

ON APPROACHING HOLY MEN

BY D. L. PAUL

THE invasions of democracy, rather than loss of faith in their supernatural powers or any other decline in orthodoxy, have done away with much of the formality once attending intercourse with the rev. clergy, but theoretically at least, among believers and infidels alike, they are still recognized as a class apart from the laity. The faithful, moreover, from the papal stronghold that is New York to the remotest wilds of the Total Immersion Belt, still consider them as belonging to the upper strata of the American social organism, and are willing to concede to holy clerks of their own denomination, if not to the profession as a whole, rights and privileges above those of the layman. It is strange, therefore, that in all the current handbooks of etiquette ecclesiastics should receive less attention, comparatively, than butlers and serving maids. Beyond meagre hints that they are officially in evidence at hymeneal and funereal orgies, all the information available, even in Mrs. Emily Post's exhaustive and immensely popular tome, as to what is expected by the clergy from the layman socially is limited to a few generalities about introductions and correspondence, totally inadequate, even if perused, to dispel the phenomenal ignorance prevailing among people otherwise well coached as to what is correct or usual in polite society.

Nowhere, for instance, is there an intelligent discussion of the matter of precedence. If it is so much as mentioned in the books of social usage, only secular personages are considered, and the men of God, so to speak, are left out in the cold. But it is becoming more and more common

for them to be present at civic receptions, conventions, banquets, flag-raising and other orgies *extra ecclesiam*, and sooner or later answers must be found to the questions of precedence that naturally suggest themselves. It would seem that even the lowest clerics, as representatives of God, should have the right to a prerogative of honor, in such assemblies, before mere men and women of the world, of how high soever standing. But even in countries where a union of church and state prevails churchmen of various ranks within their own trade are sandwiched in between the unordained, also arranged in the order of their importance, and thus even Archbishops and Bishops of the established church play second fiddle, as it were, to certain secular dignitaries. The rules of precedence obtaining in such Christian lands have, ordinarily, but one code of canon law to reconcile with the civil regulations in the matter, and thus the problem of properly lining up the laity, from sovereign to commoner, and interspersing churchmen of various ranks according to a more or less satisfactory understanding between church and state, becomes a relatively simple one. But in this country, where the clergy of a dozen or more large and competing denominations, each with a potential, if not actual, canon law of its own, must be taken into consideration, the problem assumes proportions truly alarming, and has been dodged accordingly by all our authorities on etiquette. As a result, questions of precedence have often given rise to unpleasant controversies. Prominent Roman Catholic prelates have declined to attend social functions at

which their right to precede important seculars or the hierarchs of other sects might be disputed, and Methodist pastors have more than once indignantly regretted their inability to sit at table with Catholic Bishops, Jews or atheists accorded places above them.

There is no intention of treating the subject here with any completeness. But, simply as a matter of enlightening the ignorant, and for the guidance of the Methodist-Baptist *bloc* at such time as one or the other of the evangelical churches shall at last obtain recognition as the one by law established in this country, a brief statement of the rules of precedence based on Roman Catholic canon law may not be amiss. The Pope, of course, always takes first place; but, as it is extremely unlikely, despite all the warnings of the evangelical press, that that gentleman will ever take up his residence in this country, he may be omitted from the discussion. After him come the Cardinals. We have four of them. (It so happens that American Cardinals are Archbishops also, but the two dignities do not necessarily go together. Throughout this article, the term Archbishop will be used for one who is not at the same time a Cardinal.)

Then, in descending order, come Archbishops, Bishops, monsignori (protonotaries apostolic, vicars-general, domestic prelates, papal chamberlains), and simple priests. Within these classes, priority of promotion or ordination determines precedence, except that the Apostolic Delegate, an Archbishop residing in Washington, and the Archbishop of Baltimore rank first and second, respectively, among American Archbishops. Not to confuse matters, abbots and other superiors of religious orders may be disregarded here, except to observe that, other things being equal, the so-called secular clergy, *i.e.*, those who do not belong to religious orders, take precedence of the regular clergy, *i.e.*, those bound by monastic or community rules. A Bishop in his own diocese precedes visiting Bishops and even Archbishops, excepting the Met-

ropolitan of the ecclesiastical province to which the see belongs.

