

→: Ars :← Quatuor Coronatorum

BEING THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE
QUATUOR CORONATI LODGE NO. 2076, LONDON.



EDITED FOR THE COMMITTEE BY W. J. SONGHURST, P.G.D.,
AND LIONEL VIBERT, P.A.G.D.C.

VOLUME XLII. PART I.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Proceedings, 4th January, 1929	1	In Memoriam—Joseph Walter Hobbs	69
Exhibits	3	A Masonic Pilgrimage through London	70
Provincial Warrants—Part II.	4	Reviews	115
Gild of Masons at Lincoln	64	Notes and Queries	130
Proceedings, 1st March, 1929	68	Obituary	135

W. J. PARRETT, LTD., PRINTERS, MARGATE.

1930

THE QUATUOR CORONATI LODGE No. 2076, LONDON,

was warranted on the 28th November, 1884, in order

- 1.—To provide a centre and bond of union for Masonic Students.
- 2.—To attract intelligent Masons to its meetings, in order to imbue them with a love for Masonic research.
- 3.—To submit the discoveries or conclusions of students to the judgment and criticism of their fellows by means of papers read in Lodge.
- 4.—To submit these communications and the discussions arising therefrom to the general body of the Craft by publishing, at proper intervals, the Transactions of the Lodge in their entirety.
- 5.—To tabulate concisely, in the printed Transactions of the Lodge, the progress of the Craft throughout the World.
- 6.—To make the English-speaking Craft acquainted with the progress of Masonic study abroad, by translations (in whole or part) of foreign works.
- 7.—To reprint scarce and valuable works on Freemasonry, and to publish Manuscripts, &c.
- 8.—To form a Masonic Library and Museum.
- 9.—To acquire permanent London premises, and open a reading-room for the members.

The membership is limited to forty, in order to prevent the Lodge from becoming unwieldy.

No members are admitted without a high literary, artistic, or scientific qualification.

The annual subscription is one guinea, and the fees for initiation and joining are twenty guineas and five guineas respectively.

The funds are wholly devoted to Lodge and literary purposes, and no portion is spent in refreshment. The members usually dine together after the meetings, but at their own individual cost. Visitors, who are cordially welcome, enjoy the option of partaking—on the same terms—of a meal at the common table.

The stated meetings are the first Friday in January, March, May, and October, St. John's Day (in Harvest), and the 8th November (Feast of the Quatuor Coronati).

At every meeting an original paper is read, which is followed by a discussion.

The *Transactions* of the Lodge, *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, are published towards the end of April, July, and December in each year. They contain a summary of the business of the Lodge, the full text of the papers read in Lodge together with the discussions, many essays communicated by the brethren but for which no time can be found at the meetings, biographies, historical notes, reviews of Masonic publications, notes and queries, obituary, and other matter. They are profusely illustrated and handsomely printed.

The Antiquarian Reprints of the Lodge, *Quatuor Coronatorum Antigrapha*, appear at undefined intervals, and consist of facsimiles of documents of Masonic interest with commentaries or introductions by brothers well informed on the subjects treated of.

The Library has now been arranged at No. 27, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, where Members of both Circles may consult the books on application to the Secretary.

To the Lodge is attached an outer or

CORRESPONDENCE CIRCLE.

This was inaugurated in January, 1887, and now numbers about 3500 members, comprising many of the distinguished brethren of the Craft, such as Masonic Students and Writers, Grand Masters, Grand Secretaries, &c. nearly 300 Grand Lodges, Supreme Councils, Private Lodges, Libraries and other corporate bodies.

The members of our Correspondence Circle are placed on the following footing:—

1.—The summonses convoking the meeting are posted to them regularly. They are entitled to attend all the meetings of the Lodge whenever convenient to themselves, but, unlike the members of the Inner Circle, their attendance is not even morally obligatory. When present they are entitled to take part in the discussions on the papers read before the Lodge, and to introduce their personal friends. They are not visitors at our Lodge meetings, but rather associates of the Lodge.

2.—The printed *Transactions* of the Lodge are posted to them as issued.

3.—They are, equally with the full members, entitled to subscribe for the other publications of the Lodge, such as those mentioned under No. 7 above.

4.—Papers from Correspondence Members are gratefully accepted, and as far as possible, recorded in the *Transactions*.

5.—They are accorded free admittance to our Library and Reading Rooms.

A Candidate for Membership in the Correspondence Circle is subject to no literary, artistic, or scientific qualification. His election takes place at the Lodge-meeting following the receipt of his application.

Brethren elected to the Correspondence Circle pay a joining fee of twenty-one shillings, which includes the subscription to the following 30th November.

The annual subscription is only half-a-guinea (10s. 6d.), and is renewable each December for the following year. Brethren joining us late in the year suffer no disadvantage, as they receive all the *Transactions* previously issued in the same year.

It will thus be seen that for only half the annual subscription, the members of the Correspondence Circle enjoy all the advantages of the full members, except the right of voting in Lodge matters and holding office.

Members of both Circles are requested to favour the Secretary with communications to be read in Lodge and subsequently printed. Members of foreign jurisdictions will, we trust, keep us posted from time to time in the current Masonic history of their districts. Foreign members can render still further assistance by furnishing us at intervals with the names of new Masonic Works published abroad, together with any printed reviews of such publications.

Members should also bear in mind that every additional member increases our power of doing good by publishing matter of interest to them. Those, therefore, who have already experienced the advantage of association with us, are urged to advocate our cause to their personal friends, and to induce them to join us. Were each member annually to send us one new member, we should soon be in a position to offer them many more advantages than we already provide. Those who can help us in no other way, can do so in this.

Every Master Mason in good standing throughout the Universe, and all Lodges, Chapters, and Masonic Libraries or other corporate bodies are eligible as Members of the Correspondence Circle.

Two Grand Lodges, Three Lodges. One Lodge of Instruction, One Society and Fifty-eight Brethren were admitted to membership of the Correspondence Circle.

The report of the Audit Committee:—

PERMANENT AND AUDIT COMMITTEE.

The Committee met at the Offices, No. 27, Great Queen Street, London, on Friday, 4th January, 1929.

Present:—Bro. Rev. H. Poole, in the Chair, with Bro. Sir Alfred Robbins, Rev. W. W. Covey-Crump, Gilbert W. Daynes, Gordon P. G. Hills, George Norman, W. J. Songhurst, W. J. Williams, T. M. Carter, Lionel Vibert, Secretary, and R. H. McLeod, Auditor.

The Secretary produced his Books, and the Treasurer's Accounts and Vouchers, which had been examined by the Auditor and certified as being correct.

The Committee agreed upon the following

REPORT FOR THE YEAR 1928.

BRETHREN.

It is with deep regret that we report the death on 26th October of Bro. Edmund Hunt Dring, Past Grand Deacon, whose eminent services to the Lodge are recorded in the *Transactions*. Another cause for sincere regret is the withdrawal of Bro. William John Songhurst, Past Grand Deacon, from the Secretaryship of the Lodge, after a devoted service of over twenty-two years. In the course of this he has given invaluable aid and the Committee are glad to know that this, in various capacities, will be continued to the Lodge. He is succeeded in the Secretaryship by Bro. Lionel Vibert, P.M., A.G.D.C., to whom a cordial welcome is extended. The total membership of the Lodge is now 24.

We are pleased to be able to state that the membership of the Correspondence Circle shows a net increase of 176. On the 30th November, 1927, we had a total of 3,129, and 434 names were added during the year; on the other hand, 258 were removed from the list, 92 by resignation, 58 by death, and 108 for non-payment of dues. Thus the total number carried forward is 3,305. We must again urge all Brethren to assist us by introducing new members. It is absolutely essential that our total number should reach 4,000 in order that the income may be sufficient to cover the annual expenditure. The Committee observe with regret that subscriptions amounting to over £400 are still owing. During the year under review the whole of Volume xxxix. was issued, together with one part of Volume xl., of which a second part is now in the post. It is estimated that the cost of printing the remainder of Volume xl. (1927) and the whole of Volume xli. (1928) will be £1,500.

In February the Master made a special appeal for funds in order to bring the publication of our *Transactions* up to date. It is gratifying to be able to report that the Publication Fund thus formed has already resulted in over £800 being received from members of the Lodge and the Correspondence Circle. The Audit Committee would wish to express their sincere appreciation of the efforts made by Bro. George Norman, I.P.M., in inaugurating this most useful Fund. The Fund has not been closed and the Committee hope that Brethren will continue to support it, and so enable us completely to carry out the purpose for which it was formed.

We desire to convey the thanks of the Lodge to our Local Secretaries, who continue to do much good work. A vacancy has been caused by the retirement of Bro. C. F. Hooper after 20 years' service in Bengal. Bro. E. Baker has kindly undertaken the work in Singapore, in succession to Bro. Fredk. Apps, who also has returned to England after long service. The vacancy caused in Somerset and Wiltshire by Bro. Vibert's removal to London has been filled by the appointment of

Ars Quatuor Coronatorum,
BEING THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE
Quatuor Coronati Lodge of A.F. & A.M., London,
No. 2076.

VOLUME XLII.

FRIDAY, 4th JANUARY, 1929.



HE Lodge met at Freemasons' Hall, at 5 p.m. Present:—Bros. Rev. H. Poole, B.A., P.Pr.G.Ch., Westmorland and Cumberland, W.M.; George Norman, P.A.G.D.C., I.P.M.; Rev. W. W. Covey-Crump, P.M., as S.W.; Gilbert W. Daynes, J.W.; Lionel Vibert, A.G.D.C., P.M., Secretary; Gordon P. G. Hills, P.A.G.Sup.W., P.M., D.C.; W. J. Williams, J.D., as S.D.; W. J. Songhurst, P.G.D., Almoner; Thos. M. Carter, P.Pr.G.St.B., Bristol, I.G.; and J. Heron Lepper, P.G.D., Ireland, P.M.

Also the following Members of the Correspondence Circle:—Bros. F. C. Stoate, A. L. Gladstone, Jas. F. Andrew, Arthur Heiron, Geo. Simpson, Ivor Grantham, Jas. Johnmann, F. J. Asbury, P.A.G.D.C., Robt. Colsell, P.A.G.D.C., S. W. Perfect, A. G. Harper, Jas. Wallis, Augustus Smith, A. E. Gurney, G. Trevelyan Lee, H. E. McMeel, S. Hazeldine, A. W. Caddy, H. W. Chetwin, F. L. Coldwell-Smith, R. A. Hill, P. A. Wilson, L. G. Wearing, Wallace Heaton, H. F. Mawbey, W. Davison, Richard Faull, P.A.G.D.C., E. Eyles, C. Armstrong Austin, F. W. Davy, A.G.Reg., Albert D. Bowl, Wm. Lewis, S. W. Rodgers, P.A.G.Reg., Ernest Warren, W. Brinkworth, J. F. H. Gilbard, F. Houghton, R. H. Clerke, H. Johnson, R. J. Sadlier, and C. A. Newman.

Also the following Visitors:—Bros. A. E. Jackson, Enock Lodge No. 11; Wm. Hodgetts, W.M., Wilson-Iles Lodge No. 2054; Charles G. Morin, P.M., Manhera Lodge No. 136 (N.Z.C.); J. S. Machin, P.M., St. Andrews Lodge No. 231; and H. E. Eden, Meridan Lodge No. 4106.

Letters of apology for non-attendance were reported from Bro. Sir Alfred Robbins, P.G.W., Pres.B.G.P., P.M.; John Stokes, P.G.D., P.G.D., Pr.A.G.M., West Yorks. P.M.; J. T. Thorp, P.G.D., P.M.; Wm. Watson, P.A.G.D.C.; R. H. Baxter, P.A.G.D.C., P.M.; J. Walter Hobbs, P.A.G.D.C., S.D.; Ed. Armitage, P.G.D., Treasurer; S. T. Klein, L.R., P.M.; H. C. de Lafontaine, P.G.D., S.W.; Cecil Powell, P.G.D., P.M.; and F. J. W. Crowe, P.A.G.D.C., P.M.

Bro. H. Hiram Hallett, of Taunton. Bro. Cornwell Smith, who has rendered excellent service in Newcastle-upon-Tyne for 16 years, has resigned, but arrangements are now being made for a Brother to take his place. Bro. P. C. Balcon has kindly undertaken to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Bro. B. Silverston, in Warwickshire.

For the Committee,

H. POOLE,

in the Chair.

GENERAL CASH ACCOUNT, 1928.

Receipts.				Expenditure.			
		£	s. d.			£	s. d.
To Cash Balance	...	130	2 0	By Lodge	...	35	19 1
„ Lodge	...	28	7 0	„ Salaries, Rent, Rates and	...		
„ Joining Fees	...	225	15 0	„ Taxes	...	727	9 3
„ Subscriptions, 1928	...	1122	8 8	„ Lighting, Heating, Cleaning,	...		
do. 1927	...	127	14 7	„ Insurance, Telephone,	...		
do. 1926	...	49	9 6	„ Carriage and Sundries	...	152	12 3
„ Back Subscriptions	...	12	11 0	„ Printing, Stationery, etc.	...	1588	4 3
„ Life do.	...	195	6 0	„ Medals	...	9	13 6
„ Payments received in				„ Binding	...	44	16 6
Advance	...	177	16 8	„ Sundry Publications	...	43	10 1
„ Medals	...	12	4 6	„ Summer Outing	...	381	17 4
„ Binding	...	59	13 6	„ Library	...	24	0 0
„ Sundry Publications	...	71	8 11	„ Repairs (27, Great Queen	...		
„ Summer Outing	...	362	16 0	Street)	...	61	15 0
„ Interest and Discounts	...	63	7 2	„ Postage	...	258	1 11
„ Publication Fund	...	801	8 1	„ Local Secretaries' Expenses	...	4	8 10
				„ Cash Balance	...	108	0 7
		<u>£3440</u>	<u>8 7</u>			<u>£3440</u>	<u>8 7</u>

The SECRETARY drew attention to the following

EXHIBIT :—

By Bro. E. HOLCOMBE HOWLETT, on behalf of Bro. HOOPER:—

WATCHCOCK, with number 541 and maker's name: Thos. Crump. Liverpool. Elaborately engraved with a number of Masonic emblems. If the number refers to a Lodge, it would be the Royal Cheshire, which was held in the Royal Regiment of Cheshire Militia. (Lane, 1895, p. 232.) But it is more likely to be merely the maker's number for the watch.


A Cordial vote of thanks was passed to Bro. Hooper, who had kindly lent the watch for exhibition.

Bro. T. M. CARTER read the following paper:—

PROVINCIAL WARRANTS (Part II.).

BY BRO. T. M. CARTER, P.Pr.S.G.W., Bristol.

IV.—PROVINCES IN PARTICULAR.



URING the eighteenth century there were no Lodges founded by either Antients or Moderns in Bedfordshire (first Lodge 1841), Buckinghamshire (1851), Huntingdonshire (1823), or Rutland (1869).

It is not without significance that modern organised Masonry was so slow in making its appearance in these Home Counties, as compared with the activity in the Midlands and elsewhere, and gives weight against any contention that the

Fraternity originated in London and spread peripherally.

The phenomena of the growth of modern organised Masonry indicates rather the linking up of units already existing to a newly recognised centre, and a more rapid expansion under the new impetus in those places where there already was some established tradition.

No Provincial Constitutions—(whether Warrants, or Deputations, or Dispensations)—were issued in the following Counties, which may be thus grouped:—

1. Home Counties or neighbouring thereto:
Berkshire, Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, Northamptonshire, Oxfordshire.
2. Welsh Counties:
Anglesey, Cardiganshire, Carmarthenshire, Carnarvonshire, Merionethshire, Monmouthshire, Montgomeryshire, Pembrokeshire.
3. North Border Counties:
Cumberland, Durham, Northumberland, Westmorland.
4. Worcestershire.

On looking through the lists given in Appendix I., one cannot but be impressed by the very large number of Lodges, not only founded, but still surviving in Lancashire and Yorkshire; the survival is a tribute, I think, to the character of the men of those parts, who having put their hands to the plough, do not readily turn back.

Both these Provinces exhibit this characteristic of tenacity and permanency in an undertaking once started; and perhaps it may also be rightly inferred that there existed a tradition of Masonry which gave it a greater stability there than elsewhere, and formed a more fertile soil for the new seed.

These indications of Masonic enthusiasm led me to make some extensive researches into the relationship between the number of Lodges working in a district and the available population that could be expected to support them.

The subject is a difficult one to pursue with any degree of accuracy; there was no Census before 1801, and the estimated figures of Rickman from

1700 onwards do not allow of much dissection; and I do not think any useful purpose is served by detailing the few impressions I was able to get regarding the middle of the century.

But in 1801 we can get accurate and analysed figures from the published Census, and I can present a few interesting approximations based on the calculation of the male population of all the towns and districts in which Lodges were actually working in 1800, and the number of Lodges: and compare this with the proportion of Lodges now working to the male population of the County at the last Census.

I think this is a fairer comparison than comparing the number of Lodges with the total (male) County population in 1801. The Lodge was mainly supported by residents reasonably near—(they always pleaded that convenience when petitioning),—so that it would be unfair to take the total (male) population of the County in 1801; whereas now the Lodges are so distributed all over the areas that the total County figure can reasonably be used.

(It was not practicable to extract the figures for *Adult* males only, from the Census figures of 1801.)

In Lancashire there was in 1800 one Lodge for every 6,000 males; now there is one for 5,000.

