

Extract from
The Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross

By Arthur Edward Waite

(Printed by William Rider & Son Limited, London, 1924)

CHAPTER XVII

SAINT-GERMAIN AND CAGLIOSTRO

The romance of the Rosy Cross has formed for generations, which have almost passed into centuries a prolific fund of suggestion in the fact that its early history obtained for the Brethren a title as mysterious as that which they had assumed on their own part. They were called—as we all know—the Invisibles. It mattered little to romance that the denomination was applied originally by way of derision, for those who manufactured and those who marketed in that creative world carried a hallowing wand. All the problematical personalities who emerged for periods or moments from the background of history, carrying a knapsack or wallet of strange pretensions, were sealed by imagination with the symbol of the Rosy Cross. The apparitions and occultations of the Comte de Saint-Germain would have earned him the title had he made only a small percentage of his imputed claims. It is interesting to note how the myth has grown concerning him, till at this day he has received his crown and nimbus in the form of a cultus. We shall see that there is no cultus which, is so utterly its own and no other as that of Saint-Germain. For the purpose, however, of this sketch, the most notable reports concerning him can be reduced within a small compass. It is by reason only of his growing importance from the cultus point of view that it is desirable to notice him at all.

I will make a beginning with unquestioned matters of fact, contained in certain diplomatic correspondence preserved in the British Museum under the title of MITCHELL PAPERS, (1) On March 14, 1760, Major-General Joseph Yorke, English Envoy at the Hague, wrote to the Earl of Holderness, reminding him that he was acquainted with

the history of an extraordinary man, known as the Comte de Saint-Germain, who had resided some time in England, where, however, he had done nothing. Since that period, and during a space of two or three years, he had been living in France, on the most familiar footing with the French King, Mme. de Pompadour, M. de Belleisle and others. He had been granted an apartment in the Castle of Chambord and had made a certain figure in the country. More recently he had been at Amsterdam, "where he was much caressed and talked of," and on the marriage of Princess Caroline he had arrived at the Hague, where he called on General Yorke, who returned his visit. Subsequently he desired to speak with the English Envoy, and the appointment was kept on the date of Yorke's letter. Saint-Germain produced two communications from Marshal Belleisle, by way of credentials, and proceeded to explain that the French King, the Dauphin, Mme. de Pompadour and practically all the Court, except the Duc de Choiseul, desired peace with England. They wished to know the real feeling of England and to adjust matters with some honour. Madame de Pompadour and Marshal Belleisle had sent this "political adventurer" with the King's knowledge. The conversation with Yorke lasted for three hours, but we are concerned neither with the generalities of the English Envoy nor with the needs of France.

(2) On March 21 the Earl of Holderness informed General Yorke that George II entirely approved the manner in which he had conducted the conversation with Comte de Saint-Germain. The King did not regard it as improbable that the latter was authorised to talk as he had done by persons of weight in the Councils of France, and even possibly with the King's knowledge. Yorke was directed, however, to inform Saint-Germain that he could not discuss further such "interesting subjects" unless Saint-Germain produced some authentic proof that he was "being really employed with the knowledge and consent of His Most Christian Majesty." On that understanding only King George II would be ready to "open himself" as to the conditions of peace.

(3) On April 4 General Yorke reported that Saint-Germain was still at the Hague but that the Duc de Choiseul had instructed the French Ambassador to forbid his

interference with anything relating to the political affairs of France and to threaten him with the consequences if he did.

(4) On May 6 the Earl of Holderness wrote to Mr. Andrew Mitchell, the English Envoy in Prussia, referring to all that had passed between General Yorke and Comte Saint-Germain at the Hague; to the formal disavowal of Saint-Germain by the Duc de Choiseul; and to Saint-Germain's decision that he would pass over to England "in order to avoid the further resentment of the French minister." The Earl mentioned also the fact of his arrival; his immediate apprehension on the ground that he was not authorised, "even by that part of the French Ministry in whose name he pretended to talk"; his examination, which produced little, his conduct and language being "artful"; and the decision that he should not be allowed to remain in England, in accordance with which he had apparently been released and had set out "with an indention to take shelter in some part of his Prussian Ministry's Dominions," which intention Mr. Andrew Mitchell was desired, on the King of England's part, to communicate to the King of Prussia.