Keeping in mind this general scheme, it is fairly easy to dispose of the Catholic clergy in proper order at exclusively or predominantly Catholic gatherings, where, on the ancient theory that the spiritual is superior to the material, they take precedence before all secular personages. Tolerated American custom, however, permits derogations from the rule, and prominent Catholic laymen—Governors of States, mayors of cities, and the like—are frequently given places of relative honor, depending on the nature of the affair and the willingness of democratically inclined ecclesiastics to yield their own right. When the secular dignitaries at the gathering are mixed as to religion, the lords temporal, as in Europe, relegate the lords spiritual to secondary places. Hence, the President of the United States, who, for present purposes, may be considered as a reigning monarch, and the Vice-President, heir-apparent to the presidential chair and the only person, under our system of government, remotely comparable to a prince, would occupy the first two places of honor, but Cardinals, as princes of the Church, would claim precedence before everybody else. The Apostolic Delegate, while without recognized diplomatic standing, is, in view of his representative character, entitled to a place immediately after accredited foreign ambassadors; and Archbishops, and probably also Bishops whose territory is coextensive with or larger than that of a particular Governor, go before State Governors. In general, Bishops will yield in favor of a Governor, but they precede all other State officials, as also do lesser prelates, excepting, perhaps, that a Lieutenant-Governor might claim precedence before a vicar-general. No definite provision is made for county officials, but they would seem, under our form of government, to belong ahead of parish rectors, unpossessed of prelatical dignity, who, in general, are content to follow the mayors of cities.

Numerous details and exceptions must

be omitted here, but from what has been said, it may be possible to arrive at some system of placing correctly the Protestant clergy at a reception or other assembly to which Roman clerics are not invited; or, taking the relative importance of the various sects into account, of so distributing the clergy of different denominations who may be present that the party will prove a pleasant one for all concerned. I merely make the suggestions, leaving the working out of any plan to others better equipped for the purpose.

II

With regard to introductions, there is the dictum of the authorities on etiquette that no lady is ever presented to a man, excepting the President of the United States, a reigning sovereign, or a Cardinal. The first two exceptions need not concern us here. The third is of some importance, though many 100% American ladies would doubtless do all in their power to avoid being presented to a Cardinal. They will be horrified to know what Catholic women are expected to do when so presented.

In the first place, owing to the position that the Catholic clergy retain in the mind of their own people in America, a Catholic lay person, male or female, must always be presented to a priest, whatever his rank. A few exceptions based on rules of precedence recognized abroad and favoring lay persons of noble birth or high official standing are inconsequential in this country. It is not uncommon, however, for these ecclesiastics to cede their right to prominent laics, especially at public receptions; hence, priests ordinarily permit themselves to be presented to Governors or even lesser personages, though these happen to be Catholics, and even Bishops occasionally do so. But, to proceed.

The form of introduction to a Cardinal is: "Your Eminence, may I present Mr. Blank?" Thereupon, the person presented is expected "to support lightly with his right hand the Cardinal's extended right hand," make a genuflection (*i.e.*, bend the

right knee as far as the floor), and kiss the episcopal ring on the Cardinal's hand—not the hand itself. He may wait a moment for the Cardinal's blessing, which may or may not be given; he is then free to rise and express his delight in appropriate words, remembering always to say "Your Eminence" instead of "You." If the meeting is perfunctory and others are in line to be presented, he should pass on almost immediately, "making a respectful inclination as he withdraws." When the person doing the presenting has called expressly for the purpose of introducing a stranger, he performs the genuflection and osculation first; by observing him, the person to be introduced can perfect his knowledge of what he is to do.

Should a genuflection for any reason be dangerous or otherwise impracticable, a low bow may be made instead; in that case a blessing is not to be expected. If, by prearrangement, the interview is to be lengthy, the person introduced, having made the genuflection, is to remain standing until the Cardinal himself has taken a seat and indicated that the visitor may be seated also. Toward the end of the interview, he will anticipate the Cardinal's rising; and, upon taking leave, repeat the performance of genuflecting and kissing the ring. It is at the leave-taking that a blessing is ordinarily to be expected; hence, he should guard against rising too abruptly after bending the knee.