The Lodges in 1800 were in twenty towns and districts, but much the greatest number were congregated in Manchester and Liverpool.

In Yorkshire there was one Lodge for every 7,000 males; now one in 10,000. Here again the Lodges in 1800 were in about twenty towns and districts, but they were scattered more evenly among them than in Lancashire.

In Cheshire the proportion then and now is much higher and was largely represented by Lodges in Chester. One in 3,000 in 1800 and the same proportion prevails to-day.

On comparing this area with others, Devonshire is strangely similar with one Lodge to 3,000 then and one to 4,000 now.

Norfolk has the extraordinarily high figure of one Lodge to 1,500 male population in 1801, the Lodges being in Norwich, Yarmouth, Lynn and the Walsingham district (Fakenham); and in Norwich itself the figure is still a little higher, eleven Lodges being in active work there in 1800 with a male population in the City and County of Norwich of something over 15,500, giving a proportion of one to 1,400. To-day the population has much outstripped the Lodges, and there is no more than one Lodge in the County of Norfolk to a male population of 8,000.

Gloucestershire (excluding Bristol, which was by then a separate Province) had in 1801 one Lodge (and there was actually but one in the whole County) to a male population of 6,500, while now it has one to 8,000.

Bristol (with Clifton) had one to 7,000, and has now but one in 8,000.

Impressive, then, as is the survival figure of the Lancashire and Yorkshire Lodges, the actual number of Lodges formed in proportion to available population does not seem to be greatly differing from that of some other parts of the Country.

The Constitutions issued by the Provincial Grand Masters of the remaining Provinces must now be considered in some detail and may most conveniently be arranged as follows:—

1. A large Miscellaneous Class, distinguished (except in the case of Cornwall) by the Constitutions being based on the model of the Grand Lodge Issues, whether Warrants or Deputations.

Of this Class, groups may conveniently be considered territorially:—

Group *a*. Norfolk, Lincolnshire, Suffolk.

Group *b*. Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire.

Group *c*. Warwickshire, Shropshire, Staffordshire, Flintshire, and Denbighshire.

Group *d.* South Wales.

Group *e.* Surrey, Kent, Sussex.

Group *f.* Devonshire, Cornwall, Scilly Isles, and the Channel Islands.

2. The Dunckerley Provinces—with Charters also on G.L. model—Hampshire (and Isle of Wight), Essex, Wiltshire, Dorset, Somerset, Gloucestershire (and Bristol), Herefordshire:

and the three remaining with many characteristic issues differing widely from the G.L. model and among themselves:—

3. Lancashire.

4. Yorkshire.

5. Cheshire.

CLASS 1. GROUP *a.* NORFOLK, LINCOLNSHIRE, SUFFOLK.

Norfolk.

Although Manningham had himself issued to the Friendship Lodge (No. 100 Great Yarmouth) in 1757 one of the earliest Charters of Constitution in Warrant form, the earliest issues by the Provincial Grand Master were in the old form of Deputation.

The first Provincial Grand Master for Norfolk (Edward Bacon) was appointed on 13 Jan. 1759, and he held a meeting of the Provincial Lodge on Sep. 6th of that year, when it was agreed that "Quarterly Communications should be held by rotation at the several Lodges in the City of Norwich according to seniority."

The Warrant of the Lodge constituted at the Duke's Head at Lynn Regis on June 9 1762 was a Grand Lodge issue, signed by Lord Ferrers as Grand Master, John Revis D.G.M., and witnessed by Samuel Spencer G.S. It is preserved in the G.L. Library, but in very bad condition.

But the next Lodge was the Great Lodge, meeting at the Crown Inn at Swaffham, constituted on Dec. 10 1764, and this had a Deputation from Edward Bacon, who issued similar documents to the Royal Edwin at Fakenham 1765, and the Royal Alfred at Diss 1770; the Lodge at the Blue Boar Norwich 1765 (known as the Union Lodge) united in 1819 with the Lodge at the King's Head of 1736 (now No. 52), and the character of its original Constitution is unknown, but very probably it had a similar document to those of the Lodges immediately before and after it.

A full transcription of the Deputation issued to the Great Lodge at Swaffham is given by Bro. Hamon le Strange in his most interesting account of this Lodge in *A.Q.U.*, vol. xx., p. 233.

The document itself has been lost, but a detailed account of the Constitution proceedings and a copy of the Deputation were included in the well kept Minutes of this Lodge, which are now in the possession of the Ceres Lodge No. 2879, at Swaffham.

The Deputation follows the usual form:—

"Edward Bacon P.G.M.

To all and Every our Right Worshipful Worshipful and loving Brethren. We, Edward Bacon, Recorder of the City of Norwich, and one of its Representatives in Parliament, Provincial Grand Master of the Antient and Honorable Society of free and Accepted Masons for the Province of Norfolk and Norwich, send Greeting";

and recites how at the petition of fifteen brethren who are severally named in the document "We do hereby Constitute and Appoint him the said Benjamin Nuthall, for Us and in Our Name to convene our said Brethren who have signed

the said Petition, and in due form to constitute them into a Regular Lodge": and ends:—

"Given at Our House at Westminster under our Hand and Seal of Masonry this tenth day of December A:D:1764 A:L:5764

By the Right Worshipful the Provincial Grand Master's Command
Frs Frank P.L.T."

The initials P.L.T. (probably Provincial Lodge Treasurer) instead of P.G.T. are found on other documents in this Province.

The Deputation issued to the Royal Edwin Lodge at Fakenham, dated 30 Sep. 1765, is now in Grand Lodge, but it is unfortunately in too bad a condition for satisfactory reproduction in facsimile. Its seal has gone, but was evidently fixed to a purple ribbon which is still attached. It appoints Wm. Pue "for Us and in our Name to convene (pursuant of their humble Petition)" certain named brethren (eleven are cited), "and in due form to Constitute them into a regular Lodge," and follows the usual wording of such documents, ending:

"Given at Earlham in the County of this City of Norwich, under &c.

By the Provincial Grand Master's Command

T. Davey P.G.S."

Beneath is given the "Certificate"

"Constituted by the Authority aboves^d
Ye 30th Dec. 5765":

followed by signatures of W. Pue P.L.T.: T. Davey A.P.G.M., and five others.

It is a little difficult to understand why if Wm. Pue the Provincial Treasurer was deputed by the P.G.M. to constitute the Lodge, T. Davey, the Prov.G.Secretary, should style himself A.P.G.M. in the certificate: unless the "A" stands for "Assistant" and not for "Acting."

In that model of Provincial Histories, *Freemasonry in Norfolk*, Bro. Hamon le Strange, p. 152, tells of a Copy of Anderson's Constitutions, printed in 1756, which was in the possession of Bro. Chetwood Crawley, on the fly leaf of which is written:—"This was the Constitution Book belonging to the Royal Edwin Lodge, Fakenham, Thetford": while an inset paper in the book notes:—"Royal Edwin Lodge No. 226 held at the Red Lyon Fakenham Norfolk, by virtue of a Dispensation from Edward Bacon Esq^r. P.G.M. May 14th 1765. Constituted at do. Dec. 30 1765."

Some correspondence antecedent to the Constitution of the Royal Alfred Lodge at Diss has already been quoted. Bro. le Strange's description of the document, which is now preserved at Norwich, is as follows:—"It is on vellum, signed by the P.G.M. Edward Bacon, and in the form of a deputation to Thomas Marks, of Norwich, directing him to convene the petitioners residing in Diss and constitute them into a regular Lodge. The wording is almost identical with that of the Constitution of the Royal Edwin Lodge in 1765. It is dated at Earlham on the 26th day of June 1770, and countersigned by Thomas Davey P.G.S. It is interesting to find that it still bears, pendent from the top corner by a red ribbon, a piece of blue cardboard on which is the seal in red wax of the Moderns as used by them prior to 1813—the very seal and "ribband" sent down by the Grand Secretary to be attached to the document in 1770. At the foot of the Deputation is written the certificate by Thomas Marks, stating that he had duly convened the brethren on the 26th July, at the house of James Simpson, the "King's Head" at Diss, and had constituted them into a Lodge in due form, as well as installed Bro. John Worth as their Master.

With the Account of the Provincial Quarterly Communication 12 Oct. 1770, Norwich, sent to the G.S. by Thomas Davey P.G.S., there are included items:—

For the Diss Constitution	£3	0	0
For New Plate (Diss Lodge)		2	6
The Grand Secretary is requested to accept to drink Success to the Diss Lodge		5	0

and with this Account the P.G.S. included some queries about the "cloathing" of Grand Officers at the Constitution of a Lodge when, if in London, "the fine for their Constitution is but forty shillings":—

"Query, then, if the Diss Lodge should have paid more, as they cloathed in G. Cloathing the officiating G. Officers & gave up the said cloathing w^{ch} was delivered in at this communication?"

The G. Sec. replied on 26 Oct. 1770:—

"It was some years ago customary for the G.O.'s to attend at the constitⁿ. of every Lodge and to be properly cloathed & entertained in which case 2 guineas were paid to the fund of Charity, but the matter being found inconvenient on acc^t. of the great expences attending it, was in a great measure dropped, and an order made in G.L. that on Constituting a new L. in London by the G.M.'s Warrant and without the attendance of the G.O.'s the sum of Four guineas should be paid to the Fund of Ch^{ty}., and this last is the general method at present. The Country Lodges always paid 2 guineas to the Charity, the additional guinea (for three guineas is always to be remitted) is allowed for the registering the new L., as appears by the printed regⁿ., inclosed. The L. at Diss therefore ought to remit three guineas instead of 3 pounds."

Not an unbusinesslike reply after the present of 5/- for a drink!

Twenty-two years passed before another Lodge, either of Moderns or Antients, was founded in Norfolk, and meanwhile Edward Bacon had passed, and Sir Edward Astley had in 1785 become P.G.M. with Robert Partridge as D.P.G.M., who continued to hold that position until 1817.

A Warrant was then issued to a Lodge which was to meet at the Little White Swan, St. Peter Mancroft, Norwich, and was "Given at Melton Constable under our Hand and Seal of Masonry this 28th of July A.D. 1792. A.L. 5792."

This Lodge now exists as No. 284 Shakespeare Lodge at Warwick, and has had a very interesting career, accounts of which have been published in the *History of Freemasonry in Norfolk*, in Bro. Tibbits' *History of 284 Shakespeare Lodge, Warwick*, and in Gould's *Military Lodges*.

The Warrant is still carefully preserved at Warwick and wisely kept shielded from sunlight.

The wording closely follows in full the G.L. model; it is engrossed on vellum, and bears the signature of the P.G.M., Edward Astley, at the top left-hand corner, with the seal of G.L. London, and is signed at the foot on the right Robert Partridge D.P.G.M.: Thos. Marks P.S.G.W., and James Buttivant P.J.G.W.: while to the left are the words "Witness Jas. Buttivant Jun^r. P.G.S."

It is very noticeable that the handwriting of the whole document and the word "Witness" and the signature "Jas. Buttivant Jun^r." are identical. It is scarcely credible that any engrosser in London would have engrossed the name of the Witness to the document; and it is, moreover, quite clear from comparison with the handwriting of James Buttivant, Jun^r., in the many letters that exist in the correspondence portfolios in the G.L. Library that this whole Warrant is in his handwriting.

Bro. Hamon le Strange, commenting on this issue (p. 172), says: "The Warrant, though issued by the Provincial Grand Master was drawn up in London, and not in Norwich, like the Warrant of the Royal Alfred Lodge, Diss.

It also accounts for the wording being identical with that of documents issued by the Grand Master."

Bro. le Strange based this view on a letter from James Buttivant, Junr., to the Grand Secretary, dated Norwich, 2 Aug 1792, acknowledging the receipt of the Constitution.

This hardly seems sufficient to rebut the evidence of the similarity of handwriting, particularly when we look at the actual terms of the letter:—

D^r. S^r.

I have duly rec'd the Constitution with the seal of the Grand Lodge annex'd to it, & which is in course deliver'd to the Petitioner, who will sit under the same at ye Little White Swan, S^t. Peter's Mancroft Norwich on the First Monday in the month: You will be so kind to inform me in course the number. Mr. W. White my Bro in Law & Bearer hereof will pay to you Five guineas.

I remain, with fraternal regards

Dear Sir

Your obed^t. serv^t. & Bro.

Jas. Buttivant junr.

Norwich. Aug. 2 1792.

Endorsed.

Received from Mr. White of Norwich
£5. 5 for the Constⁿ. of the Lodge.

We have already seen that at that time Lodges paid to Grand Lodge "Two guineas for Each of the Funds (Charity & Hall Fund) and one guinea for registering." while a further half-guinea was required when the Constitution was written for them. That half-guinea is not charged here.

It is not at all improbable that by that date the G. Secretary frequently sent the form of words used for Warrants to any P.G.S. requiring them; and it is not unlikely that having been engrossed at Norwich the document was sent to Grand Lodge for approval and for affixing the seal: this would have been quite in keeping with the words of Buttivant's acknowledgment. It is a little strange, however, in that case, that the number was not also affixed: but new Lodges were coming in thickly just then, and some delay often occurred before the correct sequence could be decided and a number allotted.

The evidence of the Lodge of Unity, Yarmouth, 7 Oct. 1793, the Theatrical Lodge 1797, and the Lodge of Attention, Lynn, 1798, were constituted by the P.G.M. is solely from the entry in the memorandum register of the G. Sec^y.; none of the documents has survived.

In 1796 another Lodge—the Strict Benevolence, at Lynn—was constituted by Sir Edw^d. Astley: dated at Melton Constable 14 April 1796. It is now in the Grand Lodge Library.

It is signed by James Buttivant as P.G.S., and the handwriting of the document and of Buttivant are again identical.

Strangely, and for no obvious reason at so late a date, the form reverts to the Deputation (it is the last extant of this class of Constitution), and carries the usual certificate from Thomas Marks that the Lodge was constituted: but no mention is made of the W.M. or officers appointed.

The document is unusually small, 11ins. by 9ins., engrossed on vellum, and bears the Seal of the Provincial Grand Lodge of Norfolk and not the G.L. Seal.

An interesting endorsement appears on the back, signed by Wm. White G.Sec., and with G.L. Seal attached transferring the Lodge to Wisbech, Cambridge, and dated 7 Nov. 1807, the actual removal having taken place two years before.

In 1797 the P.G.M. constituted the United Friends Lodge, Yarmouth (now No. 313), still meeting there under authority of the Warrant then issued.

The document is engrossed on parchment and was evidently locally produced; it appears to be wholly written by the new Prov.G.Sec^y., James Boyce, and the skeleton line rulings are still plainly seen; the wording has become in

places badly faded and defaced and difficult to decipher. but it is clearly in the common form of a G.L. Warrant, and all names of persons and places in the body of the Warrant are filled in by the engrosser, and not left blank.

The signature of the Provincial Grand Master is unusually placed in the wide left-hand margin, about a third of the distance from the top, and not at top left-hand corner, the number 564 being engrossed near to that position.

Although this class of expert penmanship was very common at that period, I think there can be no doubt as to the writing being that of James Boyce, the fine down stroke ending in a very short heavier portion being plainly characteristic.

There is no seal, though just below the P.G.M.'s signature are marks where one has been or was intended to be, and this would better fit the G.L. Seal usually attached than the larger oval impression of the Provincial Grand Lodge of Norfolk.

Though not an issue to a New Lodge, the Warrant of Confirmation issued to the Social Lodge, Norwich (93), dated 2 Aug. 1797, is of interest, as a document emanating from the Provincial Grand Master.

It reads:—

Edward Astley P.G.M. No. 120.



To All and Every our Right Worshipful
Worshipful and Loving Brethren We Edward
Astley, Baronet Provincial Grand Master of the
Ancient and Honorable Society of Free and Accepted
Masons send Greeting

We do hereby certify that the Lodge late
No. 135 now 120 formerly held at the Fountain
in the Parish of Saint Stephen in the City of
Norwich, but removed by Order of our Provincial Grand Lodge,
dated the seventh day of October A.L. 5790 to the Wounded Heart
in the Parish of Saint Peter of Mancroft in the said City, where the
same is now held, was duly Constituted by a Warrant bearing date
the sixteenth day of September A.L. 5755 A.D. 1755. But such
Warrant of Constitution having been mislaid we do hereby give and
grant full power and authority to the members of the said Lodge
to sit and act as a regular Lodge of Masons till such Warrant
shall be found. Provided that the Brethren of the said Lodge
shall do and observe, perform and keep all and every the Rules,
Orders and Regulations contained in the Book of Constitutions (Except
such as have been or may be repealed) together with all such other
Rules, Regulations, and Instructions as shall from Time to Time be
transmitted by us or Robert Partridge Esquire our Deputy, or by
any of our Successors, Provincial Grand Masters, or their Deputy for
the time being.

Given under our Hand and Seal of Masonry this second day of
August A.D. 1797. A.L. 5797.

By Command of the Provincial Grand Master

Jas. Boyce. P.G. Secy.

The statement here made that the Social Lodge was "Constituted by a Warrant" is interesting, but cannot be accepted as evidence that the new "Manningham" Charter had been issued to it: while the statement that the removal from the Fountain to the Wounded Heart was by order of "Our Provincial Grand Lodge" is also notable, and much more in keeping with the phraseology of the Antients than the Moderns.

Lincolnshire.

Two Lodges only are known to have been constituted by the P.G.M. of Lincolnshire, and both of these in the last decade of the century.