The Mitchell papers by no means stand alone. There is also extant in the French Record Office of Foreign Affairs certain correspondence on the same subject at the same period between the Duc de Choiseul and Comte d'Affy, who will be distinguished in the following summary by the letters A and B. (1) The Hague: February 22nd 1760. From B to A. Saint-Germain is reported at Amsterdam, claiming to be entrusted with an important mission on the financial position of France. He is said to have spent a long time formerly in England and to affect many peculiarities. (2) March 7th. From B to A. It is said that Saint-Germain "continues to make the most extraordinary assertions in Amsterdam." (3) March 10th From B to A, stating that Saint-Germain had visited him at the Hague, using much the same language as he was said to have used at Amsterdam on the state of French finances and his intention to save the kingdom, in part by securing for France the credit of the principal bankers of Holland. (4) March 14th. From B to A, stating that he had seen the scheme of Saint-Germain and intends to tell him that affairs of the kind have nothing to do with the Ministry with

which he—A—is honoured. (5) Versailles: March 19th. From A to B, enclosing a letter from Saint-Germain to the Marquise de Pompadour, which is described as sufficiently exposing "the absurdity of the personage." He is an adventurer of the first order and seems also to be exceedingly foolish. B is to warn Saint-Germain that if he chooses to meddle in politics" he shall be placed for the rest of his days in an underground dungeon." He is to be forbidden B's house, and all the foreign ministers as well as the Amsterdam bankers are to be informed. (6) April 3rd. From B to A, reporting that M. de Bentinck, "no longer seeing M. de Saint-Germain coming to my house, and knowing that I have openly discredited him, is ready to disavow him." (7) April 5th. From B to A. Reports a visit from Saint-Germain, to whom B communicated the instructions which he had received from A. Saint-Germain back to Harwich and warned to quit the English shores. He was now thought to be on his way to Berlin. (15) From B to A. March 23rd, 1762. Recalls the Comte de Saint-Germain, says that he is again in Holland under assumed names, that he has purchased an estate in Guelders and suggests that he is making dupes of people, with chemical secrets, in order to earn a living.

It will be seen that the papers in the French Record Office of Foreign Affairs give the inner significance of facts and proceedings to which the Mitchell papers bear witness. It remains to say concerning the French documents that my knowledge is derived from Appendix II of a work entitled THE COMTE DE SAINT-GERMAIN, published at Milan in 1912 by Mrs. Cooper-Oakley. It contains also some very full abstracts from the Mitchell papers, but these have been examined on my own part at the British Museum, as well as other important documents cited by her at various points of her monograph. It is obvious that their subject-matter lies far away from the concern of the present work; but in view of modern theosophical claims concerning Saint-Germain and his alleged place in the history of the Rosy Cross it is desirable to shew under what circumstances and in what environment we begin to meet with authentic particulars concerning him.

There is full documentary evidence for the fact that Louis XV assigned him the Castle of Chambord in 1758 as a

place of abode and that he was actually installed thereat in the month of May. There is also extant a letter from Saint-Germain to the Marquise de Pompadour, dated March 11, 1760, which most certainly exhibits his relations with the Court of Versailles in no uncertain manner and justifies what is said upon this subject in the Mitchell correspondence. Furthermore, it presents the writer as anxious to act in the cause of peace apart from personal interest. It does not shew, however, that he was accredited by Versailles after any manner, however informal. This notwithstanding, at the value of such a tentative view, it seems to me quite possible that he had a private verbal commission to see if he could arrange anything in the matter of peace with England behind the back of the Duc de Choiseul, and that when his attempted intervention became known to that minister he was thrown over by the French King, after the best manner of Louis XV. Whether Saint-Germain shewed any considerable ability and tact on his own part is another question. Experience in these later days tells us that the role of the professional occultist is seldom set aside by those who have once adopted it, and it would appear that he had failed signally at an interview with Pitt's clerk, However this may be, Saint-Germain comes before us as an unsuccessful political emissary who was used at best as a cat's-paw, and it must be added that when he addressed the King's mistress it was not *ut adeptis appareat me illis parem et fratrem*, or

Lofty and passionless as date-palm's bride,
Set on the topmost summit of his soul.

He tells her that he has spoken to Bentinck of "the charming Marquise de Pompadour" from "the fullness of a heart" whose sentiments have been long known to herself, reminds her of the "loyalty" that he has sworn to her and alludes to Louis XV as "the best and worthiest of kings." It is not at such cost that adeptship repays the favour even of a palace at Chambord. Let us now glance briefly at some other records.