The same ceremony is observed for the Apostolic Delegate, who, however, is "Your Excellency"; and for an Archbishop within his ecclesiastical province or a Bishop within his own diocese, excepting that the formula is varied to "Your Grace" or "Your Lordship" respectively. Outside an Archbishop's or Bishop's own territory a low bow is substituted for the genuflection and the kissing of the ring may be omitted; nor does the person presented offer to shake hands unless the prelate, as he may do in deference to the general American custom, extend his hand to a man. He will not do so to a woman.

The etiquette of subsequent meetings with these dignitaries is the same, saving that the layman should wait until, by some exterior sign, he is recognized before rendering the customary homage and not speak until he is spoken to. Similar formalities are observed when calling alone upon them, the sending up of a proper letter of introduction taking, on the occasion of the first call, the place of the spoken introductory formula, and one's card doing the same on subsequent occasions. Incidentally, all such calls should be made by appointment.

Non-Catholics are not expected to perform the actions which signify submission to the spiritual jurisdiction of the ecclesiastic in question; they simply conduct themselves as well-bred people do when introduced to anybody else of importance. Consequently, at least a profound bow is in order. But putting forth the hand to a high Roman Catholic dignitary is not, unless he anticipate the action by extending his. More than likely he will not. The forms "Your Eminence," "Your Excellency," and "Your Grace" are, however, to be used, as occasion requires, regardless of conscientious objections. Some democratically inclined Bishops seem, of late, to favor even Catholics' omitting, in less formal introductions or in mixed gatherings, acts that are on the order of religious ceremonies. Practically all of them in this country have ceased to object to being addressed as "Bishop" (only at the introduction to such Bishops is the surname added) instead of "Your Lordship" or the obsolescent "My Lord." But corresponding familiarities are not, in general, allowed with Archbishops and Cardinals.

Protestant Episcopal Bishops in this country are not lords, and in informal conversation are addressed simply as "Bishop," adding the surname at the introduction; in very formal discourse, as in publicly presenting one of them to an audience, "Right Reverend Father" is pleasing to them, though by no means common. When traveling in England they are customarily

addressed as "My Lord" or "Your Lordship" and thus put on the same footing as the Bishops of the Established Church of that country, who, when sojourning in America, are properly so addressed. Similarly, a visiting Anglican Archbishop is "Your Grace." He is introduced as "The Most Reverend, His Grace, the Archbishop of York." Methodist and other evangelical Bishops are, of course, never introduced or addressed otherwise than as "Bishop," with or without the surname according to circumstances. It goes without saying that Protestant Bishops want no genuflections. But a respectful bow, on occasion, is in order. Most of them shake hands, at least with men.

For Catholic priests, the introductory formula is "Father Blank, may I present Mrs. Dash?" There is no bending of the knee or osculation of the hand (foreign Catholics sometimes attempt the latter), though a discreet bow is permissible and appreciated. A woman never extends her hand; a man may, though politeness suggests that the priest be allowed to make the first move. It is quite possible that he will not, and the omission should not be interpreted as a slight. Promiscuous handshaking, such as is indulged in by many Protestant pastors, is not commonly practised by the Catholic clergy. A priest should also be allowed to start the conversation, throughout which he is addressed as "Father," without the surname. Protestants do not, ordinarily, object to styling the Catholic priest "Father." There are occasional outbursts of protest from Ku Klux evangelists on the ground that the priest, being a bachelor, is not the father of a family, or that it is unscriptural, but these arguments have been overwhelmingly refuted by alert Catholic apologists. It may be remarked, however, that only in America is the custom of referring to the priest as "Father" so widespread. In some countries the title is not used at all, or is reserved to the monastic clergy or otherwise limited. Formerly American priests did not resent being known as

"Mister"; now, except from a hopeless ignoramus, that address is construed as an intentional offense. The High Anglican clergy also like "Father," and it would seem eminently proper to use it whenever it affords satisfaction to the person addressed. Most of the Low Church clergy resent it, particularly in recent years, as a reflection on their Protestantism.