The Urania of Glanford Brigg, is stated in the G. Secy.'s register to have been constituted by the P.G.M. the Rev. Mr. Peters on 20 Oct. 1792, but though the Warrant (having served as authority for the St. James' Lodge at Louth, and the Apollo, Grimsby), was returned to Grand Lodge by its W.M., the celebrated Dr. Geo. Oliver, in 1834, no trace of it is now to be found. The form of the document cannot, therefore, be stated.

The Witham Lodge received its Warrant from the Rev. William Peters P.G.M.:—

“Given at London under Our Hand and Seal of Masonry this 23rd day of September A.L. 5793. A.D. 1793

By the Provincial Grand Master's Command

Matthew Barnett. D.P.G.M.

Witness. W^m. Benton P.G.S.”

and bears the Seal of Grand Lodge and the No. 530.

It is in full Warrant form, following the G.L. model in every particular except that the phrase “to take especial care that all and every the said Brethren are or have been regularly made Masons” is placed further down in the wording of the Warrant, and linked with the injunction to “observe perform and keep all the Rules & Orders”—a sequence observed in the majority of later Warrants wherever issued, and that the qualification as to Rules and Regulations being repealed at Quarterly Communications and other Rules, &c., being sent by the G.M. or Deputy or Successors, is omitted as also usually occurs in late issues.

No later Lodges were constituted in Lincolnshire during the century.

Suffolk.

The first Provincial Grand Master, Rowland Holt (1771-1788), was also Deputy Grand Master in the Grand Lodge of England over practically the same period.

On 23 Sep. 1785 he constituted the Lodge of Perfect Friendship to meet at the Green Man Ipswich, on the petition of John Conder, Mark Willoughy, and Wm. Fenton.

This Lodge united with the St. Luke's Lodge on June 14 1820 and is now No. 225.

The St. Luke's Lodge had, since 1805, been working as a civil Lodge at Ipswich, coming from Colchester at first as a Military Lodge under the Antients regime, and still works under their Warrant dated 20 Oct. 1803.

Then known as the Knights of Malta Lodge in the Second Regiment of Royal Lancashire Fusiliers, it had acquired a vacant number from an erased Antients Lodge at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, whose Warrant dated from 1 Nov. 1763, and the next year (1804) it united with another Antients Military Lodge at Portsmouth in the 2nd Battalion of the Eighty-fifth Regiment, said to have been founded on 27 Sep. 1797 by a Warrant issued to the Fifty-second Regiment of Foot.

I have been unable to obtain any information respecting the original document issued to the Lodge of Perfect Friendship, and presume that it has not been preserved; the fact that it was a Provincial issue being based upon the entry in the Grand Secy.'s register.

This register also states that the Lodge of Prudence was constituted by the P.G.M., Wm. Middleton, at the Three Tuns Halesworth on 23 Jan. 1792, but no other record of this is known to me.

The Patent to Wm. Middleton of Crowfield Hall, Esquire, M.P. for Ipswich, is entered as bearing date 20 Aug. 1788.

This would account for the absence of any reference to Constitution by the Provincial Authorities in the entry of the Philanthropic Lodge at Melford, which was constituted Aug 1 1788, since Rowland Holt had died two years before,

but there is an omission to mention the fact of Provincial Constitution with regard to the Apollo Lodge at Beccles (544).

This Lodge, still working there as No. 305, has a most interesting Constitution, dated 22 July 1794.

It is in Deputation form and appoints "Thomas Marks of the City of Norwich" to convene the petitioning brethren and constitute them into a regular Lodge: it is signed by William Middleton, Prov. Grand Master, and bears a seal after his signature, but not the seal of Grand Lodge. A detailed certificate follows telling of the name and number of the Lodge and the appointment of Officers. This Thomas Marks is cited in the "Shakespear" Warrant of 1792 as the P.S.G.W. of Norfolk, and in 1796 was deputed to convene and constitute the Lodge of Strict Benevolence at Lynn: it would be interesting to know why the P.G.M. of Suffolk imported him from the neighbouring Province to constitute this Lodge in 1794.

The engrossing is somewhat poor in quality of penmanship, as though done by an amateur, and the certificate appended is written throughout by the same hand.

The signature of Tho^s. Marks may be the especially careful writing of the same penman, though this, I think, is doubtful: possibly the document was prepared by the Secretary of the Province, and after the Constitution the later addition made by him for the Consecrating officer's signature.

The whole document is as follows:—

To All and Every our Right Worshipful Worshipful and Loving Brethren, We, William Middleton of Crowfield Hall, in the County of Suffolk, Esquire, Provincial Grand Master of the Ancient and Honourable Society of free and accepted Masons for the said County of Suffolk send Greeting.

Know ye that we of our great Trust and Confidence reposed in our Right Worshipful and well-beloved Brother Thomas Marks of the City of Norwich Esquire at the humble petition of several Brethren residing in or near Beccles in the said County of Suffolk Do hereby constitute and appoint him the said Thomas Marks for us and in our names to Convene our said Brethren who have signed the said Petition and in due form to constitute them into a regular Lodge of free and accepted Masons, he the said Thomas Marks taking especial care that all and every the said Brethren have been regularly made Masons and that they do observe perform and keep all and every the Rules Orders and Regulations contained in the Book of Constitutions (except such as have been or may be repealed or altered at any Quarterly Communication or other general Meeting duly authorized) also with all such other Rules, Orders, Regulations and Instructions as shall from time to time be transmitted by or through Us from His Royal Highness George Prince of Wales, the present Right Worshipful Grand Master or by any of His successors Grand Masters for the Time being, Hereby willing and requiring You the said Thomas Marks as soon as conveniently may be to send us an Account in Writing of what you shall do by virtue of these Presents. Given under our Hand and Seal the 22nd Day of July A.D. 1794. A.L. 5794

William Middleton
Prov. Grand Master

Seal

By Virtue of the above Constitution I convened the Brethren in and near Beccles in the County of Suffolk on Tuesday the 29th Day of July at the House of Lydia Ward Widow known by the Name or Sign of the King's Head in Beccles aforesaid, and having taken especial care that all and every the Brethren were regular Masons I constituted them into a regular Lodge in due Form, by the name of the Apollo

Lodge No. 544 and they chose Robert Davey, Gentleman their Master which choice I confirmed and installed him in due Form, and he entered immediately upon the execution of his Office and chose his Wardens and other Officers out of the Fellow Crafts and Master Masons of the same Lodge, and I approved of them and installed them in due Form in their proper Places, as Witness my Hand this 29th Day of July A.D. 1794. A.L. 5794

Tho^s. Marks.

GROUP *b*. LEICESTERSHIRE, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE,
DERBYSHIRE.

These three Counties were grouped under the Provincial Grand Mastership of Thomas Boothby Parkyns by patent issued by the Duke of Cumberland, dated 25 Mar. 1789.

Under his regime one Lodge was constituted in Leicester, the St. John's Lodge, then numbered 562, still working under the number 279 (31 Aug. 1790), and two in Nottinghamshire, the Corinthian at Newark, numbered 561 (5 June 1790) and the North Nottinghamshire Lodge at Retford No. 587 (21 Mar. 1792)—both of which have been erased.

On June 21 1792, a Patent was issued to Sir John Borlase Warren appointing him P.G.M. for Derbyshire, and under his rule the Scarsdale Lodge was constituted at Chesterfield on 5 Mar. 1793; erased in 1838.

The Warrants of all these have been lost, and the only evidence that they were Provincial issues is that they are cited in the G. Secy.'s register as having been constituted by the P.G.M.

The St. John's Lodge No. 279 works under a Warrant of Confirmation issued in 1820 by the Duke of Sussex, G.M.

GROUP *c*. WARWICKSHIRE, SHROPSHIRE, STAFFORDSHIRE,
FLINTSHIRE AND DENBIGHSHIRE.

Warwickshire.

Two Lodges only were established by the Provincial Grand Master, Thomas Thompson, whose Patent only dated from 2 May 1792, and both these were daughter Lodges of St. John's Lodge, Henley-in-Arden, which was constituted in 1791. There were no other Lodges established in the County until the Union.

Both these Warrants are extant. That of the Shakespeare Lodge of Stratford-on-Avon No. 516 (constituted 1 Feb. 1793) is now in the possession of the Shakespeare Lodge No. 284 at Warwick (see Norfolk); and that of the Apollo Lodge No. 301 (constituted 23 April 1794) is still imparting its authority to the Lodge at Alcester.

They are both in full Warrant form, closely following the wording of the Grand Lodge model, engrossed on vellum, and bear the Seal of Grand Lodge and the number assigned to the Lodge.

Blanks had been left in the engrossing for the name of the Deputy Provincial Grand Master—Brother Timmins—to be inserted, and also for the dates, and autograph signatures are added, of Thomas Thompson P.G.M. at the top left-hand corner, James Timmins at bottom right, and the Witness James Sketchley P.G.S. bottom left.

The title letters P.G.M.: D.P.G.M.: and P.G.S., and the word "Witness" are engrossed.

All these details are common form where the document was prepared in London and sent down for signature, but there is an interesting error in the Shakespeare Warrant where the word "Commons" appears instead of "Commands": "By the Provincial Grand Master's Commons." It certainly suggests the idea that the engrosser was having his copy dictated to him.

A similar "auditory error" occurs in a Warrant issued on Nov. 29 1769 to the Lodge of Sincerity (now No. 224 Stonehouse, Devon) from Grand Lodge, which closes with the words "by virtue of these *Presence*," instead of "presents." and in the Enoch Warrant we had "assistance" for "assistants."

The P.G.M. for Warwickshire also constituted other Lodges just over the Staffordshire border (of that time) at Fazeley and at Tamworth. The St. Bartholomew's Lodge, which met at the White Lion, Fazeley, was constituted 6 Aug. 1795 (erased 1828), and the Lodge of Harmony at Dudley's Coffee Tavern, Tamworth, on 5 Nov. 1796 (erased 1809), the evidence that the Warrants were Provincial issues being in the G. Sec.'s register, but the documents themselves have been lost.

Shropshire, Staffordshire, Flintshire, Denbighshire.

The Rev. Francis Hy. Egerton (afterwards Earl of Bridgwater) received his Patent as P.G.M. for Shropshire dated 1 May 1786, and a further Patent was issued to him by Lord Rawdon on 13 April 1791, the full details of his description in which, the G. Sec. Wm. White carefully copied in his Warrant register:—

Patent to Rev. Fra^s. Henry Egerton M.A. Fellow of the Royal Society of Antiquarians London, Prebendary of the 4th Stall of the Cathedral Church of Christ and of the Blessed Virgin in Durham, Rector of Whitchurch cum Marbury in the County of Salop &c., who was by a patent bearing date 1 May 1786 appointed P.G.M. for the County of Salop which we hereby confirm, and also do by these presents appoint and constitute him the said F. H. Egerton Prov.G.M. for the Counties of Stafford Flint, Denbigh & Montgomery, with full powers &c., dated 13 April 1791 signed by Lord Rawdon & Sir P. Parker.

The Rev. Mr. Egerton was the first Senior Warden of the Whitchurch Lodge which had been established through the energy and enthusiasm of that most indefatigable, though irascible and opinionated half-pay officer Major Charles Shirreff, but as the Major found that the position of Provincial Grand Master was beyond his means, he advocated the appointment of his Senior Warden for the post.

The scope of this essay prevents inclusion of many details of great interest in connection with the various Lodges and Provinces brought under review, but the following inimitable letter must at all costs be quoted.

Shirreff writes to the Grand Secretary, 6 Feb. 1786:—

"My S.W. the Rev. Mr. Egerton, son of the Bishop of Durham's and our Rector here left us on the 3rd inst, and from the Conversation that pass'd between us respecting the Fraternity altho' he knows but very little of it, yet as he will be advis'd by me, and appoint me his D.G.M^r. I have advis'd him as he is known to L^d. Effingham, to get appointed for the County he being a man of family and fortune it will be the means of promoting the Craft in this County, and wherein that is concerned, I always yield, and especially so when the person who fills the Chair is ready to receive advice, in this case it is of little moment who is in it, further on my own part I have never filled any chair yet as a Mason that I found any one could talk to me, but his answer was ready for him."

Under the regime of the Rev. Francis Henry Egerton then (with the not inconsiderable help of his Deputy) four new Lodges were established in Salop, and two in Staffordshire, one in Flintshire, and one in Denbighshire—and these were the only ones established in those provinces after his appointment as Provincial Grand Master.

Of these the Salopian No. 262 still works at Shrewsbury, but all the others have been erased: the Warrant of the Union, Soho, of 1793 is preserved in Grand Lodge, but the evidence of provincial issue respecting the rest is the statement in the G.L. Register.

The Warrant of the Salopian Lodge, still in the possession of the Lodge, is of G.L. type with the shorter phrasing to which allusion has already been made; it is engrossed on parchment and bears the signature of Francis Henry Egerton P.G.M. at the top left-hand corner and the Seal of Grand Lodge and the number Salopian No. 1 (being Shirreff's local numbering) but no G.L. number.

It is signed at the foot by C. Shirreff D.P.G.M., and characteristically he also signs as witness to his own signature, being in no whit perturbed that the letters P.G.S. had been engrossed against that place.

It is:

“Given at Whitchurch . . . the 13th May A.L. 5788. A.D. 1788.”

There is no doubt from correspondence preserved in G.L. that the Warrant was prepared in London; full details having been sent to the Secretary for the purpose (see Graham's *History of Freemasonry in Shropshire*).

The Warrant of the Union Soho Lodge, which met at Handsworth, Staffordshire (now included in the City of Birmingham), is preserved in the Grand Lodge Library, having endorsed on it “Returned by T. B. Ribbons of Carmarthen. 14 Jan. 1857.”

It is on very thin vellum, well mounted on linen, and in good condition: it bears the Seal of G.L. and another Seal not clearly decipherable after the P.G.M.'s signature at the top left-hand corner—probably the P.G.L. Seal. The number 514 is also engrossed.

It is signed, bottom right, by C. Shirreff D.P.G.M.

“for the County of Staffordshire &c. &c.,”

and witnessed by John Collins P.G.S.

The names in the body of the document are all engrossed, including that of the Deputy, and it is “Given at Whitchurch under the Seal of Masonry this 10th Day of Jan. A.L. 5793. A.D. 1793.”

The evidence of issue by the Province in all the other documents—Egerton Lodge, Whitchurch, Salop, 1789; Wrekin Lodge, Wellington, Salop, 1789; Friendly Brothers, Newcastle-under-Lyme Staffs., 1793; Peace & Good Neighbourhood, Wynnstay, Denbighshire, 1795 (which Warrant number was assigned to No. 620 Truro in 1810, still working as 331), and St. Winifreds, Holywell, Flintshire, 1795, and the Lodge of Industry, Bridgnorth, Salop, 1799—is that they are cited as having been constituted by the P.G.M. in the G. Secy.'s register: items in Shirreff's correspondence preserved in G.L. also confirming this in some cases.

GROUP d. SOUTH WALES.

Two Lodges only were constituted by the P.G.M., Sir H. Mackworth, namely, The Mackworth at Cowbridge, Glamorganshire, 30 Mar. 1787, and The Cambrian Lodge, Brecon, 1 Aug. 1789, but neither Warrant has survived and the evidence is the entries in the G.L. Register.

Arrangements were made to Warrant a Lodge at Aberystwith, Cardiganshire, but a note in the G.L. Register states:—“On acc^t. of the death of Sir H. Mackworth before he had executed the Warrant: a Dispensation for holding the Lodge was sent dated 29 Sep. 1791.”

There were no other Lodges constituted in South Wales until the next century.

GROUP *e.* KENT, SURREY, SUSSEX.*Kent.*

From 1760 to 1780 seventeen Lodges were constituted by the Moderns and eleven by the Antients, from 1780 to 1800 four by the Moderns and ten by the Antients, the majority under the Atholl Constitution being Military Lodges.

During the regime of the early Provincial Grand Masters—Walsingham, Frederick, and Smith (1770 to 1785)—there had been no Lodges warranted by the Provincial Masters, thereafter all issues by the Moderns were Provincial.

After the death of Col. Sawbridge, Dr. Wm. Perfect became P.G.M., and two Lodges—Jacob's Lodge, Ramsgate, 3 Sep. 1798, and The Lodge of Reason, Ashford, 18 Mar. 1799—were warranted by him, as recorded in the G.L. Register, but these Lodges were erased in 1827 and 1811 respectively and all traces of their Warrants are lost.

But both Warrants issued by Col. Sawbridge exist; that of the Thanet Lodge, Margate (1785), being preserved in Grand Lodge, and the Emulation Lodge, Dartford (1794), still working under the number 299 and preserving the original Provincial Warrant.

The Warrant of the Thanet Lodge is engrossed on vellum, not much embellished or decorated, and has the Seal of G.L. and the number.

The signature of the P.G.M., Jacob Sawbridge, appears at the top left, and George Farbrace signs as D.P.G.M. bottom right with the Witness Wm. Epps P.G.S. bottom left.

It is in full form on G.L. model:—

“ Given at Canterbury . . 18 Aug. A.L. 5785. A.D. 1785.”

In the body of the document the name of the D.P.G.M. has been left blank by the engrosser and filled in in autograph for Geo. Farbrace Esq.

Probably engrossed in London and sent for completion and signatures to Canterbury.