(l) December 9, 1745. Horace Walpole writes to Sir Horace Mann, stating that "the other day they seized an odd man who goes by the name of Comte St.-Germain." He is said

to have been in England for two years and had confessed that he was not passing under his real name, while refusing all information as to his origin and identity. Walpole acknowledged Ills great musical abilities but testifies otherwise that he was mad.¹ We hear from a later source that he was arrested because some one who was "jealous of him with a lady slipt a letter in his pocket as from the Young Pretender . . . and immediately had him taken up." It is said that his innocence was proved and that he was discharged. See Read's WEEKLY JOURNAL OF BRITISH GAZETTEER, May 17, 1760, the reminiscence of 1745 arising out of Saint-Germain's second visit to England. (2) He is heard of next at Vienna, "from 1745 to 1746," with Prince Ferdinand von Lobkowitz, "first minister of the Emperor," as his intimate friend. He became acquainted with the Maréchal de Belle-Isle, who "persuaded him to accompany him on a visit to Paris." The authority is J. van Sypesteyn: HISTORISCHE ERINNERUNGEN, 1869. (3) On his own testimony at its value he was in India for a second time in 1755. (4) It would appear that he revisited Paris about 1757 and according to Madame de Genlis her father was a great admirer of his skill in chemistry.² (5) April 15, 1758. Writing to Frederick the Great, Voltaire mentions Saint-Germain, "who will probably have the honour of seeing Your Majesty in the course of fifty years. He is a man who never dies and who knows everything."³ (6) Notwithstanding the events of 1760, Saint-Germain is said to have been in Paris in 1761, and when the Marquise d'Urfé mentioned the fact to the Duc de Choiseul the latter answered: *il a passé la nuit dans mon cabinet.*⁴ (7) Saint-Germain is reported at St. Petersburg, presumably *circa* 1761-2, and according to the Graf Gregor Orloff he "played a great part" in the Russian Revolution.⁵ (8) In 1763 he was at Brussels, as appears in a letter of Graf Karl Coblenz, who regarded him as the most singular man whom he had ever seen, affirms that he witnessed his transmutation of iron "into a metal as beautiful as gold," his preparation and dyeing of skins, silk, wool, etc., all carried to an extraordinary degree of perfection, as also his composition of colours for painting.⁶ There is no need to particularize further: considerable evidence exists for the fact that Saint-Germain had signal skill in chemistry. (9) If we can trust the MEMOIRES of Casanova, and research has placed them in a better position than criticism

had assigned formerly, Saint-Germain was at Tournay at some later time in the same year and permitted the famous adventurer to visit him, when Casanova found him wearing a long beard and an Armenian dress. (10) Between 1763 and 1769 we have the authority of Dieudonné Thiébault for the fact that Saint-Germain spent a year in Berlin, where he became acquainted with Abbe Pernety, who was a considerable figure in Hermeticism and High Grade Masonry at that period and later.⁷ (11) The Graf Max von Lamberg met him in Venice under an assumed name, engaged in experiments on flax, and in July, 1770, they were staying together at Tunis.⁸ (12) He is said also to have been at Leghorn in the same year during a visit of the Russian fleet, when he wore a Russian uniform "and was called Graf Saltikoff by the Graf Alexis Orloff." I have not met with confirmation of this story.⁹ (13) According to Von Sypesteyn, 1770 is another year in which the Count revisited Paris, being after the fall of the Due de Choiseul.¹⁰ (14) The same writer states that Saint-Germain was again at the Hague in 1774, after the death of Louis XV, and proceeded thence to Schwalbach, where he carried on alchemical experiments with the Markgraf, but their nature and results do not appear. (15) In 1776 it is certain that he was at Leipzig and at Dresden in the following year, when Graf Marcolini offered him an important post in that city, which, however, Saint-Germain refused. According to a letter of Baron von Wurmb, written on May 19, 1777, the Count was at that date between sixty and seventy years old. There is also extant a communication in his own hand which shews that he was acquainted with Baron de Bischoffswerder,¹¹ whom we shall meet with again as an active member of the Rosicrucian Order at the Court of Frederick William II of Prussia. (16) In or about 1777 Saint-Germain was at Hamburg and afterwards on a visit to Prince Karl of Hesse, with whom he engaged in experiments, presumably on various herbs, but the particulars are vague. (17) The last authentic record is that of the Church Register of Eckrenforde, which has this entry: "Deceased on February 27th, buried on March 2nd, 1784, the so-called Comte de St. Germain and Weldon — further information not known—privately deposited in this Church." On April 3rd the Mayor and Council of the town certified that "his effects have been legally sealed," that nothing had been

ascertained as to the existence of a will, and that his creditors were called upon to come forward, "with their claim," on October 14th. The result of this notice is unknown.¹²