For the abbot of a religious order the introductory formula is varied by using, not the surname, but the so-called "name in religion"—a Christian name assumed when the religious vows are taken; or, more generally, "Father Abbot" without any name. The honorary prelates and other dignitaries having the title of "Monsignor" (literally, "My Lord," now taken as a noun, which may be in apposition or preceded, when used alone, by an article) are introduced as "Monsignor Blank," and thereafter addressed by the title alone. While it seems hardly logical to use this title in the third person, it is done by well-established custom, even in Rome, where Archbishops and Bishops, as well as inferior prelates, are all addressed and referred to as "Monsignor." *Monsignore* is a vocative, incorrectly given in our dictionaries as an alternative spelling, and frequently used in the newspapers. The surname should never be used with this form of the word save in attracting the attention of one particular monsignor in a group of them. To *monseigneur*, the French form, used for all prelates, the rank is sometimes added, e.g., *Monseigneur l'Archevêque*, not the surname. Either of these vocatives is occasionally used alone, in this country, as the formal salutation in a letter, but on general principles it is in rather bad form to use foreign expressions for which accepted English equivalents exist.

Unless a priest has actually obtained the degree, he is never called "Doctor"; this academic title is disregarded if he has some honorary ecclesiastical title; otherwise, he is simply "Father." If "Doctor" is used, the surname is always added. In contrast is the growing custom of styling

nearly all Protestant divines "Doctor," though they may not have received even a high-school education. The latest manual of etiquette distinguishes between ministers who are doctors and those who are not, prescribing "Mister" for the latter; the older ones did not distinguish effectively, and most rural white pastors, as well as most of their colored colleagues, seem to enjoy their courtesy rights. "Brother" in reference to a Protestant pastor was once esteemed a provincialism, though as such, it enjoyed a wide currency; it has gained momentum since the war, and, with the spread of the Kiwanian, Rotarian and Y. M. C. A. idealism, is now accepted, if not encouraged, by more than one evangelical body, perhaps as a desirable offset to the Catholic "Father." It is rather odd that no 100% Protestants have ever raised objection to it on the score that Roman Catholic monks who are not priests have been called "Brother" for centuries. Otherwise, ministers of the Gospel are popularly known in the rural regions as "Reverends." The use of "reverend" as a noun is, of course, in the worst possible taste, but it continues notwithstanding all protest from the pedagogues. Hence, it is not uncommon for a small-town American hostess to say: "Mrs. Black, meet Reverend Blank," and the society columns of bucolic newspapers frequently contain statements such as: "The officiating reverend took dinner with the relatives of the corpse after the funeral." "Reverend," in this sense, has not afflicted the Catholic clergy so far in their relations with their own parishioners, but Jewish rabbis have not altogether escaped. These gentlemen of God are correctly introduced as "Doctor (or Rabbi) Blank." In direct address, "Rabbi" alone is scriptural and permissible.

Canons and deans are fortunately not common in America, and, speaking to or of their own, Roman Catholics seldom use either of the titles. Among Anglicans it is proper to say "Canon" or "Dean," with the surname. The correct employment of

various less common designations for the ministers of some sects—Parson, Elder, Pastor, and the like—can, in general, be determined from the foregoing discussion.

The niceties of correspondence are rather complicated, and, for the Roman Catholic clergy in America, they differ in many respects from the usage in Rome and elsewhere abroad. In writing to a Cardinal, the correct formal salutation is "Your Eminence"; to the Apostolic Delegate at Washington, "Your Excellency"; to some other Archbishop, "Your Grace"; or, from a non-Catholic, "Most Reverend and dear Sir" to any of the three; to a Bishop, "Your Lordship," "My Lord," or "Right Reverend and dear Father (or Sir)" and to a priest, "Reverend and dear Father (or Sir)." Honorary monsignori and abbots are also "Right Reverend." Informally, the Apostolic Delegate might be saluted simply as "Excellency"; a Cardinal, Archbishop, Bishop, monsignor, canon, dean, or doctor is "My dear" or "Dear," depending on acquaintance or the character of the communication, plus the title and surname of the individual, e.g., "Dear Cardinal Blank." For an abbot, the religious name takes the place of the surname: "Dear Father Francis"; or, "Dear Father Abbot," but not "Dear Abbot Francis."