The Warrant of No. 299 Emulation, Dartford, is similar in character; engrossed on parchment it bears the G.L. Seal and the number: the signature of the P.G.M. Jacob Sawbridge is missing at the top, though he is cited as the authority for issuing the Warrant. It is signed by Julius Shepherd as D.P.G.M. and witnessed by Wm. Epps P.G.S., and:

“ Given at Faversham under . . . 4th day of January A.L. 5793.
A.D. 1793

By the Provincial Grand Master's command.”

There are blanks, as in the other, for filling in the name of the D.P.G.M. in the body of the document.

Similarly to that of the Thanet Lodge, this Warrant appears to have been engrossed in London and sent to Faversham for signature.

Surrey.

Very few Lodges were constituted in Surrey—five Moderns during the century and no Antients.

One only—the Pythagorean at Richmond (1788)—was constituted by the Provincial Grand Master, Thomas Parker, and no other Lodge was subsequently warranted before 1800.

The Warrant of the Pythagorean Lodge is preserved in G.L., the Lodge having been erased in 1794.

It is engrossed on stout vellum, in very good condition, has the Grand Lodge Seal and number and the usual signatures of the P.G.M., D.P.G.M. and P.G.S. in the usual places; is in the slightly shortened form of G.L. phrasing, and was “ Given at London,” and has the blanks filled in by autograph.

Sussex.

General Sir Samuel Hulse was granted the Patent as P.G.M. for Sussex by the Duke of Cumberland, dated 20 May 1788, and during the following ten years warranted four Lodges in his province; a fifth Lodge was warranted in 1799, but by Grand Lodge, and though he continued as P.G.M. until 1814 he appears not to have had any hand in it.

This was for the Lodge of Harmony, Hastings, warranted on July 1 1799: perhaps as it was a Military Lodge formed in the Royal Westminster Regiment of Middlesex Militia (though stationed at Hastings) he did not consider it within his province to grant the Warrant, or possibly the impending legislation of 39 Geo. III., c. 79, which was passed on 12 July 1799 and had the effect of stopping the issue of new Warrants, may have caused the more expeditious plan to be adopted—though in fact the legislation actually gave two month's grace before the new law became operative.

Of these four, No. 271 Royal Clarence, Brighton (1789), 311 South Saxon, Lewes (1796), and 315 Royal York, Brighton, retain their old documents, the other, Harmony, Chichester (1790), being cited in the G.L. Register as having been constituted by the P.G.M. for Sussex.

The interesting spoiled Warrant for 271 has already been described and its significance noted.

The wording of the Charter issued to the Royal Clarence follows in every detail the G.L. model. It bears the Seal of G.L. and the number 543 (which was the number of the Lodge in the 1781 enumeration), but it is signed at the foot by Samuel Hulse P.G.M. himself, and witnessed by James Galloway P.G.S.W.

It is:

“Given at London under Our Hand and Seal of Masonry this 8th day of August A.L. 5789: A.D. 1789.”

The Warrant of 311 is similar in wording; *i.e.*, strictly of G.L. model, and is somewhat elaborately embellished with emblematic figures; it bears the Seal of Grand Lodge and the number 557, and, this time, has the usual arrangement of signatures: Samuel Hulse P.G.M. top left, James Galloway D.P.G.M. at bottom right, and the witness, W. Lee P.G.S., bottom left.

It also appears to have the finely engrossed name C. Rand at the extreme margin at bottom right, which is frequently the manner in which the engrosser places his name when particularly pleased with his work, or the illuminator if the embellishments and decorations are imposed upon the originally plainly executed document.

This Warrant also is:

“Given at London, 15 Oct. A.D. 1796.”

The Warrant of No. 315 Royal York Lodge was issued by Samuel Hulse as P.G.M. to be named the Royal Cinque Port Lodge, meeting at the Old Tree Inn, Seaford.

It is also strictly in G.L. form, with the Seal, the number 566, and the signatures of P.G.M., D.P.G.M., and P.G.S., and:

“Given at London 28th day of September A.L. 5797 A.D. 1797; by the Provincial Grand Master's Command.”

This Warrant was lost, and a Warrant of Confirmation issued in 1823, but both documents are now in the possession of the Lodge.

The Warrant for the formation of the South Saxon Lodge as the Provincial Grand Lodge has already been described.

GROUP *f.* DEVONSHIRE: CORNWALL AND SCILLY ISLES;
THE CHANNEL ISLANDS.

Devonshire.

The first P.G.M. was Sir Charles Warwick Bampfylde.

He was "born and baptized" 23 Jan. 1753 at St. Augustine's, Bristol. He was initiated in the Union Lodge, Exeter (No. 39), in 1768 (*i.e.* at the age of 15!), and proceeding to Oxford was entered at New College, as "Charles Bampfylde. Son of Richard Bampfylde of Bristol, Bart."

He joined the Alfred Lodge, Oxford, being entered as a "Fellow Craft of the Union Lodge, Exeter, 19 Mar. 1772," and was raised M.M. 4 June 1772.

He commenced his Masonic career at Oxford badly, for in November of that year a resolution was passed in Lodge reprimanding him for having expressed to persons not Masons his intention of "entring a Negative" against every person who should be proposed to the Lodge for admission.

He returned to the Union Lodge, Exeter, on leaving Oxford in 1774, and was in that same year elected M.P. for Exeter and received his Patent as Provincial Grand Master for Devonshire at the age of 22, and continued to hold that post until 1819, when he met a tragic death in London, being murdered by his valet.

He was elected a joining member of the Royal Cumberland Lodge at Bath on 7 Oct. 1788.

Of one Lodge constituted in the Province after the date of his appointment—Friendship, Dartmouth (1780)—there is no evidence as to the character of its Charter, but in 1782 the P.G.M. constituted the Lodge of True Love and Unity at Brixham (still working as No. 248), and thereafter until 1794 seven other Lodges were constituted, all by the P.G.M. except one in 1783—a Military Lodge—The Good Intention (2nd Devon Militia) stationed at Exeter, of which there is no existing evidence.

Five of these seven Provincial Warrants have been preserved: four with their Lodges, and one in Grand Lodge after erasure.

The Lodge of True Love & Unity, Brixham, No. 248, possesses a most interesting document. It is issued by the P.G.M. in true Warrant form, following closely the G.L. model, except that reports are required to be made "to your Provincial Grand Master"—his Deputy not being there mentioned or named; but at the foot a note is added after the fashion when the Deputation form was used, and the necessary certificate added:—

"The Provincial Grand Master doth hereby also authorise and depute Brother Henry Pollexson to assist in opening the said Lodge & installing &c. of the said officers."

The Warrant is engrossed on parchment and all the names, &c., in the body of the document are in one handwriting; it bears the Seal of the Provincial Grand Lodge, with the signatures of the P.G.M. and D.P.G.M., but not of a witness.

The Lodge number is not given, but the words "By the name of the Lodge True Love & Unity" appear, engrossed apparently in the same style and at the same time as the rest of the document, at the left-hand margin below the Seal. It records that it was:—

"Given at Exeter under our hand and seal of Provincial Grand Lodge of the County & City the Twentieth Day of January A.D. 1782.
A.L. 5782

By the Provincial Grand Master's Command
John Codrington D.P.G.M."

It is a plain unembellished document, probably locally engrossed.

No. 251 Loyal Lodge, Barnstaple, also possesses and works under its original Warrant issued by Sir Charles Bampfylde. Engrossed on parchment.

bearing the Seal of Provincial Grand Lodge and the name "Loyal" but no number, it bears the names of P.G.M., D.P.G.M. and P.G.S. (Beavis Wood) in the usual places, and appears to have been written locally without blanks (except for the date) and by the P.G.S. himself, who engrossed the names of the others instead of obtaining their autograph signatures.

It is:

"Given at Exeter under the Hand and Seal of the Provincial Grand Lodge of the said County and City this twenty third August A.D. 1783. A.L. 5783

By the Provincial Grand Master's Command."

There is no certificate added to this as there is on 248.

The next in order of Constitution, Concord, Devonport (1784), is stated in the G.L. Register to have been constituted by the P.G.M., but its documents have been lost.

In 1786 The Amphibious Lodge was constituted at Stonehouse, near Plymouth, but now works at Heckmondwike in Yorkshire—No. 258—and its Warrant must appear a strange one among its contemporaries of that County.

It was assigned to a Lodge formed at Shears Inn, High Town, Yorkshire, in 1803, having lapsed about 1800.

This is similar to the previous issues by Sir Charles Bampfylde, bears the Seal of Provincial Grand Lodge and the number 407, and is:

"Given at Exeter under our Hand and seal of Provincial Grand Lodge of the said County and City, the fifteenth day of June A.D. 1786. A.L. 5786

By the Provincial Grand Master's Command

John Codrington. D.P.G.M.

Witness Beavis Wood P.G.S.";

and here, as in 248, follows an additional note—a pseudo certificate:—

"The Rev. William Wood A.M. and P.G.C. the Rev. Henry Shorbridge Carews L.L.D. and Beavis Wood P.G.S. are by the Provincial Grand Master deputed to constitute the said Lodge in due form and swear and invest the above named Philip Welsh, Master."

No. 282 Bedford Lodge reported that "their Warrant hath by some accident been lost or destroyed" and they were granted a Warrant of Confirmation in 1839. The Lodge is cited in the G.L. Register as having been constituted at Tavistock by the P.G.M. on 10 Aug. 1791.

The Faithful Lodge, Bideford, was erased in 1823, and its Warrant is preserved in the G.L. Library; it is similar to the previously described issues.

It is engrossed on vellum, plainly and simply, and evidently locally produced; the name of the witness appears to be the only actual autograph (Beavis Wood P.G.Sec.), the others having been filled in by the engrosser.

It was:

"Given at Exeter under our Hand & Seal of Provincial Grand Lodge of the said County and City this twenty third of April A.D. 1792. A.L. 5792

By the Provincial Grand Master's Command."

No. 303 Benevolent, Teignmouth, was warranted by the P.G.M. on Mar. 25 1794, and has all the characters of the other issues. It was locally engrossed—in the opinion of Wor. Bro. Rayment, the Secretary of the Lodge,—by the P.G.Sec. Beavis Wood himself; there is a curious mis-spelling of the word Teignmouth, as "Teingmouth," which one would not expect in a document locally produced. Thomas Okes now appears as D.P.G.M. in the place of John Codrington.

The citation of issue at Exeter is as before, and there is no attached "certificate."

*Cornwall and Scilly Isles.**Scilly.*

I have included the St. Mary's Island Lodge, Scilly (1768) among those constituted by the Province on the evidence of a document in the correspondence folios in G.L. Library with reference to the payment of fees to G.L. for Charity and resolving to send 10^s/6^d., dated Scilly 1770:—

“The Right Worshipful Provincial of these Islands and the Master of this Lodge, constituted by the Provincial's Deputation bearing date the 25th day of November. A.L. 5755

Isaac Head P.G.M.

Lodge at St. Marys Island, Scilly.”

There is no Charter preserved, and the word “Deputation” used above refers to the P.G.M.'s Patent 1755, and not to the character of the “Constitution” he issued to the Lodge, which was dated 13 July 1768. The Lodge was erased in 1851.

This appears to be the only Lodge ever constituted on these Islands, and it is curious that a Provincial Grand Master should have been appointed, and that the Masonic Year Book does not include him in the list of Provincial Grand Masters.

It may be of interest to note that in vol. i., of Oliver's *Golden Remains*, p. 102, is a Lecture “on the Social Virtues of Freemasonry,” delivered in the Lodge No. 151 at Helston, in Cornwall, by Isaac Head, Esq., A.D. 1752. The number of the Lodge in 1752 was 217, and it was erased in 1774.

Cornwall.

In 1810 certain brethren “residing in or near Truro” petitioned for a Warrant, and had assigned to them the Warrant of 1795 issued to the then No. 548 at Wynnstay in Denbigh, which had lapsed in 1809, and this Lodge now works as the Phoenix Lodge No. 331; they do not possess the old Wynnstay Warrant, and never had the document itself, a special Warrant having been issued to them by the Earl of Moira, reciting the authority of the older issue and transmitting it to them, as was the custom then observed in order to get round what were believed to be the restrictions of the Act of July 1799.

But, fortunately, this Phoenix Lodge possesses the Charter of the older Phoenix, which was constituted at Truro in 1779 and lapsed in 1788. This is a very interesting document, which begins as a Deputation, in that it authorises a certain Henry Rosewarne to “Convene our Brethren who have signed the Petition in the manner and form of a Freemasons Lodge.” But its text then takes on the form of a Warrant; for the P.G.M. proceeds “of our own will and pleasure” to appoint the Master and Wardens, and even the Treasurer and Secretary.

This document is, therefore, *sui generis*, and has so many individual characteristics that it must be transcribed in full:—

“To All and every our Right Worshipful & loving Brethren, We, Stephen Bell (by virtue of a Deputation from the Grand Master) Provincial Grand Master of the Ancient and Honourable Society of Free and Accepted Masons in the County of Cornwall, send greeting, Know ye, that We, of the great trust and Confidence reposed in our Right Trusty and Well beloved Brother Henry Rosewarne Esq^r. & of the humble petition of several Brethren residing in or near the said Town of Truro do Hereby Authorise, Constitute & Appoint him the said Henry Rosewarne to Convene our Brethren who have signed the said Petition in the manner & form of a Freemasons Lodge And further more of our own will & pleasure do nominate & appoint him the said Henry Rosewarne Master presiding in the said Lodge,

taking to his assistance James Dagge or Daage of Killaganoon Esq^{re}. for his Senior Warden, The Rev. Cornelius Carden of Truro Clerk. for his Junior Warden, Thomas Warren of Truro, gentleman, for his Treasurer, and Thomas Clutterbuck of Truro, gentleman, for his Secretary of the said Lodge.

Also we hereby do Confirm the Dedication of the said Lodge by the STILE & TITLE of the Phoenix Lodge of Honour & Prudence pursuant of the prayer of the said petition, and that from this day forward they have full power to Have and to Hold a Regular Lodge in the said Town of Truro to Make, Pass, & Raise Masons, & such other Work as belongs to the Craft, taking especial Care that all & every the said Brethren have been regularly made Masons, admitting no person into the said Society but such whose lives & conversations may justly entitle them to become members. And Also that they will serve, Perform & keep all and every the Rules, Orders and Regulations contained in the Book of Constitutions except such as have been or may be repealed or altered at any Quarterly Communication or other General Meeting, together with all such Orders, Rules, Regulations & instructions as shall from time to time be transmitted by us or our Deputy William Pryce or by any of his successors taking care punctually to attend such Quarterly Communications as shall by us be called & to give a just account of all their Proceedings, Bye-Laws & other Regulations they shall think convenient to make for their own Government of the Craft, & as soon as may be transmitting to our Deputy an account of what House they meet at and what Days to the end that it may be inserted in the list of Lodges &c.

Given at Falmouth, under our Hand and Seal of Masonry this first day of January A.D. 1779. A.L. 5779

Stephen Bell P.G.M.

The points of difference between this and the G.L. model will be readily recognised; it was evidently locally produced; no number of the Lodge is attached, though the Seal is that of the G.L. of England; but no other officer than the P.G.M. signs the Warrant.

The date of the Constitution of the Lodge is given in the G.L. Register as 1 Jan. 1780.

The P.G.M. makes use of the phrases in his own Deputation or Patent. to ensure that his own obligations to Grand Lodge when undertaking to form New Lodges under its authority are observed, but in other ways he differs much from the usual form of words.

This is the only Provincial Warrant now preserved in Cornwall.


The G.L. Register cites the Three Grand Principles Lodge at Penryn as having been constituted by the P.G.M. Sir John Aubyn Bart. on 21 April 1799. He had been appointed by Patent dated 23 Nov. 1785.

The Lodge was erased in 1838 and the Warrant has not been preserved.

The Warrant of 318, True & Faithful, Helston, a Military Lodge, founded in the Cornwall Regiment of Fencible Light Dragoons, 1 April 1799, was issued from Grand Lodge.

The Channel Islands.

A facsimile Copy of the Warrant No. 2 Jersey is in G.L. Library and reads:—




“ To All and Every our Right Worshipful, Worshipful and Loving Brethren We Thomas Dobree Esq. Provincial Grand Master for the Islands of Guernsey, Jersey & Alderney &c. In virtue of a Patent dated the 22nd December 1753. Granted to us by John

Proby Baron of Carisford in the County of Wicklow
in the Kingdom of Ireland. The Grand Master of
the Ancient and Honourable Society of Free and
Accepted Masons, send Greeting:—

Know Ye that we of the great trust and confidence reposed in our
Right Worshipful & well beloved Brother Charles Coutanche Esq^{re}.
Do hereby Constitute and Appoint him Master of a Lodge of Free &
Accepted Masons to be kept in the Town of St. Hillary in the Island
of Jersey and to be called the Union Lodge No. 2, with full power
and authority to form said Lodge by chusing & appointing proper
officers. As also to make Masons in due form from time to time as
occasion may require. And to execute all and every such other Acts
and Things appertaining to the said Office as usually have been or
ought to be done & executed by other Masters, The said Master taking
especial care that all and every the Members he shall admit have been
regularly made masons, and that they do perform and keep all and
every the Rules Orders & Regulations contained in the Book of
Constitutions (except such as have been or may be repealed at any
Quarterly Communication or other General Meeting). And that
you promote on all occasions whatever may be for the Honour and
Advantage of Masonry, and the Benefit of the Grand Charity. And
that you Yearly send to the Grand Master or his Successors an account
in Writing of Your proceedings.

