

THE TERM "MESOURANEQ" AS APPLIED TO MASONRY.

In my "Allocation" of last year, I referred to the criticism of the Rev. J. F. Woodford, of the London (England) *Freemason*, in which I incorrectly stated that he was better known as "Masonic Student" in the pages of that journal. This, I have since learned, is not the case, but that of one well-known to us all in Masonic circles, and most highly esteemed.

The theory I advanced of the derivation of the name "Masonry," requires some little explanation. I did not for a moment intend to throw discredit on the opinions given by such able and erudite Masonic antiquarian authorities as "Gould," "Hughan," "Woodford," and "Whytehead," of England; and "Neilson," of Dublin, whose valuable and authentic researches are beyond all praise. What constitutes one person's belief, is not necessarily that of another although equally well-informed; but the color given by individual bias so alters its aspect that both are right and neither wrong, the widest dissimilarity will be found in their views. (See Appendix A.)

The word "Mesouraneq" appears to me to suit admirably Speculative or Spiritual Masonry; its true meaning does not apply to material building, but the spiritual building, MAN,—not made with hands, and is particularly applicable to the English Templar system, its connection with Freemasonry. The Masonry there intended to be inculcated is fully expressed by the term "Mesouraneq," as indicative of the character of a "Waiter or Worshipper" in the Temple of the living God; seeking to expound the teachings of revealed religion; but this word, when applied to "Builders," "Stone-Masons," in an architectural

science recommend him to take them, if he can do so conveniently and is not victimized by enormous fees. If they will do nothing else for him, they will, at least, affix certain mysterious numbers to his signature, to wear a variety of costly jewels and to call himself by certain magnificent titles, such as "Sovereign Prince," "Illustrious Brother," or "Sublime Prince," etc.

The Order of the Templar is not in any sense a Masonic Rite or Degree, although the Degree of Royal Arch Mason is now required as a pre-requisite for admission. It is a Christian Order, and is generally held to be a continuation of the old Knightly Order of the Temple, of the time of the Crusades. Its teachings are of real value, and its membership sought after by the best class of Masons. Finally, it has this great advantage, it stands, as it were, alone, and is never engaged with any other Order or Rite in its disputable and childish squabbles for place, fees, or supremacy.

point of view, certainly appears out of place and far-fetched.

Our great Masonic authority, Bro. Hughan, of Truro, distinctly shows that Freemasonry is the offspring of the Building Guilds of the middle ages, but he does not say the rituals of the three degrees, now used, are the same, nor that the doctrines as now inculcated were "universal." The Building-Guilds of Masons, derived from the cloisters, were a Christian Society until the revival and revision of 1717. Hughan, in his late admirable work on the "English Rite" (which no Brother should be without who is interested in Masonry), says:—"The desire for the return to the exclusive *Christian basis* of the fraternity was one chief cause which led to the fabrication of additional degrees."

It is a very striking fact in 1717 and 1721, at which time true Masonry apparently was lost, and the Stone Builders' Guild had usurped its place, at least it was made so to appear,—Drs. Anderson and Desaguilliers made out of what was left (the crude ceremonial of the Guild), the rituals of the Masonry which we now have, making the First and Second degrees out of the one degree which they received from the Guild of Stone Masons, and issued them in 1721, and in 1725 adding the Third,—since considerably enlarged. Now, I feel convinced that Bro. Carson, of Ohio, U. S., asserted a great truth:—"That a few members amongst them who had the old Templar doctrines, retired from the Lodge and practised the ritual in their own way." In all probability Anderson and Desaguilliers got the idea of the Master from them, but out of it changed the Truth to suit their own legend, dividing the ritual of the Craft into three degrees in conformity to the three steps of the "Disciplina Arcani"—"The Disciple of the Mysteries." The ancient form of conveying instruction in the Mysteries of the early Christians—the principles of which were evidently known and practised as the doctrinal teaching of the Ancient Templars and Stone Masons.

It may be, that Anderson and his colleagues were not without knowledge of the ancient system, but impressed with the belief that it was of too sacred and sectarian a character to be communicated in common, and therefore more advisable to introduce an entirely new one, on the cosmopolitan plan of Universal Charity. Some such idea must also have been entertained by the old Templar Order, who had one general ceremony for a "Reception," and another only communicated to a select few of the Order.

WHY THE TEMPLAR SYSTEM BECAME ENGRAFTED ON FREE AND ACCEPTED MASONRY.

So many surmises and conflicting opin-