There are foolish persons who challenge the truth of these later records, because, according to the protestant Anti-Mason Eckert, Saint-Germain was invited to attend the Masonic Congress at Paris in 1785 and that of Wilhelmsbad in February of the same year, according to another account. It has not occurred to them that such invitations could be issued without knowledge that a mysterious and unaccountable individual, ever traveling under assumed names, and ever vanishing out of view with great suddenness, had at last departed this life in a private manner.¹³ There are other uncritical persons, and Mrs. Cooper-Oakley is among them, who take the Comtesse d'Adhemar's SOUVENIRS SUR MARIE-ANTOINETTE¹⁴ seriously, instead of as an exaggerated and largely fictitious narrative, no important statement in which can be accepted, unless it has been checked independently. They certify among other marvels innumerable to the appearance of Saint-Germain and to the fact that she saw him with her own eyes (1) at the execution of Marie Antoinette; (2) "at the coming of the 18th Brumaire "; (3) on the day after the death of the Duc d'Enghien; (4) in the month of January, 1813; and (5) "on the eve of the murder of the Duc de Berri," in 1820. According to his alleged promise, she was to see him yet once more and was not to wish for the meeting, meaning evidently on the eve of her own death. In any case, on the basis of these statements Saint-Germain survived his recorded burial in Germany by at least thirty-six years, and by as many more as we may choose to imagine after 1820. He may have even attended his own funeral in 1784. It is also on Madame d'Adhémar's unsupported authority that we hear of Saint-Germain being present at the Court of Versailles long before herself—that is to say, in 1743. Notwithstanding her absence she is able to give an almost microscopical account of his appearance and especially of his apparel.

We may compare the CHRONIQUES DE L'ŒIL DE BŒUF, ¹⁵ which is equally explicit on appearances and not less mendacious after its own manner.

We hear of a Countess von Gergy, who met him at Venice in 1710, looking about forty-five years, and fifty years later she talked to him at the Court of Louis XV, no older to outward seeming by a single day. When she said that he must be a devil he was " seized with a cramp-like trembling in every limb, and left the room immediately."¹⁶ The Baron de Gleichen bears witness also to the Count's presence in Venice at the date in question but makes it clear in his sincerity that he has derived it at second hand.¹⁷

There are other fables besides those which have been quoted, and when all have been set aside as accretions which, accumulate invariably about occult and mysterious personalities, the facts which remain are (1) that Saint-Germain was a wanderer for a considerable period over the face of Europe; (2) that he had the entrée to most courts in the countries which he visited, and this could not have been the case apart from personal and other high credentials; (3) that although there are no occult sciences there are secret arts, and there is very full evidence that he was versed in these; (4) that for twenty-six years he was an occasional figure on the stage of public affairs and that this period was closed by his death. Here is the plain story, which invention has coloured to its liking. The inventions are much more interesting than the plain facts, and I should be very glad if there were evidence of their truth. There is none, however, and their rejection is inevitable on this ground, quite apart from *a priori* considerations of the possible and probable, in which I have no concern when I write as an historian.

I am of opinion otherwise that Saint-Germain was not an adventurer in the ordinary sense of the term, that he was not living by his wits, that during the whole period of his known activities there is no evidence of dishonourable conduct and that he was a gentleman of his time who acted throughout as such. Those who represent him as making preposterous claims on his own behalf are those precisely whose accounts in particular and in general