Given at Guernsey under our hand & Seal of Masonry this
28th day of March AD 1788. AL 5788

Thomas Dobree P.G.M.



Witness

John de Havilland M.M.

CLASS 2. THE DUNCKERLEY PROVINCES.

This Class consists of Hampshire (and Isle of Wight),
Essex, Wiltshire, Dorset, Somerset, Gloucestershire (and
Bristol), and Herefordshire.

In none of these Provinces had any Provincial Warrant been issued previous
to Dunckerley's appointment as P.G.M.; but although responsible for so wide
an area, he did not constitute any very large number of Lodges, less than twenty
in the nine provinces under his rule, and of these but seven survive to-day: four
of these being in Somerset.

The position of the Lodges in the Provinces under his care in 1786 is
clearly given in a letter from Colchester on Sep. 14:—

“ Dear Sir

Yesterday morning I was favour'd with yours of the 5th
forwarded from Hampton Court, but as I met the Brethren (in
Grand Lodge) at eleven in the forenoon; I did not leave them before
this morning, tho' the Lodge was clos'd at 8 in the evening.

We pass'd a very happy day and I appointed Bros. Sperling &
Tyssen (Gentlemen of large fortunes in this County) to be my Wardens.
I thank you for the account of the Lodges in Hampshire, that have
shewn their regard for me: but I did not know that there was a
Lodge at the George Inn, Portsmouth.

I am ambitious to have Sir P. Parker's signature to my Patent,
therefore beg you will defer it till his nomination is confirm'd.

In conformity to my new Patent, it will be proper that the Lodges under my care be inserted in the next Calendar according to the following alphabetical arrangement:

- B. City & County of Bristol
155: 253: 296: 359: 445: 472.
- D. Dorsetshire. 219: 382. With the two *new* Lodges.
- E. Essex. 30: 51: 205: 270: 402: 411.
- G. Gloucestershire. 462. City of Gloucester.
- H. Hampshire. 18: 206: 314: 400: 485.
- S. Somersetshire. 39: 212: 230: 294: 369: 473.
- W. Isle of Wight. 33.

The above will give great pleasure to the Brethren of Bristol & the Isle of Wight, and I hope will meet with your approbation.

Next Monday evening I am to visit the Lodge at Ilford on my return home.

Believe me most sincerely Your affect. Brother
Tho^s. Dunckerley.

Hampshire.

Though issued from Grand Lodge the Warrant of Hengist Lodge No. 195, now meeting at Bournemouth, is of great interest as being a kind of *transitional* Warrant, in which the Provincial Grand Master, Tho^s. Dunckerley, has a recognised authority though not issuing it himself, and in this differing from both the usual Grand Lodge and Provincial Grand Lodge Warrants.

The date of the Warrant is 1770, and the main wording is in the usual G.L. form and need not be recited, but the name of Dunckerley occurs three times in it.

The Petition is said to be granted, "at the recommendation of our Right Trusty and dearly Beloved Brother Thomas Dunckerley Provincial Grand Master for the said County of Hants." The injunction to send the account in writing once in every year includes the name of the P.G.M. and his successors, and lastly the signature of Dunckerley as P.G.M. is added below that of Charles Dillon the D.G.M.: all most unusual features in Warrants issued by Grand Lodge.

Lodge No. 132 at Ringwood has a unique story of great interest.

On Aug. 16 1764 a Lodge was constituted to meet at the Crown, Lymington, and continued there with a somewhat chequered career (see Sadler's *Life of Dunckerley*, p. 139) until it was removed in 1777 under the authority of the D.P.G.M. Henry Dagge to the White Hart Hotel, Ringwood: the happier conditions to be anticipated there being set out in the document authorising removal. Times were still somewhat troublous, however, and on 12 April 1780 the Lodge was erased.

Now a new enumeration happened just then to be in progress, so the Ringwood Lodge was omitted from the authorised list of Lodges: the belated payment of a guinea to G.L., however, secured its re-instatement later in the same year, without loss of seniority, with the result that all the subsequent Lodges in the roll had to have another alteration of numbers in 1781.

Since then the Lodge has achieved a distinction of another kind, for its subsequent history has been so fortunate that the Lodge has now been held under the same roof for a hundred and fifty years.

But that authority to remove the Lodge from Lymington to Ringwood issued by the D.P.G.M. in 1776 has been regarded by members of the Lodge—and apparently by other authorities also—as their "Warrant."

A Centenary Warrant was issued in 1877: but there has apparently never been any Warrant of Confirmation applied for or required.

In an address to his Lodge, published by the W.M. some years ago, he says: "The earliest document still in the possession of the Lodge is that old Warrant of removal which we in Lodge Unity look upon as our Charter," and

while pointing out that it differs in many respects from the usual forms, says: "However that may be the Warrant appears to be in due order."

It reads:—

To all to whom these presents shall come. Henry Dagge Esquire, Deputy Grand Master for the County of Southampton sends Greeting.

Whereas it has been represented to me that there are now remaining two members only belonging to the Lodge at Lymington in the said County of which the Master Mr. Samuel Colborne is one, who has signified to me his desire that the said Lodge should be transferred and removed to the Town of Ringwood in the said County to be held there at the Sign of the White Hart, kept by Bro. Richard Gibbs. And Whereas there are several Brethren residing in and near the said town of Ringwood who are desirous of becoming members of the said Lodge when removed to Ringwood as aforesaid, now I the said Henry Dagge, by virtue of the power and authority in me reposed do hereby transfer and remove the Lymington Lodge to the town of Ringwood, to be held at the White Hart Inn aforesaid, and the said Master of the Lymington Lodge having resigned his office and our Worthy Brother Stephen Martin of Ringwood aforesaid Esquire having been presented to me as a proper person to succeed to the said office, and having been strongly and unanimously recommended by all the Brethren now present as a person of Good Morals, and great skill, true and trusty and a lover of the whole Fraternity wherever dispersed over the face of the Earth. I do therefore appoint the Said Stephen Martin Master of the said Lodge.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand this twenty seventh day of December in the year of Our Lord one thousand seven hundred & seventy six.

Henry Dagge D.G.M.

No seal, no witness, just a usual D.P.G.M.'s dispensation to remove, except that he appoints a Master—"strongly and unanimously recommended by all the Brethren now present"—when he had previously recited that there were only two such left.

But if in this he had strained to its limits his Deputy's prerogative, he can little have dreamed that that piece of paper on which he was inditing his authority to remove would, for a hundred years to come, be regarded and revered by a long succession of zealous Brethren as "the old Warrant."

Still, in all sincerity, we share the hope of the Brethren of 132 that this interesting document will always be most carefully preserved.

On July 1 1775, Dunckerley constituted the Lodge of Concord at the Star Inn, Southampton, in person, as recorded in a letter preserved in G.L. (see *Life of Dunckerley*, p. 140); but I have found no evidence of the character of the Warrant, though it was probably issued by him.

The Phoenix No. 257, Portsmouth, has a Grand Lodge Warrant.

In 1787 the Royal Navy Lodge, Gosport, was constituted by Dunckerley, but the Warrant has been lost.

In 1792, Dunckerley rejoiced exceedingly that the Brethren of the Antient Lodge No. 174 petitioned him for a Constitution under "Our Grand Lodge," and he "immediately granted them a Dispensation," and writing from Salisbury on August 8th he says to the Grand Secretary:—

"I am to desire that Warrants may be engrossed for: The Lodge of Love & Honour to be holden at the Bell Inn Shepton Mallet, County of Somerset . . . Dispensation dated 4 June 1792. Royal Gloucester Lodge East S^e. Southampton . . . Dispensation dated August 5 1792."

This last was the Lodge of Antient Masons who had met for twenty years past at the Vine Tavern: and he constituted them in person at a Provincial Grand Lodge held on Sep. 17 1792.

After Dunckerley's death the Lodge reverted to the Antients though working under both Warrants, and returning names of members to the Registers of both Societies (some being included in both lists); both numbers were carried forward at the Union, and recognised as of separate Lodges, that of the Moderns being erased in 1822 and that of the Antients still working as No. 130.

I cannot find that the Moderns Warrant issued by Dunckerley has been preserved.

The three other Lodges constituted before 1800 had Provincial Warrants issued by Col. Sherborne Stewart.

They follow the G.L. model in all respects, "Given at London," and apparently engrossed in London, with blanks left for names and dates.

The D.P.G.M. for Hants., signing the Warrants of 309 and 319, is Thomas Jeans, who was nephew to the Junior Warden named in the Warrant of 195; while the D.P.G.M. for the Isle of Wight Lodge—the Vectis Lodge of Peace & Concord—is William Holloway.

Essex.

Dunckerley became P.G.M. in 1776 and remained in that office until his death in 1796, being succeeded by George Downing, a full account of whose installation is given by Sadler in his *Life of Dunckerley*.

Dunckerley warranted three (perhaps four) Lodges of which only one survives; Downing warranted one which lapsed in 1828.

Two Warrants only are at present known to have been preserved: one still used by the existing Lodge at Chelmsford No. 276, the other preserved in G.L.; but there are several letters of Dunckerley's in the G.L. Library which have a bearing on these issues.

The Warrant of the Unity Lodge of Colchester is lost, but it is included among the Provincial issues on the sufficient evidence of this letter:—

Hampton Court Palace. July 10 1776.

My dear Friend

I set out for Essex the 13th inst, and as I have not yet rec'd my Warrant of Deputation, shall call at your house that day: but if you should be out of Town beg you will have the goodness to leave Orders that it may be deliver'd to me.

At the same time I beg a Warr't of Constitution may be ready for the Lodge at Colchester, as I intend (with God's permission) to Constitute that Lodge on Monday the 15th inst. It is to be held at the King's Head Tavern, in that Town.

The Rev'd. W ^m . Martin Leake L.L.B.	Master.
Collin Hossack M.D.	Sen ^r . Warden.
Tho ^s . Boggis Esq ^r .	Jun ^r . Warden.

Let it be dated at London June 11th 1776 & blanks left for the names of my Deputy and Secretary.

My wife & daughter unite in sincere regard, & am

Dear Sir

Your obliged Friend & affect. Brother

Tho^s. Dunckerley.

Ja^s. Heseltine Esq^r.

This Lodge was erased in 1791.

Though it is probable that the "Social Lodge" constituted at Braintree on 9 June 1777 was similarly warranted by Dunckerley, there is at present no evidence available of this.

Ten years later, we have the letter:—

Hampton Court Palace. March 30 1787.

Dear Sir

I have this morning receiv'd a letter from Braintree in Essex, requesting me to grant a Warrant of Constitution to confirm the Dispensation which I gave them to hold a Lodge at a Private Room in that Town Dated Nov. 3 1786 of which I inform'd you & receiv'd for answer that the number would be 491.

I must now desire you will do me the favour to get the Warrant made out with the above date, for the Lodge of Good Will, to be held at a Private room, Braintree in Essex. Bro. William Low Master, Bro. Richard Biss, Senr. Warden, and Bro. Tho^s. Osborne, Jun. Warden.

If it can be engross'd by next Wednesday I can sign and send it the next day to Colchester, for my Deputy and Secretary to witness it.

Your faithful & zealous Brother

Tho^s. Dunckerley.

William White Esq.

The Warrant has been preserved in G.L. engrossed on vellum, not decorated: with autograph signatures, & of G.L. model wording. There appears to be a clerical error in that the office of Senior Warden is cited twice, Thomas Osborne (evidently the Junior Warden) being given the senior office as well as Richard Biss: but a close scrutiny of the parchment reveals the fact that the word Junior has been altered to Senior—perhaps at the instigation of the worthy Brother Osborne when he achieved promotion.

The Warrant issued to the Lodge of Goodfellowship No. 553, now No. 276 at Chelmsford, is of the same character—in full wording of the G.L. model, except for the omission of the exceptions referring to the Rules & Orders in the B. of C. and the combination of the requirement to take special care that all and every the said Brethren are or have been regularly made Masons, with the obligation to “observe perform & keep all the Rules &c.”

The engrossing on vellum is plainly done, without emblematic embellishments, and blanks had been left of the name of the Deputy “Thomas Boggis” in the body of the document, and for the words “Hampton Court” at the end.

In every respect this Warrant is typical of those issued elsewhere by Dunckerley.

Minute Books in the possession of this Lodge go back to 1770, and the earliest appears to be the continuation of a still earlier record; these, however, appear to relate to the Lodge established at the Saracen's Head on 18 Jan. 1764 (erased 10 April 1782).

The Prestonian Lodge of Perfect Friendship established at Gray's Thurrock on 18 Feb. 1797 is stated in the G.L. Register to have been constituted by the P.G.M. George Downing: the character and location of the Warrant being now unknown.

Wiltshire.

No Provincial Warrants are now known to exist, but there is some evidence that two were issued by Dunckerley.

In 1783, as a result of serious insubordination in the Sarum Lodge, Dunckerley was being persuaded by the Grand Secretary to resign the Province of Wiltshire, and was promised appointment to Somerset. A letter addressed to him from Jas. Heseltine, the Grand Secretary, and dated Mar 20th 1783, states, *inter alia*:—

“the Committee intimated that if it was the desire of the Lodges in Somersetshire to have you appointed their P.G.M. and you would take

the trouble to represent them it might be recommended to the Grand Master in the name of the Committee to appoint you to that office, upon resigning the Superintendency of Wilts, which would certainly convey the highest degree of Masonic Respectability to you, and be an indirect rebuke to the Sarum Lodge, without any absolute Censure that might give offence, and thus universal peace and fraternal goodwill might be produced.

The Grand Officers have also, since the Committee reconsidered this plan which they still approve, and flatter themselves with the hopes of your Concurrence. J.H."

Five days later Dunckerley replied:—

"I am much obliged to the Brethren at Bath for the regard they express for me, and should be happy to render them any service, but cannot prevail with myself to take Somersetshire and resign the County where I now reside and (with God's permission) propose to remain; and it would be ingratitude to the Lodge of Science in this City who have been at the expense of a Warrant of Constitution to be under my Authority and Instruction. If the Grand Master will honour me with the appointment of Provincial Grand Master for the Counties of Dorset, Somerset and Wilts; I shall esteem it a pleasing employment for the very little time I may remain in this life."

Grand Lodge decided (10 Sep. 1783) to continue him in office as P.G.M. for Wilts., but directed that the Sarum Lodge should deal directly with Grand Lodge, and not through him; to which he responded with some spirit on 16 Sep.:—

"I shall not in future interfere with the affairs of the Sarum Lodge; and to prevent the possibility of any fresh disputes I shall not permit any Members of that Lodge to be present at any Provincial Grand Lodge that I may occasionally hold in future for this County."

The allusion to the Science Lodge at Salisbury appears to indicate that he had "constituted" the Lodge himself, but there is no other evidence of this, and the Warrant is lost.

In a letter dated from Salisbury, Dec. 21 1783, Dunckerley writes:—

"I have the pleasure to inform you that a Lodge of Antient Masons, constituted 7 years ago by Mr. Dermot by authority from the Duke of Athol, have apply'd to me for my Instruction and Patronage. I have granted them a Dispensation for holding a Lodge and gave them several obligations in an extra Prov. G. Lodge the 11th inst. Their Warr^t. of Constitution will be deliver'd in Prov. G. Lodge on St. John's Day and I would put the impression of the Grand Lodge seal to it, if you can send it on a piece of paper."

This last remark would, I think, clearly indicate that, contrary to Dunckerley's usual custom, the Warrant was being engrossed locally.

This Antient Lodge was meeting at the Vine Inn, Salisbury, then numbered 200 on the roll of their Grand Lodge, and had had, soon after their constitution in 1777, some serious disagreement with Dunckerley owing to his having questioned the legality of their Warrant and the genuineness of the support they claimed to receive from the Duke of Athol.

The Antient Warrant was returned, and the number declared vacant in 1792. In 1801 No. 200 was granted to certain brethren for a Lodge at Carisbrook, Isle of Wight, now the Albany Lodge No. 151 Newport.

The Moderns Warrant has been lost.

The Unity & Friendship Lodge, constituted at Bradford-on-Avon on 31 May 1794, had a Warrant issued by Grand Lodge, and the text (of the usual type) has been published in Goldney's *History of Freemasonry in Wiltshire* (p. 162).

Dorset.

No Provincial Warrants have been preserved of the Lodges in Dorset.

It is of interest, however, to note that through the close trade connections between Poole and Newfoundland, Dunckerley was concerned in the issue of two Warrants for that colony. In an illuminating letter to the Grand Secretary, dated from Hampton Court Palace, April 21 1785, we read:—

“ Dear Brother,

Cavil and Dissipation prevented my talking to you at the Quarterly Communication on *real* Masonry. You may remember I jockey'd Dermot out of Newfoundland by obtaining a Warrant for a Lodge at Placentia, it has produced another petition for a Lodge at Harbour Grace on the Island. I rec'd it this morning under cover of a letter from my very worthy Deputy, Doctor Campbell of Pool. I beg you will get it executed (in the same *neat* manner as that for Gloucester) as soon as possible & send it (by the Pool coach) to Alex Campbell Esq. at that place, as the ship that is to convey it is under sailing orders. Favour me with a line, when it is sent, and I will be accountable to you for the £5. 15. 6. which will be paid to me when I visit Pool this summer.

The Certificate came safe to hand for which you will also give me Credit 6^s. / 8^d.