III

In America, unlike in England, the addition of "My" indicates greater familiarity than its omission. Generally speaking, female correspondents should omit the possessive. Writing to his own ordinary, a priest or layman may begin "My dear Bishop (or Archbishop)" without the surname, the pronoun then having reference to the spiritual relation between writer and addressee rather than to personal intimacy. Any dignitary less than a Bishop may be informally saluted as "Dear Father Blank."

Lately, there has appeared a tendency to write "Reverend dear Father," without the conjunction or a comma. These formulæ are used, as circumstances demand,

by the Catholic clergy in communicating with one another. "Your Reverence" has disappeared as an epistolary salutation, and is practically obsolete in personal address except among aged Irish-Americans; even these seldom refer to a priest as "His Reverence" now.

Between "Right Reverend" and the simple "Reverend," custom in America brought in the designation of certain priests (canons, deans, superiors of religious orders who are not abbots, monsignori who are not prelates, and college presidents) as "Very Reverend." (This is observed also by Anglicans for their canons and deans.) As a matter of logic and fact, there is no "very reverend" cleric as distinguished from one who is "right reverend," the "right" in this construction having no reference to the prerogatives of the higher clergy, notwithstanding writers who have maintained the contrary, but being only the adverb synonymous with "very." (Cf. Chaucer's "right fat"; also the colloquial "right smart.") This agrees perfectly with official and social usage in Rome itself, where every Archbishop, Bishop or monsignor is *Reverendissimus* (the superlative), which, however, is construed only as "Right (or Very) Reverend." *Admodum Reverendus* (literally "Quite Reverend"), formerly used more extensively in Latin publications and letters to describe higher ecclesiastics who are not prelates and especially religious superiors who are not abbots, is now confined chiefly to the latter class. The expression, ordinarily translated "Very Reverend," has, in this country, created a distinction for which, if "Right Reverend" be properly understood in English, there exists no plausible basis whatever.

Judging from recent official publications, *Admodum Reverendus* is disappearing from Vatican usage. There is no good reason, therefore, for keeping up "Very Reverend" in this country as something intermediate between "Reverend" and "Right Reverend"; still, it is being done, and there are those who insist that the lower monsignori

(e.g., the papal chamberlains) are *only* "Very Reverend." To settle this dispute, attention is directed to the *Annuario Pontificio*, a directory published by the Vatican Press, wherein the chamberlains, like other monsignori, are *Reverendissimi*; and, since all dignitaries higher than the honorary prelates are the same, other descriptive adjectives are added if further qualification is necessary: e.g., *Eminentissimus ac Reverendissimus* for a Cardinal; *Illustrissimus et Reverendissimus* for a Bishop. British and American usage retains only the last adjective, but translates it by the superlative for Cardinals and Archbishops, and, somewhat illogically, by a comparative for a Bishop!

In Ireland, however, he too is "Most Reverend," and Catholics in Great Britain sometimes follow the Irish custom. All these various adjectival expressions, like the simple "Reverend," should always be preceded by "The." The article is, however, now often omitted on the envelope, even by the highly literate, and the abbreviations, "Rt. Rev.," "Vy. Rev.," as well as "Rev." itself, are so commonly used—probably not to delay postal clerks and carriers by obliging them to read too long addresses—that it is useless longer to protest against them. The practice is encouraged indirectly by the clergy, who, especially those with illegible signatures, have their name with such abbreviations printed on their stationery or typewritten beneath their signatures for the guidance of their correspondents in directing the reply. The correspondent usually takes the hint too literally and abbreviates accordingly.