cannot be accepted on their own warrants and no others are forthcoming. At the same time it is well within possibility that he may have claimed considerable occult powers and may perhaps have possessed some, seeing that such powers exist. Voltaire's scoffing allusion indicates the kind of rumours that were abroad, and whatever they owed to invention their opportunity could have been provided only by Saint-Germain himself. His chemical and herbal knowledge is vouched for fairly well, but does not enter into the consideration. On the other hand, there is also no evidence that he was a man of spiritual experience and much less a mystic in the sense, let us say, of Saint-Martin. He was an occult personality of his period, and whatever his faculties of this kind—if indeed he had such faculties—they could count for nothing on the mystic path of adeptship. For these reasons and on these grounds I do not accept the judgment of his personal friend, the Landgrave Charles, Prince of Hesse, when he affirms that Saint-Germain " was perhaps one of the greatest philosophers who ever lived";¹⁸ it is open to question whether the deponent had any valid canon of distinction on such a subject. But as nothing can be found to the contrary in authentic records of the past, and as it postulates nothing that is in the least unlikely or the least uncommon, I accept and welcome the judgment when the Prince of Hesse affirms otherwise (1) that Saint-Germain was "the friend of humanity," desiring money only that he might give to the poor; (2) that he was a friend to animals; and (3) that "his heart was concerned only with the happiness of others." For the rest, it seems to me that his own account of himself, which is not wholly unsupported and has reasonable inferences in its favour, may be accepted provisionally, and according to this he was a son of Prince Rákóczy of Transylvania. It seems fairly certain also that in his earlier life he was under the powerful protection of the Duc de Medici. He adopted innumerable aliases during his life-long travels, and some of them may have been dictated by prudence, but others are more readily explicable by the love of mystery for its own sake. It is inalienable from the professional occultist, especially of that period, and if its connotation is a passion for pose, it must be said that Saint-Germain had dispositions of this kind. They are significant of folly, but I

have followed the tracks of occult adeptship through all the Christian centuries and I have not found wisdom.

Saint-Germain was a man of his period and a figure in the great world. As such in the eighteenth century he was of course a Freemason. I have quoted elsewhere Casanova's shrewd advice to those who in his time — being that time — had an ambition to make their way: if they were not Masons already, they must become such; it was a condition of future prosperity. Saint-Germain had obviously no way to make, but he had a position to maintain, being that of a great occult virtuoso and master of his period, and all sorts and conditions of occultism were gathered in that day under one or other of the Masonic banners. He is described as an "eager" Freemason by the Landgraf von Hessen-Phillips-Barchfeld, but I find no record of activities, except in suspicious sources. There is nothing to shew that Cadet de Gassicourt was speaking from first-hand knowledge when he describes Saint-Germain as travelling for the Knights Templar, to establish communication between their various Chapters or Preceptories — a reference either to the Rite of Perfection or the Strict Observance. On the other hand, the great vogue of the Strict Observance makes it not antecedently improbable that he belonged to it as part of his concern, though I cannot regard as genuine a letter which he is supposed to have written to Count Gortz and in which there is reference to this Rite. If, however, Saint-Germain was drawn into Masonry as part of his business, it must be confessed that he would be attracted still more strongly by the Rosicrucian Order, and there is evidence that on one occasion he appeals to Bischoffswerder, a militant member of the fraternity, as one who knew and would speak for him. There is nothing to be inferred from this except a precarious possibility, and otherwise there is a complete blank in all the records, which never mention the Rosy Cross, in connection with Saint-Germain or otherwise.

The lacuna thus created has been filled, however, to the brim by occult speculation, expressed as usual in terms of more or less complete certitude. We know too well already that whensoever it has proved convenient every one who practised alchemy was *if so facto* a Rosicrucian, every one who wrote about elementary spirits or was supposed to

have commerce with these belonged to the Order. The flagitious rule obtained naturally enough in the case of Saint-Germain, but the myth of his membership has been the subject of special effort in the forcing-house of modern theosophy. Out of a casual and unsupported affirmation of Madame Blavatsky, who says that Saint-Germain was in possession of a Rosicrucian cipher-manuscript, Mrs. Cooper-Oakley leaps to the conclusion that he occupied a high position in the Brotherhood and talks vaguely of his connection with alleged branches of the Order or developments therefrom in Bohemia, Austria and Hungary. She maintains that these things are proven, but how or by whom does not appear in the statement. It is presumably the kind of proof which she met with in a German occult periodical, according to which Vienna at that period was swarming with Rosicrucians, Illuminati, Alchemists and Templars, whence it follows that during his visits to that city he could not fail to come in touch with many "mystagogues," especially in a certain Rosicrucian laboratory, where he is said to have instructed his Brethren "in the science of Solomon." She may have remembered also that LE LOTUS BLEU (1895), a French Theosophical Review, described the Rosicrucians as "perhaps the most mysterious Fraternity ever established on western soil," and obviously therefore a fitting asylum for a professional man of mystery.