I had no opportunity when I saw you last of enquiring if you heard of the Captain concerning the letter sent to me from Bro. Webb. for a Lodge on the Island of Dominica. I shall be glad to have a line from you in return that I may acquaint Bro. Campbell with the success of the Petition from Newfoundland.

Make my sincere regard acceptable to Bro. Heseltine, serious Bro. Berkeley &c. &c.

From your faithful & affec. Brother

Tho^s. Dunckerley.

N.B.—I have paid 6s. for postage since ye last accounts for Letters from Bristol, Essex, Bath, Pool, Bridgwater & Dorchester. If the Accounts of the last Quarterly Communication are printed before the 6th of next month do me the favour to leave those for the Counties under my care & also for Newfoundland with Bro. Berkeley as I propose (with God's permission) to attend the Grand Committee of Royal Arch Masons that day at his house.

William White Esq.”

What actually happened at Placentia, Newfoundland, is not quite clear. Lane records a Lodge there, constituted by the Antients on May 2 1788,—three years after this alleged “jockeying of Dermot out of Newfoundland”; the Modern Lodge to which Dunckerley alludes was registered in 1784 with the number 455,—next in order to the Apollo, which he had weaned from the Antients at Salisbury.

The anticipation of a Lodge in the Leeward Islands at Dominica does not appear to have been fulfilled. After an abortive attempt by the Antients to establish a Lodge there in 1773, they constituted the Dominica Union Lodge on May 16 1785. The Moderns had constituted a Lodge there on 29 Nov. 1773, which worked until 1813, but no other is recorded as having been founded until 1823. It looks then as though Dermott scored in Dominica in 1785, even though temporarily jockeyed out of Newfoundland a year before.

In the important letter written by Dunckerley from Colchester on Sep. 14 1786, given above, the allusion to Dorsetshire is:—

D. Dorsetshire. 219: 382: with the two *new* Lodges.

In the enumeration of 1781 to which these figures belong No. 219 is the present 137 Lodge of Amity, Poole, founded 1765; No. 382 The Durnovarian Lodge meeting at Dorchester, founded 1775; the Greyhound, Blandford, of 1771 had been erased in 1781, and the Weymouth Lodge, founded 1776, was erased 1785.

The two *new* Lodges referred to were therefore the ones at Sherborne and Shaftesbury: the former having been warranted on Mar. 31st, and the latter on May 3rd of that year.

Both Lodges are defunct, and their Warrants lost, but it is almost certain that these were issued by Dunckerley.

Somerset.

Of the seven Warrants issued by Dunckerley for Lodges in Somerset four are extant, and after his death one was issued by John Smith for a Lodge at Chard.

The Warrant of the Royal Cumberland Lodge at Bath is not preserved, and it is probable that none was ever issued; the Lodge amalgamated with the Lodge founded in 1733 and still works as No. 41 with the old Deputation as its authority, under the name of Royal Cumberland.

In a long footnote in Dr. Oliver's *Revelations of a Square* (p. 145, 1855 edition) is an account of the amalgamation of these two Lodges, through the zeal and activity of Bro. Dunckerley, the latter having been "recently instituted by himself," and he is said to have "projected the junction to enable it to take precedence in the Province by the adoption of the former number."

Dunckerley had long taken an interest in the old Lodge of 1733 (then No. 113) meeting at the White Bear, Bath, whose early associations were linked with,—indeed it may have been continuous with,—the first Lodge in the Provinces to be constituted (in 1724) by the Grand Lodge of 1717.

The first Minutes of No. 113 (beginning from Dec. 28 1732), a very full account of which has been published by Bro. George Norman in the *Transactions* of the Somerset Masters' Lodge 3746, indicate that the Lodge had been for some time in working order, and that there was then at least one member present who is known to have been a member of the 1724 Lodge. On May 18 1733 a resolution "For many good offices, useful Instructions & unnumbered Favours the Lodge have received from their Worthy Brother Charles de Labely through his zealous endeavours to promote Masonry," unanimously passed, speaks of a longer past than that particular Minute Book shows, and goes a long way to prove his connection with the Lodge long previously.

It may be noted, in passing, that the first P.G.M. for Somerset, John Smith M.P., is referred to in that capacity in the Minutes of the Lodge as early as 1767, though the official Year Book gives the date of his appointment as 1770. (He was raised at a meeting of the Lodge on Dec. 28 1767, but in that connection it is sufficient to recall that the Grand Master himself need only be a Fellow Craft.)

There is a cryptic reference to a possible "inspection" of the Lodge by Dunckerley on Aug. 7 1767, but no doubt whatever about his election as an Honorary Member on Dec. 15 of that year, and on subsequent occasions in the following year he attended the Lodge, and is once recorded as having performed the Second Degree ceremony.

On the death of John Smith, M.P. for Combhay, in 1775, the vacancy in the position of P.G.M. does not appear to have been officially filled, though the Lodge on April 5 1776 proposed to Grand Lodge Bros. Lisle, Tynte and Cox as proper persons for the office, and asked to be directed as to the mode of election.

None of these was appointed, and it is stated by Bro. Peach in his *Craft Masonry of Bath*, that the fifth Duke of Beaufort held the office till Dunckerley was appointed in 1784: but the Year Book gives no such information.

One of Dunckerley's first acts after his appointment was to visit this Lodge at St. John's Feast: and by the following November a definite proposal of amalgamation with the new formed Royal Cumberland Lodge was received by the Master, and accepted by the Lodge.

The first meeting of the Royal Cumberland Lodge was held on 11th Aug. 1784, with Dunckerley himself as acting Master "pursuant of a Warrant of Dispensation for that purpose under the hand and seal of Thomas Dunckerley Esq., Provincial Grand Master for the Counties of Essex, Gloucester, Dorset & Somerset, bearing date the 7th day of August 1784," and many members of No. 113 attended either as members of the new Lodge or as Visitors, and Chas. Phillott was initiated.

Oliver is in error in stating that this was "the first meeting after the union of the two Lodges."

Thomas West (Dunckerley's Deputy for Somerset) was appointed Master, and he at once set about the business of amalgamation. It is significant to note that in the list of "Jewels & furniture" the incoming Lodge brought with them to the old Lodge there is no mention of heavy furniture, such as they must have provided for themselves had they intended a long life of their own. New Square, Level, and Plumb: various Officers' Jewels, Officers' Hiram's, Inkstand, Papercase, various Glasses, New 1784 Book of Constitutions, New Tyler's Sword, New Bible, Freemason's Calendar and "One Entered Apprentice Lodge, One Fellow Craft Lodge and One Master Mason's Lodge" (presumably Lodge Boards or Tracing Boards)—all these might well have been provided by Brethren intent on refitting an old Lodge which had fallen into some decay.

In a letter dated Hampton Court Palace, Feb. 1 1785, Dunckerley writes to the Grand Secretary:—

"It gives me much pleasure to have constituted two lodges in honour of the Dukes of Gloucester & Cumberland."

This history has been detailed at some length as it may give validity to the opinion that no *Warrant* was issued to the Royal Cumberland Lodge: it appears to be not improbable that Dunckerley contented himself with giving them a temporary Dispensation to meet as a Lodge, and indeed himself "Constituted" them: but did not think it necessary to issue the usual Warrant in view of his intention to amalgamate them with No. 113 (or No. 39 as it then was).

It is strange that if a Warrant had actually been issued it is not preserved either in Grand Lodge (to which it should have been immediately returned, though but just issued), or in the Royal Cumberland Lodge, which has taken such care of its old documents.

Grand Lodge records do not show any payment for a Constitution respecting this Lodge.

The G. Sec.'s Memorandum Register states that the Unanimity Lodge, Wells (30 May 1785), and Royal Clarence, Frome (2 June 1790) were constituted by Dunckerley—these Lodges were erased in 1809 and 1838 respectively, and their Warrants have not been preserved.

Of the five other Lodges constituted during the century, three are still working and retain their original Provincial Warrant, and two Warrants of the erased Lodges are preserved in Grand Lodge.

The Lodge of Unanimity & Sincerity (No. 261 Taunton) was constituted by Dunckerley on May 7 1788.

The Warrant is in the full wording of the Grand Lodge model, the signatures being autographs of Tho^s. Dunckerley P.G.M., Thomas West D.P.G.M., and William Myler P.G.S. as Witness; the blank space for the Deputy's name left

in the body of the document is filled in "Tho^s. West Esq. of Bath" in Dunckerley's handwriting, and the Seal of the Grand Lodge and No. 524 are attached.

The Warrant is in very good condition, though a little faded.

The amusing mistake in engrossing occurs of using the word "Lodge" instead of Master, in the impossible phrase "Deputy Provincial Grand Lodge."

No. 285 Love & Honour, Shepton Mallet (4 June 1792), is in all essentials a similar issue, except that the P.G.S. does not sign as Witness. It has the G.L. Seal and No. 357 (which was its number at the enumeration of 1832).

No. 291 Rural Philanthropic, Highbridge, was issued by Dunckerley on 21 Jan. 1793. This Lodge first met at Huntspill, two or three miles out of Highbridge. The Warrant is signed by Dunckerley and John Dunning D.P.G.M., with Charles Mines P.G.S. witnessing, but strangely enough the D.P.G.M. cited in the body of the document is Tho^s. West of Bath. This is also of the usual G.L. model wording, bears the G.L. Seal and the number 517. It is becoming very faded.

The Warrant of the Lodge of Urbanity, Wincanton, issued by Dunckerley on 10 April 1793, has recently come into the possession of Grand Lodge. The Lodge was erased in 1809, but the Warrant has until now remained in private hands. It is similar in all essentials to the previous issues, and is very well preserved.

After the death of Tho^s. Dunckerley in 1796 one other Lodge was warranted by the new P.G.M. John Smith—No. 579 The Lodge of Prudence & Industry, Chard, dated 25 Mar. 1799. This Lodge was erased, and the Warrant returned to Grand Lodge in 1831: and it is still preserved there.

It is badly engrossed on very thin vellum: but it is in good condition and very legible, though too crumpled for satisfactory reproduction; it has the appearance of having been locally produced by a very indifferent scribe,—possibly some junior clerk.

It bears the G.L. Seal, but no number, and is in the shortened G.L. model form, ending "Given—the 25 Day of March 1799," without the usual A.D. A.L. formula.

Names are filled in by the engrosser in the body of the document. The signatories are John Smith P.G.M., Charles Phillott D.P.G.M., and William Mayler P.G.S.

The name of the D.P.G.M. is interesting as being that of the initiate at the first meeting of the Royal Cumberland Lodge, when Dunckerley presided as Master P.T. and Tho^s. West as his J.W. And on Jan. 3 1786 West was appointed W.M. of the newly conjoined Lodge with Charles Phillott as his S.W.

Some confusion has prevailed as to the identity of John Smith, the new P.G.M. who succeeded Dunckerley in Somerset.

Sadler, in his *Life of Dunckerley* (p. 216), says: "Dunckerley's Successor in Somerset was John Smith Esq. M.P. who had filled the office of Provincial Grand Master for the County prior to Dunckerley's appointment"; and in an introduction to Bro. Floyd Norris' *History of the Rural Philanthropic Lodge*, Bro. W. J. Hughan states: "The first Prov.G.M. for Somerset was the R.W. Brother John Smith, appointed in 1770, who appears to have again held that honourable position from 1796 on the decease of the second Prov.G.M. Thomas Dunckerley."

It is rarely that these authorities on Masonic history can be found faulty in statements as to facts: but the Minutes of the Royal Cumberland Lodge show that the elder John Smith of Combhay M.P., who was P.G.M. in 1767, died in 1775; that his son John was initiated and passed in that Lodge on Jan. 15th 1788, and on Feb. 5th he was "raised to the degree of Master Mason, and afterwards ballotted for, & elected a member of the Lodge."

He took a continuously active part in the working of the Lodge and was R.W.M. in 1791.

His Patent is preserved in Grand Lodge, and is entered in the Memorandum Register of Warrants and Deputations:—

“ Patent to John Smith Esq. of Combhay & Major of the Somersetshire Reg^t. of Militia to be Prov.G.M. for Somersetshire, dated 22 Oct. 1796.”

Gloucestershire.

Sir Rob^t. de Cornwall, who was appointed P.G.M. for Gloucestershire in 1753, died in 1756, some years before the brusque injunction on the margin of the Grand Lodge List, “ Take no notice of him,” was written. It has generally been held that the only record of his Masonic work was the one attendance at Grand Lodge, but the Minutes of the Royal Cumberland Lodge at Bath show him as a visitor there in 1739.

But no one succeeded him as P.G.M. until Thomas Dunckerley was appointed in 1784, and by that time many of the earlier Lodges had been erased: so that there were but five Lodges working in Bristol, and none in the County when he took office.

One new Lodge at Gloucester, and two in the City of Bristol were constituted during the next four years, but none subsequently, and none of these have survived.

The Royal Gloucester Lodge was constituted to meet at Gloucester as shown by the letter of 1 Feb. 1785 from Dunckerley to the Grand Secretary, which has already been quoted.

In *Freemasonry in Bristol*, p. 7, the Authors state: “ Among the papers of the late Bro. Richard Smith is a document which is no doubt a dispensation for holding this Lodge until the official document arrived from London.” The wording of a Provincial Warrant is then described. The fact that the letter of 1 Feb. 1785, quoted above, is of later date than this “ document ” appears to have prevented their realising that the Warrant had been *dated back*, according to the instructions conveyed in that letter.

Unfortunately, however, the document is not the original Warrant, but a contemporary, or nearly contemporary Copy of it. It is written on old hand-made paper in the same handwriting throughout, giving the names of Thomas Dunckerley as P.G.M. at the top left corner, of Joshua Springer as D.P.G.M. bottom right, and of Jno. Cartaret Lewis P.G.S. as Witness at bottom left; but none of these are signatures, all are in the same handwriting; which, however, bears some resemblance to that of Joshua Springer.

The addition of the T.H. device (the later modification of which has become known as the “ Triple Tau ”) under Dunckerley’s name with the three sets of three dots in the form of a triangle, one at either side of it and one below, is interesting as indicating Dunckerley’s interest in the R.A. degree: it is very unusual to see these indications on official Craft documents; Dunckerley was fond of using them in his private correspondence, and in a letter to the G. Sec. Wm. White he ends, “ I greet you with the triple trine,” and then puts his dots. Their significance is, I think, similar to that of our Craft “ fire.”

Compare this with the device he gives in 1789 on the Royal York Warrant. It is, of course, only an assumption that this device was used on the original Warrant, but as we find a similar use in 1789 it is a justifiable one.

The place of the seal beneath the P.G.M.’s signature is indicated by an oval drawn within a rectangle, and beneath that is the No. 463.

There is a very interesting old water-mark of a man surrounded by a low paling from the bottom of which hangs a bell, and within which is also enclosed a small heraldic lion, rampant and brandishing a sword, the man carrying a long staff with a hat perched on it, and the words *Pro Patria* extending across the space below the hat. This appears to be a caricature of the Britannia water-mark, and may be original “ Fool’s Cap.”

The paper is somewhat dilapidated and has been strongly backed in places. It is twice endorsed on the back, one reading:—

“1785. Copy of Warrant granted by Br. Dunckerly (thro’ his Deputy) for Royal Sussex L. Gloster”—

this on the upper part of the original paper, and I think the earlier of the two endorsements,—the “Br. Dunckerly” looks more familiarly contemporary than the other which is further down on the paper and reads:—

“Copy of a Warrant of Constitution for Gloucester sign’d by J. Springer D:P:G:M. for Bristol & Gloucester January 1785”;

and here the “sign’d” shows that this is an old endorsement.

The wording is that of a G.L. model Warrant:—

“Given at Hampon Court Pallace under our Hand and Seal of Masonry this 10th Day of Jan^r. AL 5785 AD 1785. By the Provincial Grand Master’s Command.”

In the same year Temple Lodge No. 472 was also warranted by Dunckerley, as stated in the G. Sec.’s Register, though no date of Constitution is given, but “dated at Salisbury” is noted. If this refers to the declaration of issue of the Warrant, it is unusual, for all other Dunckerley Warrants are “Given at Hampton Court”—but the Warrant is lost. It was a short-lived Lodge and was erased in 1791. Dunckerley reported to the G. Sec., Nov. 22 1785:—

“No. 472 at Bristol, was forfeited by Tho^s. Jones who had partly paid for the Warrant, but did not pay the remainder, tho’ he made several Masons.”

The names of the Officers of the Lodge cited in the G. Sec.’s Register are Chris. Sawyer, Master, Jas. Brown & Rich. Jones, Wardens.

Bristol was created a separate Province in 1786, but only one other Lodge was constituted—The Royal York Lodge.

The Warrant for this Lodge was granted by Dunckerley to Rich. Blake Master: Rev. J. Attwell Small D.D. and the Rev. Wm. Blake (Clerk) Wardens, on Aug. 18 1789.

In *Freemasonry in Bristol*, p. 81, we read that “the Lodge was most respectable, but was at last ruined by extravagance.” Its furniture “which was splendid” was seized and sold. Richard Blake, the Master, went to the Cape of Good Hope as Private Secretary to the Governor of the Colony and took the Warrant with him.


He appears to have returned to Bristol by 1792, for he was a member of the Town Council from that date till he died in 1829, aged sixty-nine.