Certainly for the sake of brevity "His Excellency" or "His Grace," preceding, for example, "The Most Reverend John Blank," are no longer customary on the cover, though they are still used in the superscription of the letter itself to the Apostolic Delegate or to an Archbishop respectively. The word indicating the office of a cleric is never written between the adjectives and a given name; it should, however, precede the surname if his in-

itials or given name are not known: e.g., "The Right Reverend Bishop Blank." (Generally speaking, it would seem more courteous to ascertain the initials or given name before writing.) One exception in favor of Cardinals is that their rank is indicated between the given name and the surname: "His Eminence, James Cardinal Gibbons." In this case, "The Most Reverend" is omitted. Another exception, relatively unimportant in this country, is the superscription for a canon—"The Very Reverend Henry Canon Blank." "Monsignor," being a title not indicative of an office, may precede the name: "The Right Reverend Monsignor John Blank," but is preferably omitted. Incidentally, "Monsignor" is correctly abbreviated "Msgr."—not "Mgr." as American dictionaries have it. In Europe, following Roman custom, the abbreviation is "Mons." "Doctor" is rarely used among Catholics for the superscription; in proper circumstances, it would not be incorrect to write it before the full name. The word "Father" should be omitted in addressing a priest by his full name; hence, never "The Reverend Father John J. Blank." If his given name is unknown, "The Reverend Father Blank" is correct. In some monastic orders the surname is discarded altogether in favor of the religious name. For priests conforming to that practice, it is proper to write, say: "The Reverend Father Francis, O.S.F."

All Catholic Bishops are *ex officio* doctors of divinity, and, with other clergymen who have obtained the degree, add D.D. after their surnames. The initials of other academic titles, if used, follow this; more frequently they are omitted. The word "Doctor" and such initials are, of course, never used in the same superscription. A member of a religious community adds after his name the initials of his order's Latin name (e.g., S.J. for a Jesuit; O.S.B. for a Benedictine), which always precede D.D. if he is also entitled to these.

There are, of course, no Anglican Archbishops resident in this country. For those in England, the envelope is properly ad-

dressed "The Most Reverend, His Grace, The Archbishop of York," followed by the full name; the letter then begins: "My Lord Archbishop, May it please Your Grace . . ."; the superscription for Bishops of the Church of England is "To the Right Reverend, the Lord Bishop of Chester." These are admittedly clumsy formulæ. The formal salutation for an English Bishop (Established Church) is "My Lord"; the informal, "My dear Lord Bishop." Apparently, it would not be amiss to conform to these models in writing to British Roman Catholic Bishops, prescinding from the fact that they are not, as are the Bishops of the Established Church, members of the House of Lords.

IV

Most ecclesiastical authorities agree that the proper superscription for a Protestant Episcopal Bishop in this country is "To the Right Reverend William Blank, Bishop of Wilmington." Whether the episcopal see is always to be mentioned is not certain; Roman Catholics omit this on the envelope, since it sometimes happens that the name of the see does not correspond to that of the city in which the Bishop resides, and there is consequent confusion for the postal clerks. Likewise, "To" is superfluous, and does not seem to be used in practice. "Most Reverend and dear Sir" is accepted both as the formal and informal salutation of an Anglican Archbishop visiting in America; "Your Grace" would, of course, be entirely proper formally. For Protestant Bishops in general, the correct formal salutation is "Right Reverend and dear Sir," excepting a few High Anglicans who prefer "Father." The correct informal form is "My dear Bishop Blank." In other than purely business letters to Bishops and higher dignitaries, it is considered more polite to place the superscription last, at the left hand of the page, in line with the body of the communication. This is sometimes done also in formal social letters to the lesser clergy.

For a Protestant minister the envelope is inscribed "The Reverend John Blank." If his given name is unknown, some authorities recommend "The Reverend . . . Blank" instead of "The Reverend Mr. Blank," but there is little reason in substituting dots or dashes for the abbreviation of the title common courtesy accords to any man. Older manuals prescribed "The Reverend Doctor Blank" in this case. A Protestant clergyman is saluted formally as "Sir" or "My dear Sir"; informally as "Dear Mr. Blank," or "Dear Doctor Blank" if he be entitled to the degree. "Dear Elder" is used, though not always, by Campbellites and Mormons in corresponding with their clergy. Outsiders having occasion to write to ecclesiastics addressed in their own sect by some unusual or distinctive title should conform to the custom of the denomination in question. Lutheran ministers of certain synods, for instance, are called "Pastor"; hence, it is customary for a layman to write "Dear Pastor" (adding the surname for another than his own pastor) in addressing them. "Dear Brother," with or without the surname, is rapidly being adopted in some of the reformed churches; between ministers of the same denomination, "Brother" alone is winning favor. Jewish rabbis are either "Doctor," "Rabbi," or "Reverend," with the full name, on the envelope; the salutation is simply "Dear Sir"; or, informally, "Dear Doctor Blank." "Dear Rabbi" is also used, from laymen and other rabbis alike. Between rabbis themselves, the spread of Rotary notions has, I am informed, introduced "Dear Colleague." It is slightly better than "Dear Brother."

