warranted in considering these things as facts) the "vanishing point" of the Bible in the Lodge, to a Christian believer, is at the invitation of his Jewish brother, and the conception of God to all these men, according to the faith in which they have been educated, must be different, until they each and all attain that grander conception which belongs to Masonry. That many Masons do not attain to that conception I grant, but the why and the wherefore of this we cannot now stop to enquire. That the Old Testament is necessary and of importance in a Lodge will I think be granted by Masons of all shades of opinions, not as an authority for dogma, but as a legendary, historical reference, without which the symbolism and traditional history of Masoury would lose its vitality, and perhaps after a time its form and character. Neither do I see any great objection to its being termed the Sacred Volume, for sacred undoubtedly it is to our Jewish brethren (and a Mason should ever be ready to respect the religious feelings of others). Sacred may it almost be said to be to those who no longer look on it as inspired, notwithstanding the martyrdoms which it is said to have been the cause of, and which after all must be considered as the result of the human intellect on all sides being sunk in the slough of Ignorance. Sacred on account of its being the teacher through all the Ages of one God pure and indivisible, and who, though it clothed at times with powerful and terrible human attributes for good or evil, affords us sometimes a glimpse of that great JENOVAH which in this present day we yet stand in awe and wonder of—that inscrutable mystery at which we stand appalled.

That Masonic ritual makes use of the Bible, need not surprise us when we consider that, as regards the history of Masonry, the ritual we now possess is such an elaboration of that used by Masons of the olden time that could they re-visit the scenes of their former labors, and again assemble within the walls of those grand old edifices which stand as monuments of their surpassing skill, they would stand transfixed with wonder, if not with admiration. Primitive rituals of the Craft were short and concise. It was when the speculative element was introduced into Masonry that ritual was enlarged and elaborated, and of course partook of the particular line of thought of the individuals performing the work, not perhaps designedly so, but from the natural bent of ideas. But the dogma of a resurrection to life eternal can only have been imported into Freemasonry by those brethren who were anxious to christianize the Institution, for if it may be said to be shadowed forth anywhere, it is in the legend of the third degree. This degree, called the "Master Mason," is comparatively of modern date, for we are informed "In ancient times no brother, however skilled in the craft, was called a Master Mason until he had been elected into the chair of a Lodge." We know it was not in use before the year 1716, for up to that period all Masons not having been elected to the chair of a Lodge were called Fellow-Crafts. Its authorship is generally imputed to Drs. Anderson and Desaguliers; and Oliver says "the legend was evidently borrowed from certain tales taken out of the Jewish Targums which were published in London A.D. 1715, from a manuscript in the University Library at Cambridge." And Dr. Anderson himself said in a work published A.D. 1730, that it "seems to allude to a beautiful passage in the sixth book of Virgil's *Æneid*." For the different interpretations, paganistic, political, and biblical, put on this legend by the Craft at the time of its first appearance, I must refer your readers to "Oliver's Freemason's Treasury," pages 295-6-7. But that it *has* an impressive occult

significance and teaching worthy of so beautiful an allegory, I think no true Mason should be ignorant of.

The Grand Lodge of England is now busy with the revision of their Book of Constitutions, a work forced on them by the advance of the times. On the completion of that, it would redound much to their common-sense were they to revise, and in some measure reconstruct, the ritual. This can be done without sweeping away any of the real landmarks of the Order, or destroying its beautiful allegory, and they would at least gain credit for consistency from those Indian Princes and other eastern gentlemen who have been initiated under their rule, and for whom certain references in the ritual can have no meaning. Then the ancient and honorable order, venerable with hoary antiquity, instead of posing before the world simply as a charity organisation, to be used in some instances as a masked phalanx of support for Church and State, may in altered circumstances retain more of the bright intellects that fall out of her ranks year by year, to be supplemented by those who never rise to a conception of the nature and objects of the Institution. Then would the East indeed be a place of Light and Wisdom, and the rays of the Sun of Knowledge would shine strong and radiant on all within the circle of its influence. Then might it be truly said that "A Mason's Lodge is a Mason's Church."

#### A DARWINIAN REVERIE.

One evening when he was more than commonly out of sorts, after sitting some time in moody silence, he roused himself, and taking up a book that lay on her table, he glanced at its title and turned over the leaves. It happened by ill luck to be a volume of Darwin that Mrs. Lee had just borrowed from the library of Congress. "Do you understand this sort of thing?" asked the Senator abruptly, in a tone that suggested a sneer.—"Not very well," replied Mrs. Lee, rather curtly.—"Why do you want to understand it?" persisted the Senator. "What good will it do you?"—"Perhaps it will teach us to be Modest," answered Madeleine, quite equal to the occasion.—"Because it says we descend from monkeys?" rejoined the Senator, roughly. "Do you think you are descended from monkeys?"—"Why not?" said Madeleine.—"Why not?" repeated Radcliffe, laughing harshly. "I don't like the connection. Do you mean to introduce your distant relatives into society?"—"They would bring more amusement into it than most of its present members," rejoined Mrs. Lee, with a gentle smile that threatened mischief.—But Radcliffe would not be warned; on the contrary, the only effect of Mrs. Lee's defiance was to exasperate his ill temper, and whenever he lost his temper he became senatorial and Websterian. "Such books," he said, "disgrace our civilisation; they degrade and stultify our divine nature; they are only suited for Asiatic despotisms where men are reduced to the level of brutes; that they should be accepted by a man like Baron Jacobi, I can understand; he and his masters have nothing to do in the world but to trample on human rights. Mr. Carrington, of course, would approve those ideas; he believes in the divine doctrine of flogging negroes; but that you, who profess philanthropy and free principles, should go with them, is astonishing; it is incredible; it is unworthy of you."—"You are very hard on the monkeys," replied Madeleine, rather sternly, when the Senator's oration was concluded. "The monkeys never did you any harm; they are not in public life; they are not even voters; if they were, you would be enthusiastic about their intelligence and virtue. After all we ought to be grateful to them, for what would men do in this melancholy world if they had not inherited gaiety from the monkeys—as well as oratory."—Extract from "Democracy," an American novel.

#### BRUNO'S THEORY.

"Struck with the problem of the generation and maintenance of organisms, and duly pondering it, he came to the conclusion that Nature does not imitate the technic of man. The infinity of forms under which matter appears were not imposed upon it by an external artificer; by its own intrinsic force and virtue it brings these forms forth. Matter is not the mere naked empty capacity which philosophers have pictured her to be, but the universal mother who brings forth all things as the fruit of her own womb."—TYNDALL.