In 1808 an attempt was made to re-open the Lodge under the Original Warrant, but this was refused by Grand Lodge, and a letter from Wm. White, the G. Sec., to Joshua Springer, the D.P.G.M., states that the “last Contribution to the Funds of the Society was in Feb. 1793,” and also that a Warrant of Confirmation had already been issued (as the Warrant of the Lodge was lost or mislaid) authorising petitioning brethren to meet at Minchinhampton, since “it appears the original Warrant . . . was carried to S. Africa whereas it ought not to have been taken from Bristol,” and “as the Grand Master’s Warrant of Confirmation stands in the place of the original Warrant it, of course, supersedes it”—continuing: “I have the honour to be acquainted with Richard Blake Esq. . . . and his taking the Warrant to Africa was, beyond doubt, done inadvertently, for it could be no manner of use there, and I very much doubt if he is at present acquainted that the Lodge now meets at Stroud, but which will be seen by its contributions . . . and to deprive the Brethren there of the Lodge without any fault committed by them, after they had been

at so much trouble & expense to obtain it would really be an act of great injustice."

It was in this Royal York Lodge that Dr. Howley, Archbishop of Canterbury (1828-1848), was initiated on Dec. 21 1791.

A few months ago our W.M. Bro. Geo. Norman found in Bath this original Warrant of 1789, together with many other very interesting Masonic papers, among the effects of a relative of Richard Blake, about 130 years after he had "inadvertently" taken it with him to S. Africa.

The Warrant is similar to others issued by Dunckerley, but an exceptional feature is that after his signature the Provincial Grand Master has put the device , and the series of three triangular groups of dots, as in the Royal Gloucester Warrant. The device is that of the Knights' Templar, which Dunckerley in a letter dated Jan. 27 1792 explains: "It is the signature of our Order Templum Hierosolyma Eques."

Dunckerley was very zealous in promoting the interests both of the Royal Arch and the Chivalric degrees.

Herefordshire.

No Provincial Warrants were issued in Herefordshire before Dunckerley's appointment in 1790, after which he constituted the Silurian, Kingston (1791), and Royal Edward, Leominster (1793).

Both these are cited in the G. Sec.'s Register as having been constituted by him: but both Lodges were short-lived, and the Warrants are lost.

CLASS 3. LANCASHIRE.

Active as was Dunckerley in the group of Provinces for which he accepted responsibility, and undoubtedly beneficial to the Moderns Grand Lodge as was his influence, yet when one comes to look at the Provincial developments in Lancashire his importance somewhat pales.

Great as he was, he cannot rightly be given the position of "father of the present race of Provincial Grand Masters," as Sadler claims.

The List of Lodges in Lancashire shows many remarkable features, both for the Moderns and the Antients; it shares with Yorkshire the very high proportion of Lodges founded in the eighteenth century which have survived.

It is remarkable that in the whole list, not one Lodge can be shown to have received a *Warrant* from Grand Lodge.

One of the last of the Grand Lodge "Deputations" was that issued in 1753 to the Rose and Crown at Prescott (now No. 86); but in 1739 a Lodge had been constituted at the Golden Lion, Salford, which Lane states to have received Provincial authority, but not having been registered in Grand Lodge until later, it lost its seniority in numbering. It now works under authority of a Provincial Warrant of Confirmation issued by John Allen in 1772 (*vide infra*).

A year after the Prescott Lodge, the Lodge at St. Anne's Coffee House, Manchester, was founded (now No. 89, Dukinfield, Cheshire), for which Ratchdale's Warrant already described was issued.

There are only four Lodges out of the twenty-eight known to have been constituted subsequently (during the century) in this Province, the character of whose Charter of Constitution is not known,—these *may* have been Grand Lodge Warrants, but the presumption is equally strong that they were Provincial issues; but after 1770, under John Allen's rule, every issue in the Province was by him, and eighteen of them survive, either as the authority in a Lodge to-day, or pre-served in the Grand Lodge Library.

After the establishment of No. 89 by Ratchdale seven years elapsed before another Moderns Lodge was constituted, and in the interval six Lodges were founded by the Antients—Nos. 44 and 57 still surviving by transfer of Warrants.

Just as the Dukinfield Warrant has characteristics of its own, so has that of The Hole in the Wall at Colne (now No. 116 The Royal Lancashire Lodge), founded Feb. 4 1762. This was the first Warrant issued by John Smith, who

had been appointed P.G.M. in 1760. The wording differs from the G.L. model, but it is obvious that it derives from the Patent of the Provincial Grand Master. Its full text is:—

To all and every our Right Worshipful, Worshipful and Loving Brethren. We, John Smith of Manchester in the County of Lancashire, Gentleman, Provincial Grand Master of the Ancient and Honourable Society of Free and Accepted Masons, send Greeting.

Whereas the Right Honourable & Right Worshipful Sholto Charles Douglas, Lord Aberdour, Grand Master of the Ancient and Honourable Society of Free and Accepted Masons, Hath by a certain instrument in writing under his hand and seal bearing date the 23rd day of June A.D. 1760 A.L. 5760, Constituted and Appointed us the said John Smith, Provincial Grand Master for the County of Lancaster, with full power in due form to make Masons and Constitute and regulate Lodges as occasion may require as in and by the same Authority relation being thereunto had may more fully appear

And whereas application has been made to us by petition under the hands of several of our Worthy and beloved brethren now residing in Colne in the said County of Lancaster, praying that they may have a Warrant from us to grant them liberty and power to meet and form themselves into a regular Lodge and in due form make Masons according to the Constitution thereof, Now know ye that we the said John Smith upon mature consideration of their promises and of the great trust and confidence reposed in them do hereby in pursuance of the power and authority invested in us as aforesaid, authorise & empower them the said petitioners to meet and form themselves into a regular Lodge of Masons at the House of John Petty known by the sign of "The Hole in the Wall," in Colne aforesaid, on the first Thursday in every month, and do hereby appoint our Worshipful and Loving Brother James Ellis Master of the said Lodge, Lawrence Whittaker Senior Warden and John Hargreaves Junior Warden thereof, they the said James Ellis, Lawrence Whittaker, and John Hargreaves taking especial care in their promises and that they do observe the forms and keep all and every these Rules, orders, and regulations contained in the Book of Constitutions, except such as have been or may be repealed at any Quarterly Communication or general meeting, together also with all such other rules, orders, regulations and instructions as shall from time to time be by us transmitted to them or by our Deputy or any of our successors Provincial Grand Masters for the time being, and that you yearly remit us such sum or sums of money as you shall think proper for the use of the Grand Charity and other necessary purposes.

Given at Manchester under our Hand & Seal

the fourth day of February.

A.D. 1762. A.L. 5762.

No. 216.

John Smith.

Seal

The number is unusually placed in this Warrant, but was not there originally, since the Lodge did not receive that number until the enumeration in 1770.

The next Lodge that John Smith constituted was at Burnley: the Warrant (still extant and operative) is similar to that of the Colne Lodge, except that it leaves out the "other necessary purpose" on which the sum or sums of money contributed may be spent as well as on "the Grand Charity."

The Warrant is signed at the foot by John Smith, and the Seal of the Provincial Grand Lodge of Masons, Manchester, is attached in that same part of the document: but in this case the signature of W. Brock, Provincial Secretary, is also added. It is stated to have been "Given at Manchester under our Hand

& Seal, the 27th day of December A.D. 1762 A.L. 5762"—though Lane gives the Constitution date as 9 Oct. 1763.

The Lodge constituted at Warrington in 1765 has long lost its original Warrant, but an ancient Copy used to hang in the Lodge room, and served for many years as the authentic Warrant, till in 1863 a Warrant of Confirmation was issued. This old Copy is still in possession of the Lodge, but is deposited in a bank for safe custody.

Its wording is again as that of John Smith's previous issues, but he now styles himself in the preamble as "of Hammersmith in the Parish of Fulham and County of Middlesex, Gentleman"; it re-introduces the "other necessary purposes" (words which it will be remembered occur in the P.G.M.'s Patent).

It was signed by John Smith only, and "Given at Hammersmith."

I have not been able to find out when the copy was made.

The Warrant of the Lodge at the Swan & Saracen's Head, founded at Manchester in 1766, is still preserved and operative in the Lodge of Integrity No. 163.

Again exactly similar in wording to the others, except that John Smith here styles himself in the preamble as "late of Manchester in the County of Lancaster, but now of London, Gentleman"; it is "Given at London," is sealed as before, and signed only by John Smith,—who in none of these Warrants adds the initials of his rank and title. No name or number is given to the Lodge.

These, it will be noticed, are all true Warrants, authorising the Petitioners to "meet and form themselves into a Regular Lodge," and appointing the Masters and Wardens by name, and the authority emanates from the person of the P.G.M. acting on behalf of the Grand Master—and not from the P.G. Lodge or Grand Lodge.

In a Copy which was made of this Warrant some years ago by a Provincial Grand Tyler and published, there are several errors: the chief being that the G.M. is styled Sholto Charles Dowlas, Lord Aberdeen, in place of Sholto Charles Douglas, Lord Aberdour.

John Allen was appointed P.G.M. in 1769, and continued ably conducting the Masonic affairs of the Province throughout the rest of the century; he was "of Clement's Inn in the County of Middlesex," and spent half of his time in London.

The earliest Warrant issued by him that has been preserved is the Warrant of Confirmation granted in 1772 to the Lodge of Fortitude, then No. 83, meeting at The Fox, St. Ann's Sq., Manchester.

The wording of this earliest document of John Allen's has many of the characteristics common to all his Warrants:—

"To All and Every our Right Worshipful and Loving Brethren, I, John Allen, of Clement's Inn in the County of Middlesex, Gentleman, Provincial Grand Master of the Most Ancient and Honourable Society of Free and Accepted Masons in and for the County Palatine of Lancaster, by virtue of and under the patent of His Grace the Most Noble Henry Somerset, Duke of Beaufort Grand Master of the Said Order &c. &c. &c. Greeting.—

Whereas Edward Entwistle, deceased, formerly Provincial Grand Master of the said County of Lancaster, did on the 9th day of January 1739, duly Constitute a Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons at the Golden Lyon in Salford in the said County to be held on the first Monday in every Month, and thereby appointed our late Brethren Richard Goodwin, Master; Edward Mullineaux Senior Warden; and John Magill Junior Warden as it appears by the Register of the said County Palatine. And whereas the members of the said Lodge have ever since its Constitution regularly assembled and conformed

to the Laws of Masonry, and the same lodge hath been duly removed to, and for several years past held at the Fox, near St. Ann's Square in the town of Manchester in the said County, on the first and third Mondays of every Month. And whereas the Warrant or Certificate of Constitution of the said Lodge hath been lost or mislaid. Wherefore our Right Trusty well-beloved Brethren Joseph Smith, the present Master and the rest of the members of the said Lodge have besought me to grant them my Certificate of Constitution which I have readily agreed to do.

Now know ye that I the said John Allen Provincial Grand Master aforesaid, do hereby certify that the said Lodge formerly held at the Golden Lyon in Salford, and now at the Fox, in Manchester in the said County, was legally Constituted, and I do allow and ratify and Confirm the same to be a Regular Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons, by the name of the Lodge of Fortitude being No. 83 in the list of Lodges, to be continued and held at the Fox aforesaid, on the first and third Mondays in every month, till the time or place of meeting shall, with the concurrence of me or my Successors be altered, our Said Brother Joseph Smith being the present Master, our Brother Benjamin Wild Smith, Senior Warden, and our Brother John Upton Junior Warden thereof, with such powers, privileges, and advantages of right belonging to regular established Lodges, hereby warning and requiring them and their successors to take care that they and the rest of the members of the said Lodge do at all times, observe perform and keep all and every the Rules, Orders and Regulations contained in the Book of Constitutions, except such as have been or shall hereafter be repealed at any Quarterly or General Communication, together with such other Rules, Orders, Regulations and Instructions as shall from time to time be by me or my Deputy or by my successors Provincial Grand Masters for the time being, transmitted to them or their successors.

And that they and their successors omit not once in every year to send to me or my Deputy or our Successors Copy of all such Rules, Orders and Regulations as shall be made for the good Government of the said Lodge, the same not being repugnant to the General Laws and Constitutions of the said Society together with a list of the members of the Lodge.

And such sum or sums of money as they may think proper and consistent with the circumstances of the said Lodge, towards supporting the Fund of Charity & the Grand Fund. Recommending to them the cultivation of the Royal Craft and their keeping in view the three grand principles—Brotherly Love, Relief and Truth.

Given at London under my hand this first day of May
A.D. 1772. A.L. 5772.

John Allen."

Seal

The note of personal intimacy—largely through avoidance of the more pompous "We" and "Our" usually adopted by Charter granters.—and of genuine love of the Craft, is noticeable in this as in all his subsequent Warrants (with the exception of the Lodge of Harmony, Ormskirk 1786).

He always concludes with the phrase about the three Grand Principles.—sometimes, and indeed in nearly half of his Warrants, the word is spelt *Principals*, as though the engrosser were vaguely thinking of the Royal Arch. As a matter of fact, this may be another instance of the auditory error, the engrosser working by dictation: nor at that period did the different spellings connote quite the distinct meanings they do to-day: for instance, in a letter from the Lodge of Harmony, Carlisle, to Wm. White G.S. on April 9 1792, about Masons made under the Scottish Constitution, the phrase occurs "if

consistent with the Honourable Principals of our Institution," and the same spelling occurs in the letter from the Grand Treasurer at York to Bro. Newbald, previously quoted.

The original Warrant of the Lodge which met at the Woolpack, Manchester (now 191 Bury) has been lost, and they work under a Warrant of Confirmation of 1846. The Lodge meeting at the Red Lion, Bury, in 1770 was erased in 1789, and its Warrant has not been preserved.

The earliest extant Warrant issued to a New Lodge by Allen was for the Lodge meeting at the Punch Bowl at Leigh (now No. 219, Todmorden). This, dated 24 Feb. 1774, is still in possession of the Lodge, but is faded and indecipherable. It is plainly engrossed, without embellishments.

A careful transcript on parchment was made in 1877, and hangs framed in the Lodge beside the original.

Bro. R. H. Baxter makes the comment, after kindly inspecting this Warrant for me, that unless the damage to the original has occurred since 1877 it is difficult to see how the scribe managed to read the document at all. This is probably a very good instance of the steadily damaging effect of ordinary daylight on these handwritten documents; in forty years a very serious fading must occur, and valuable documents become ruined unless protected from light. There is one seal at the top left-hand corner, and Allen signs at the bottom right, after the line "Given at London &c.": but there is the unusual arrangement that below his signature is the line "By the Deputy Grand Master's Command," followed by the signature of John Chadwick D.P.G.M.: and at the bottom left "Witness. Math Wale P.G.S."

The expression Deputy Grand Master, and even Grand Master, is sometimes met with as referring to the Provincial officials in their own Province.

The wording of this Warrant as given in the transcript closely follows the usual Allen form, but as it is not the original, I do not select it as the type.

The name—Lodge of Prudence—and number 462 are given in the body of the document.—John Allen was in close contact with Grand Lodge in London and could get the number without difficulty, and an unusual expression is used. "Consistent with the general Laws and Constitutions of Our Unity."—Society or Ancient Society are usually found and this word Unity is probably an error in the transcription.

He uses here the phrase "by virtue of these presents" as in the G.L. model, but, correctly legal as it appears, he evidently did not like it, for it does not occur in any other of his Warrants, where he prefers to say "by virtue of this my Warrant of Constitution": and in this preamble he cites himself as "Provincial Grand Master . . . by virtue of and under the Patent of His Grace the most noble Henry Somerset Duke of Beaufort &c. &c. as Grand Master of the said Lodge." In 1772, when he issued his Warrant of Confirmation to the Lodge of Fortitude, the Duke of Beaufort was still G.M., but at the date of this issue Lord Petre was the supreme Ruler of the Craft. It is interesting to see that John Allen, as a lawyer, considered, at first, that he should cite the authority from whom his Provincial Grand Mastership originated, and indicate that in virtue of the permanent powers then confirmed on him, he was continuing to function, without stating that his present power derived from the present Grand Master.¹

He repeats this in 1783 in warranting the Mariners Lodge (now 249), Liverpool: but in 1788 for the Lodge of Naphtali at Salford (now 266 Heywood) he cites his Mastership as "under His Royal Highness Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland &c. &c.," who had been Grand Master since 1782: using similar wording in all Warrants until Amity, Rochdale, 1791 (now 283 Haslingden),

¹ In the Book of Constitutions (1784 Edition, page 370), respecting Provincial Grand Masters, Article II. states:—

The appointment of this Grand Officer is a prerogative of the Grand Master . . . not for life, but during pleasure.

when he adopted the usual expression "under the authority of His Royal Highness &c.," and continued this in all his subsequent Warrants.

The wording of John Allen's Warrants differs in many respects from the G.L. model, though evidently based on it and on the text of his own Patent. He introduces the same essential clauses, and enjoins upon the Masters of his new Lodges similar duties and obligations as are found elsewhere, but he has his own phraseology which he varies but little in all the score of his Warrants still extant.

But for some unknown reason the Warrant issued to Brethren at Ormskirk in 1786 under the name of the Lodge of Harmony, differs from this usual type in being entirely of G.L. model.

This Lodge was erased in 1838, and the Warrant is in the Grand Lodge Library.

It, and two others (Sincerity, Wigan, 1786-1828; and St. Johns, Lancaster, 1793-1809) are the only ones out of the nineteen Warrants issued by John Allen (from 1780 onwards) which are not still operative in their original Lodges to-day.