It would serve little purpose to quote the fantastic memorials at large, but they have grown from more to more with the effluxion of time, and so it comes about that in the foolish account of the Order published as No. 2 of the Golden Rule Manuals¹⁹ we hear of the hand of Saint-Germain being traceable in the formation or guidance not only of Mystic and Masonic, but of many Rosicrucian bodies, as it would seem, anywhere and everywhere at the end of the eighteenth century. The source of these inventions is not in the records of the past which are known to history but rather in those Akasic Records to which I have referred in my first chapter. They must be left or taken as such, remembering the kind of deponent who skries in that psychic sea. If the Graf Rákóczy is known to certain theosophists at this day in a physical body; if he testifies that he is the Comte de Saint-Germain; if Saint-Germain was Francis, Lord Verulam; and

if Verulam was Christian Rosy Cross; it is obvious that the French occult personality of the eighteenth century knew better and more about the mysterious Order than any one else in the world and must have come into his own in every Lodge and House of Initiation that he happened to visit. But outside the Akasic Records there are those of German Rosicrucianism at the close of the eighteenth century, and they have not one word to tell us on the presence or activities of the Comte de Saint-Germain. In this dilemma I am content to leave the issue.

I have now to consider for a moment the case of Count Cagliostro. Whether he is to be identified with Joseph Balsamo — that cheerful Sicilian rogue — as affirmed by the Holy Inquisition, or whether he appeared suddenly in France and London in the role of an occult personality, his antecedents and identity unknown, as Mr. Trowbridge has tried earnestly to prove,²⁰ are not alternatives which call for discussion in this place. The question is whether he also, like Saint-Germain, came out of the hiddenness as a Master of the Rosy Cross, for this is the story concerning him, and though it has been in no wise invented by modern occultists it is cherished near to their hearts. The original of the mythos is to be found in a sensational romance, published anonymously but attributed to the Marquis de Luchet.²¹ It belongs to the year 1785, and the scene of the episode is Holstein, where Cagliostro and Lorenza, his wife, are represented as visiting Saint-Germain and being received by him into the "sect" of the Rosy Cross. That which they learned, however, was (1) that the Great Art is the government of men; (2) that its secret is never to tell them the truth; (3) that they must get wealth but dupes above all. In a word the account is a comedy, but it set in motion a belief that Cagliostro claimed connection with the Order. There is no particle of evidence that he did. On the contrary the Rosy Cross would have dissolved for him in the higher and more ancient light of Egyptian Mysteries, and what lie actually pretended was that he had been initiated at the foot of the Pyramids into the secret wisdom of Osiris, Isis and Anubis. His Rite of Masonry drew, by its hypothesis, from these sources and owes nothing to the later institution. When a catechism attached to its Second Degree describes the Sacred Rose as a symbol of the First

Matter of Alchemy we are far removed from the field of Rosicrucian symbolism.

Having disposed in this manner of the chief occult personalities who figured in France during the second half of the eighteenth century there remains only Martines de Pasqually, whose Rite of the Elected Priesthood had at least one Rosicrucian Grade high up to the ritual sequence. We know practically nothing concerning it, though John Yarker in one of his most confused moments seems to suggest that he has seen it.²² In such case, the procedure included a baptism and apparently a rank in chivalry, for the candidate became in his reception a Knight Rose-Croix, as in the Eighteenth Degree. There was also an Historical Discourse in which it was affirmed (1) that natural philosophy was the object of research in the Order; (2) that its origin was lost in remote time; (3) that the Rose and other symbols, displayed in the Lodge or Temple, represented the vivifying light which renews itself incessantly, but also the everlasting benevolence of the Divine Source; (4) that the Rose in union with the Cross signified the mixed joys and pains of life, "indicating that our pleasures, to be lasting, should have delicacy, and that they are of short duration when delivered over to excess." I think better of Pasqually than to believe that these puerilities entered into the highest Grade of his Rite. They have the flavour of Memphis or Mizraim in the annals of Masonic folly. I should add that Pasqually claimed to derive from Unknown Superiors and at the beginning of his Masonic career he carried a hieroglyphical charter. It may be mere speculation to suggest that it had a Rosicrucian source, but it does not offend probability, and at need I should take this view rather than conclude that a man of his blameless life sought to make capital out of a forged document. Otherwise he drew from elsewhere, and in such case his Rose-croix Grade may have been one more item added to the long lists of developments from the Eighteenth Degree. It would doubtless owe much also to himself, a suggestion which obtains in respect of his Rite at large.