The amenities so far discussed are exchanged between clergymen of the same denomination and also in interdenominational correspondence. "Dearly beloved brother in Christ," "Fellow laborer in the Lord" and the like are not uncommon in the letters of one evangelical divine to another and have been used in letters from such pastors to Catholic priests and rabbis.

The formal closing of a letter is apparently limited only by the ingenuity of the writer and the degree of respect he entertains for the cleric addressed. For a dignitary who has been saluted as "Your Eminence," "Your Excellency," or "Your Grace," the accepted manner is "I have the honor to remain, of Your Eminence (Excellency, Grace), The humble (respectful) servant," which is also appropriate, with proper modification, for a Bishop who has been saluted as "My Lord" or "Your Lordship"; otherwise, "I have the honor to remain, Respectfully yours." "Your Eminence's" and the like, instead of the prepositional phrase, while approved by ecclesiastical authorities on etiquette, are awkward, and not used to any great extent by Catholics, who, however, in writing to their proper Bishop, sometimes close: "Begging (Asking) Your Lordship's blessing, I remain," etc. A rather common, and very good, form is "With every sentiment of esteem and regard, I remain," etc. The informal close is shorter: for a Cardinal, "Of Your Eminence, The humble servant"; for an Archbishop, the same, except "Grace" instead of "Eminence"; for a Bishop, "Sincerely (Faithfully) yours," unless he has been saluted as "Your Lordship," in which case it is correct to write "Of Your Lordship, The servant." All in all, the advance of democracy has appreciably diminished the former taste for "I beg," "humble servant," and similar expressions. Catholic priests writing to their own ordinary sometimes add "in Christ," "*in Christo*," or "*in Domino*" (in the Lord), or, by abbreviation, "in Xt. (*Xto.*, *Dno.*)" after the final adverb or "servant."

For clergymen of all denominations who are not Bishops "Faithfully (Sincerely) yours" is always appropriate, the prefixing of "I beg to remain," "I remain," etc., adding a little to formality. "I am" is, of course, used only on the occasion of the first letter; it is then permissible to close as "Yours respectfully," which, however, is considered a business rather than a social

form. Catholic priests writing to one another, as well as Protestant pastors, frequently use "Fraternally yours." But it smacks of the lodge room, as also does "Cordially yours." "Sincerely your friend and brother" is a contribution from the headquarters of the Latter Day Saints.

Formal letters to Bishops of the Church of England close with the clumsy compliment, "I have honour to remain, Your Lordship's obedient servant"; informal, "I have honour to remain, my dear Lord Bishop, Faithfully yours." Note that "honour" is to be spelled with a *u*. Why the word should be used without an article is not explained. For a Church of England Archbishop the approved closes are: formal, "I remain, my Lord Archbishop, Your Grace's most obedient servant"; informal, "I have honour to remain, my dear Archbishop," plus the signature.

V

Formal communications to the Pope must be in Latin, though French or Italian are, in general, allowed if it is impossible or difficult to put the message into intelligible Latin. To foreign Cardinals Latin is also the usual vehicle of communication, but the diplomatic language, French, is in good taste; then Italian, since that is the native tongue of most of the Cardinals in Rome, and finally, any language with which the Cardinal addressed may be familiar. If this happens to be English, the formulæ given for American Cardinals are in order, though by no means so elaborate as those in vogue abroad. It is safer, if a layman should have occasion to engage in correspondence with His Holiness or members of the Sacred College, to entrust the rather delicate job of composing the communication to some one who can do it properly in the classical Roman style. The closing formulæ are particularly elaborate.