It follows from my whole consideration that France on the eve of Revolution knew little of the Rosy cross except by filtration through Masonic channels.

NOTES

¹ LETTERS OF HORACE WALPOLE EARL OF ORFORD, TO SIR HORACE MANN, 1833, Vol. II, pp. 108, 109.

² Comtesse de Genlis: MEMOIRES INEDITS POUR SERVIR A L'HISTOIRE DES XVIII ET- XIX SIECLES, 1825, p. 88.

³ See Beuchot's edition of Voltaire: Œuvres, Vol. LVIII, p. 360. The letter is numbered cxviii.

⁴ F. W. Barthold: DIE GESCHICHTLICHEN PERSONLICHKEITEN IN CASANOVA'S MEMOIREN, 1846, Vol. II, p. 94. The Marquise d'Urfé story seems evidently mythical.

⁵ C.A.Vulpius . CURIOSITÄTEN DER LITERARISCH HISTORISCHEN VOR UND MITWELT, 1818, pp. 285, 286

⁶ A. Ritter von Arneth: GRAF PHILIPP COBLENZ UND SEINE MEMOIREN, 1889. See annotation to p. 9.

⁷ See Thiébauld's SOUVENIR DE VINCT ANS DE SÉJOUR À BERLIN, 1813.

⁸ See von Lamberg's, MÉMORIAL D'UN MONDAIN, 1775.

⁹ There is no authority in this case beyond that of Mrs. Cooper-Oakley *op. cit.*, p. 60. It is one of the few instances in which she fails to provide a reference.

¹⁰ Cornelius Ascanius von Sypesteyn : VOLTAIRE, SAINT-GERMAIN, etc., 1869.

¹¹ Karl von Weber : Aus VIER JAHRHUNDERTEN, 1857, pp. 317 *et seq.*

¹² Louis Bobé: JOHAN CASPAR LAVATER'S REISE TIL DENMARK I SOMMEREN, 1793, published at Copenhagen in 1898, Vol. III, p. 156, cited, by Mrs. Cooper-Oakley, who refers also to BERLINISCHE MONATSSCHRIFT for June, 1785. It may be added that no less a friend than Prince Karl of Hesse is said to have been not only acquainted with the fact of Saint-Germain's death at Eckrenförde but that his illness began while pursuing experiments in colours, his own apothecary preparing

innumerable medicaments for his cure in vain.—See THE THEOSOPHIST, May, 1881, reproducing an article from ALL YEAR AROUND.

¹³ It may be mentioned that Louis Claude de Saint-Martin was certainly invited to these Conventions and as certainly did not attend, though many unequipped writers have said that he did.

¹⁴ Published in 1836.

¹⁵ Published in 1845 under the name of G. Touchard-Lafosse.

¹⁶ *Loc. cit.* RÈGNE DE Louis XV, *chap.* XXII, *tome* III, pp. 407 *et seq.* Much as the supposed authoress of these memoirs, La Comtesse Douairière de B is acquainted with the Court of Louis XV, she has heard nothing of Saint-Germain's residence at Chambord or of his political mission. In her story of the *Règne de Louis XVI*, *cap.* 4, pp. 450, 451, there is an account of his death, with fabulous details, especially regarding the terrors of his last moments.

¹⁷ MÉMOIRES, published at Paris in 1868

¹⁸ MÉMOIRES DE MON TEMPS, 1861.

¹⁹ THE ROSICRUCIAN already cited on several occasions.

²⁰ This apologist for Cagliostro weaves a thin romance of his own about the Rosicrucians and has scarcely a vestige of evidence for anything that he says, as, e.g., concerning their far-reaching influence. He explains that "contentment" was the Philosophical Stone of the Order, which is taking Addison's rather dubious story literally.

²¹ MÉMOIRES AUTHENTIQUES POUR SERVIR À L'HISTOIRE DU COMTE CAGLIOSTRO.

²² This at least is the inference to be drawn from an account of the Rite which appeared in THE KNEPH, No. 45.