The Protestant clergy seem to be fond of complimentary closes. Many of these are in the nature of scriptural texts or allu-

sions: "Yours in the communication of the Holy Spirit"; "Faithfully yours in the fellowship of Christ"; "Yours, in His Name"; "May the Lord bless thee thrice, and I remain, Yours truly"; "May peace surpassing understanding abide between thee and, Yours truly." Others bear specific reference to the lodge affiliations of the writer and addressee: "Yours in the I. O. O. Fellowship"; "Fellow Klansman, I salute (greet) you, and remain, Yours"; "Fraternally yours, John Blank, 32^o"; "Sincerely yours in the Square and Compass"; "Yours for America and pure womanhood." The favorite phrases, however, are usually of a militant character: "Yours for the smashing of Rome, rum and rebellion"; "Yours in the fight for the right" (this one I have from an African Methodist Bishop serving

a term in a State penitentiary with which I was once connected officially); "Faithfully yours, dearly beloved Bro. in Christ, in the cause of righteousness"; "Unto death in the battle for the Lord"; "Yours in the battle against Sin and Satan"; "Fellow soldier of Christ, Yours in the bonds of brotherhood," and the like. One, the chosen valedictory of a Campbellite divine, "Yours in the dissemination of the Seed," acquired a peculiar appropriateness when it was discovered that the rev. gentleman, a married man, had not yet got over sowing his wild oats. His last public appearance was in a race down a narrow and littered alley one dark night, scantily clad, hotly pursued by an irate disciple of whose hospitality and supposed absence he had taken pastoral advantage.

A RESOLUTE LADY

BY L. M. HUSSEY

WITNESSING Mrs. Borneman's act, Mr. Harlow, in the crude surprise of the moment, called it murder. He was later to regret the error. A less sensitive man would have held obstinately to the first designation, but Mr. Harlow, in accordance with whim and nature, had a love for intelligent precisions of speech. A bit impishly inclined to grin at all faiths, he himself held to the faith that one should describe all phenomena in meaningful terms. Had an apple bounced off his head, as it happened to Newton in the fable, never could he have leaped to his feet with a cry of ecstatic satisfaction: "Ha! Gravitation!" Inevitably Mr. Harlow would have buttonholed himself forthwith, shook a forefinger under his own nose, and inquired: "Now, define the word. Just what do you mean by gravitation?"

On that superb Autumn day he had clambered up the mountainside, through balsamed pine woods and weedy stretches of chestnut forest dead with blight, to an iron observation tower on the summit. There he was alone. Gazing across magnificent reaches of landscape he could see no living person. Under the roof of the large hotel in the valley he knew there were no guests, for the vacation season in these parts was ended. It was now a region pleasantly unpeopled. Indulging a whimsical fancy, it entertained Mr. Harlow momentarily to imagine that a just God had finally put an end to the antics of the human race, and that he alone, of all the simians, remained alive. "But in that case," he told himself, "justice would fall short of completeness. There is no reason for my survival. I am not a Methodist, nor yet a

Baptist. I've no faith in my own peculiar salvation. I should be in limbo with the other animals."

However, a moment later, he smiled. "It's all in accordance with divine practice," he amended. "That would be the way of the good God. In addition to doing justice He indulges His little joke."

Pleased with his understanding of heavenly wont and use, his eyes searched idly once again the undulations of the high hills. And then he saw that gallant lady, Mrs. Borneman, put a quietus to her husband. He saw first the touring-car dart out upon the curve six or seven hundred feet below. Of the two occupants Mrs. Borneman was at once identified by a brilliant checker-board sweater, a garment the gentleman on the tower had observed her to wear before. She sat at the wheel driving, but her husband was not at her side. The top of their touring-car was thrown back, and Mr. Harlow could see the man seated uncompanionably on the rear cushions. This denoted, he told himself immediately, a late row. Unquestionably they had quarreled during the morning, these two. The fact, surmised by deduction, caused him not even a trifling surprise. Although at the moment a widower, he had been in his day a married man, and he understood the manners of wedded life.

There on the tower, for want of another spectacle, he watched Mrs. Borneman drive to that part of the curve where a sharp dip would carry the car to the next lower level. At the summit of this declivity he observed the car to slow and stop somewhat like a complicated beetle groping its way. Pausing before she steered down hill,