The Warrant is plainly engrossed on parchment, and bears the Seal of G.L. and No. 493 at the top left-hand corner, with John Allen's signature and seal at the top right; it is of the usual Grand Lodge model wording throughout, with the use of "We" and "our" for Allen's more familiar "I" and "my."

It is:

"Given at London under our Hand & Seal, and the Seal of Masonry
this 12th day of December A.L. 5786 A.D. 1786

By the Provincial Grand Master's Command

Witness

John Broome P.G.S."

A blank space was left for the name of the Innholder of the Golden Lion, and has not been filled in.

Presumably this Warrant was engrossed at Grand Lodge in Allen's absence, in the form usually adopted there, and completed later by his signature and seal, the position of which and the use of the blue silk ribbon are very unusual features.

The type usually followed in John Allen's Warrants may be taken from that issued to the Lodge of Unity No. 533 (now No. 267 Macclesfield):—

No. 533

The Seal of the
Grand Lodge of
Masons, London

To All and everyone Right Worshipful and Loving Brethren, I, John Allen of Clement's Inn in the County of Middlesex, Provincial Grand Master of the Most Antient and Honourable Society of Free and Accepted Masons in and for the County Palatine of Lancaster, under His Royal Highness Henry Frederick Duke of Cumberland and Strathern, Earl of Dublin, Grand Master, send greeting.

Know Ye That upon the humble Petition of our Right Worthy and well beloved Brethren John Ashworth, Joel Bretland, James Croke the Younger, William Gregory, Edward Goddard and James Croke the Elder, And in consideration of the Great Trust and Confidence reposed in them I have Constituted. And by these Presents do constitute them the said Brethren into a regular Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons to be opened at the House known by the Name of the Dog Tavern, in Deansgate, Manchester, in the County of Lancaster, to be distinguished by the Name of the Lodge of Unity, being Number 533 in the List of Lodges, To be there formed and held on Thursday on or after Full Moon in every Month until the time and place of Meeting shall with the Concurrence of Me or my Successor be altered, With such Powers, Privileges, and Advantages as of Right belong to regular established Lodges. And

I do hereby nominate, constitute and appoint our said Brethren John Ashworth Master, Joel Bretland Senior Warden, and James Crooke the Younger, Junior Warden, for the opening of the said Lodge, and for such further time only as shall be thought proper by the Brethren thereof It being my Will and Intent that this appointment shall not in anywise affect the future Election of Officers of the said Lodge, but that the same shall be regulated by such Bye-Laws of the said Lodge as shall be consistent with the General Laws and Constitutions of our Antient Society. And further I will and require you the said John Ashworth, Joel Bretland and James Crooke and your Successors to take special care that you and the rest of the members of the said Lodge do at all times observe, and keep all and every the Rules, Orders and Regulations contained in the Book of Constitutions. Except such as have been or hereafter shall be repealed at any quarterly or other General Communication. Together with such other Rules, Orders, and Regulations as shall from time to time by me or my Deputy or by my Successors the Provincial Grand Master for the time being transmitted to you or your Successors. And that you and your Successors omit not once in every year or oftener as occasion may be to transmit to me or my Deputy or our Successors Copies of all Rules, Orders, and Regulations as shall from time to time be made by your said Lodge for the good Order and Government thereof Together with a list of the members of the said Lodge with their respective Titles or Additions and the respective times of their several Initiations or Admissions And that you do duly remit such Sum or Sums of Money as shall from time to time accrue due from and be contributed by your said Lodge or the Members thereof to the Fund of Charity and the General Fund of the said Society. And Lastly I will and require you the said John Ashworth, Joel Bretland, and James Crooke as soon as conveniently may be to send an Account in Writing of your Proceedings under and by order of this my Warrant of Constitution, Recommending to you and the rest of the Brethren the Cultivation of the Royal Craft and your keeping in view the three Grand Principles of our Order, Brotherly Love, Relief and Truth.

Given at London under the Great Seal of Masonry and also under my Hand and Seal, the twenty-sixth day of September A.L. 5788 A.D. 1788.

W^m. Hall
Dep^y. P.G.M.

Seal

John Allen
Prov. Gr. Mar.

The following characteristics will be noted:—

- (1.) The Name and Number of the Lodge are given in the body of the document.
- (2.) The time and place of meeting are given (in many of the Warrants this was left as a blank space, and the details filled in afterwards), followed by the words "until the time and place of meeting shall with the Concurrence of me & my successors be altered, with such powers, privileges, & advantages as of right belong to regular established Lodges."
- (3.) "A list of the Members of the said Lodge with their respective Titles or Additions and the respective times of their several initiations or admissions."
- (4.) "Such sum or sums of money as shall from time to time accrue due from and be contributed by your said Lodge or the members

thereof to the Fund of Charity, and the General Fund of the said Society."

- (5.) "By virtue of this my Warrant of Constitution."
- (6.) Recommending "the three Grand Principles."
- (7.) Signed by himself (usually at the foot of the document), sometimes also by his Deputy, and the P.G.Sec. witnessing.

There are slightly varying phrases, *e.g.*, "not repugnant to" (in place of "consistent with"): the general laws &c., is a legal phraseology he affects in his earlier documents, but it would be tedious and unnecessary to specify each in detail.

He always states that contributions are for the General Fund as well as the Fund of Charity.—this was a great bone of contention in the Provinces for many years.—the levy on account of the Hall Fund meeting with strenuous opposition in all parts of the Country and causing many erasures.

As originally issued, these Warrants do not appear to have been much embellished or decorated; just the variety of size and O.E. lettering in places of emphasis, and some scrolling and flourishes about the "Know ye," &c.

Three of them, Naphtali (266 Heywood), Union (268 Ashton in Lyne), and Friendship (277 Oldham) have simple rubrication with ruled lines, around and within the main divisions.

But two, Amity (283 Haslingden) and Harmony (288 Todmorden), are tastefully embellished and decorated with emblematic figures, and in the latter there is a small signature at the bottom margin of the parchment: J. Welton del. 1793 (or 2).

These decorations are later than the original text, probably locally done some time after the Warrant was issued.

It will be noticed that the drawings cut in on the text in some places in a way that would not have occurred had the decorations been originally intended.

During the period of John Allen's rule over the Province twenty-two Lodges were Warranted by the Antients, and sixteen of the Warrants originally issued to them have passed to Lodges at present working. This does not signify so much as it would under the Moderns, for when a Lodge lapsed or was erased the Antients habitually sold the Warrant to some other Lodge and conveyed to it the vacant number; but nine of them—Lodge of Antiquity (146 Leigh), Lodge of Antiquity (178 Wigan), Ancient Union (203 Liverpool), Duke of Athol (210 Denton), Lodge of Commerce (215 Haslingden), Harmonic (216 Liverpool), Lodge of Harmony (220 Garston), St. John's (221 Bolton), Lodge of Benevolence (226 Blackburn)—have an unbroken record from the time of the first issue of the Warrant.

Was Allen's serenity ruffled by the success of the rivals?

I am afraid I have not had time to search into that, but the impression one gets is of calm stateliness and a will to "live and let live," while looking well to the affairs of his own Order. I know of no more satisfactory and impressive picture in the Masonry at the end of the eighteenth century than this continued success that crowned Allen's work, side by side with an almost equal activity by the rival organisation. Have no biographical notes been written of this worthy Mason? There are many documents in Grand Lodge from which details of his work might be gleaned, and he deserves well of his Brethren to-day.

Many Lancastrian Lodge histories refer to his having issued the Warrant and then they pass to other matters without further mention of him.

His influence upon the Province as a whole is worth defining and describing more fully.

His activities in London are better known.

He was a signatory of the Charter of Compact of Grand Chapter of July 22 1767, where his name appears as Scribe N.

He was a Steward at Grand Lodge in 1769, thereby becoming qualified for promotion to office in Grand Lodge, which he received on May 1 1777 by his appointment as Junior Grand Warden, and he was a very frequent attendant at the meetings of Grand Lodge, filling various chairs as a substitute from time to time; he was present at the ceremony of laying the foundation stone of the new hall, as Prov.G.M. for Lancashire (together with Thomas Dunckerley for Hants., Thomas Parker for Surrey, Francis Minskill for Sussex, and Charles Frederick for Kent), and also at the opening ceremony on May 23rd 1776. when Thomas Sandby, "who designed the building," was honoured with the title of "Grand Architect of the Society."

At the next meeting after his appointment as Junior Grand Warden he was in the Chair as Grand Master: Senior Grand Warden on Feb. 4th. and occupied his own Chair on April 8th 1778: while at the Grand Feast on April 29th he was again in the Senior Grand Warden's Chair, yielding office as Junior Grand Warden at the end of his year to "Charles March of the War Office." to whose Patent we have already alluded. His name also appears as a member of the Committee of the School for Girls.

A.Q.C., vol. xxxvi., p. 166, gives a few further details of his career. In addition to these he was for many years Treasurer of No. 4 Royal Somerset House and Inverness Lodge.

CLASS 4. YORKSHIRE.

In no other Province is its history so reflected by the Warrants issued to its Lodges as in Yorkshire.

In the sister County of Lancashire the fleet had sailed in stately procession over calm seas bringing its rich freight safely to harbour. Yorkshire may, at the last, have secured as heavy a cargo, but its ships were buffeted by many storms, and there was more than a suspicion of privateering in its trading.

Nearly all the Warrants issued to the Yorkshire Lodges are much decorated and illuminated, often in gold and colour, with Masonic emblems and elaborate lettering.

We have already quoted a letter from the Prov.G.Sec. in 1788 to the Grand Sec. stating that "done plain upon parchment w^d. not be satisfactory," and there was evidently a strong tradition in favour of the highly decorated document.

And it is interesting to see that this appears to have arisen through the personal sentiment of the Grand Sec., Samuel Spencer, for the place of his birth.

In 1738 a Lodge was founded to meet at the Bull's Head, Halifax and a Deputation in the usual wording was issued by the Grand Master Lord Carnarvon, and signed by J. Ward D.G.M., and in all probability its general appearance was very similar to that of the Bath and Exeter Deputation of 1732.

For some reason a duplicate Warrant was prepared and issued to them in 1765, and this copy was "witnessed" by the then Grand Sec. Samuel Spencer (John Revis was G.S. at the date of the original issue).

Beneath Samuel Spencer's signature appears the unusual personal notice "Born at Halifax in Yorkshire—His Gift." and engrossed in very small letters on the extreme lower margin of the parchment appears "Br. Michael Devon D.G.S. Fecit."; the expert engrosser whose work at Grand Lodge has already been described.

Evidently then, to pay some tribute to the Lodge in his native town, Samuel Spencer had personally incurred this expense and sent the Brethren this highly decorated document to keep him in remembrance.

In no other way could the Warrant be called "His Gift."

This appears to be the first issue in Yorkshire of a document decorated in this manner with drawings of Masonic emblems, and elaborate variation of penmanship.

The original Deputation issued in 1739 was certainly not as embellished, and the Warrants of No. 123 Richmond (1763) and 139 Sheffield (1765), issued just previously, are plainly engrossed without decoration.

But the next year after this illuminated Warrant had been presented to Halifax, a Lodge was founded at the George & Crown, Wakefield (now Unanimity 154), and the Warrant issued in the G.L. form of wording, by Lord Blaney G.M., signed by John Salter D.G.M. and witnessed by Samuel Spencer G.S.

This Warrant also is highly decorated: Bro. Hepworth, the Lodge Secretary, kindly giving the description:—"In the top right-hand corner of the Warrant are coloured drawings of the Square, the Level, and the Plumb rule, each topped by blue rosette; in the bottom left-hand corner over the signature of the Witness is a coloured drawing of the V.S.L., overlapping a Square and a pair of Compasses, with one leg hidden." The date is 15 Feb. 1766. Here also occurs the same engrosser and illuminator's signature, "Br. Michael Devon. Fecit," as in the Kent and Bristol Warrants previously described.

Thomas Tancred was appointed Provincial Grand Master for Yorkshire about the year 1771, but he does not appear to have been very active at first, and no Provincial meeting was held for three years after his appointment, nor had he appointed any Provincial officers in 1774.

In 1773 certain Brethren who for the most part were destined to play important parts in the future of Yorkshire Masonry,—Dr. Wm. Spencer, Richard Garland, Thos. Thackray, and others,—petitioned Grand Lodge "for a Constitution for forming a Lodge at the George Inn, Coney Street, in this City (York) under the Stile and Title of the Apollo, and do also agree to pay any expenses that may occur in the obtaining & supporting of the same."

This petition was granted, and the Lodge held its first meeting on Aug. 3 1773, under the Mastership of Wm. Spencer.

But the Warrant is in many respects singular: it recognises the Provincial Grand Master and purports to be issued by him, indeed, his signature appears at the top left-hand corner—Tho^s. Tancred, P.G.M.—but it is not signed by the D.P.G.M. but by Jas. Heseltine, G. Sec^y. of the Grand Lodge.

It has the usual decorations and embellishments with Masonic emblems. The wording is that of the usual G.L. Warrant model, except for the following peculiarities which influenced other Warrants subsequently issued in the Province:—

1. It states in the preamble the name of the Provincial Grand Master "under the Authority of the Grand Lodge of England, of which the Right Honourable Robert Edward Petre, Lord Petre is at present Grand Master (the special citation of the Grand Lodge of England being of course in distinction from the Grand Lodge of All England stationed at York).
2. It has the unusual phrase: "if there should not happen to be a Provincial Grand Master for the County of York at any period."
3. It omits the usual phrase "By the Provincial Grand Master's Command," but substitutes:

"Executed in the presence of"

Jas. Heseltine. G^d. Sec^y. of the G^d. Lodge.

The charges in connection with the Constitution of the Apollo amounted to £7. 17. 6., and were paid to Grand Lodge on 19 Nov. 1773: only two guineas of this was the G.L. Constitution fee, so that the exceptional costs represented the special charges made for the decorated Warrant.

After the founding of the Apollo Lodge till the end of the century thirty-one Lodges were established under the Moderns, and all but four of these

are known to have been constituted by the Provincial authorities, nor is it certain that these four were not so constituted; their Warrants are lost, so the evidence is missing. These are the Lodge at the Wild Man, Middleham, 1774 (erased 1788); at the Rodney, Kingston on Hull, 1781 (1838); St. George's, Beverley, 1782 (1829), and Albion, Skipton, 1789 (1798).

The Apollo Lodge soon assumed ascendancy over other Lodges and maintained it for many years.

On 16 Feb. 1774, the G. Sec. writes that "Bro. W^m. Spencer (the W.M.) was confirmed Deputy Provincial Grand Master, John Cordley S.G.W., Richard Garland J.G.W., Tho^s. Swann Treasurer, M. Beckwith Secretary" of the Prov.G.Lodge—a Minute on that date also stating:—

"At this Lodge the Right Worshipful Sir Thomas Tancred, Prov. Grand Master was present, and recommended a communication to be attempted with the Lodges in the Province, in order to establish the Provincial Grand Lodge, and the present officers of the Apollo Lodge should be the Provincial Grand Officers for the ensuing year, and also permitted the Lodge to make use of his name for promoting the same."

In 1776 a New Lodge was founded at the Royal Oak, Ripon, and we note the next stage in the Yorkshire methods.

The Warrant has been preserved in Grand Lodge, and shows the influence of the Apollo document.

It is issued in the name of Thomas Tancred, whose authority is cited in the preamble, but he does not himself sign it anywhere. The place of honour—the top left-hand corner—is assumed by Wm. Spencer D.P.G.M., and at the bottom right is the signature of George Russell, P.G.S.—and as in the Apollo—there is no witness nor title initials placed where a witness was intended to sign.

The phrase "if there should not happen to be &c." is also there, and the end phrasing is:—

"Given at York under our Hand and Seal of Masonry this 22^d day of June A.L. 5776. A.D. 1776

By the Provincial Grand Master's Command

Executed in the presence of

George Russell. P.G.S."

In his *History of the Apollo Lodge*, p. 87, Bro. Hughan states:—"The Royal Oak No. 495 was chartered 22 June 1776, the sum of £4. 4. 0. being credited in the Apollo accounts 5 Mar. 1777, and also £2. 2. 6. for the registration of sixteen members. The fee forwarded to Grand Lodge was only two guineas as required by the regulations for Constitution, the balance being retained by the local officials, one half of which was paid to Bro. Russell the Secretary for writing out the Warrant."

On 30 April 1777, a petition was presented to the Provincial Grand Lodge of Yorkshire (*i.e.*, the Apollo Lodge) desiring a Constitution for a Lodge at Lockwood's Coffee House, York. A Dispensation was granted for preliminary meetings to be held and a Warrant was duly issued in July 1777, for constituting the Union Lodge (now No. 236).

This corresponds in every respect with the Ripon Warrant of the previous year. The Provincial Grand Master's name and authority are merely recited in the preamble and he nowhere signs the document. William Spencer D.P.G.M. appears as signatory at the top, and George Russell P.G.S. signs below: there is no signature of a witness. The Lodge number is given—No. 504—and the wafer seal of Grand Lodge is attached.

The document is elaborately engrossed in varied type and scrolling and has the embellishments with Masonic emblems as before seen. It contains the phrase "if there should not happen to be &c." and is "Given at York. By the Provincial Grand Master's Command" and "Executed in the presence of."

Before the next Lodge was constituted,—the St. George's Lodge, Doncaster (now No. 242).—Sir Walter Vavasour had succeeded Sir Thomas Tancred as Provincial Grand Master.

He had been initiated in "The Grand Lodge of All England" in 1768. and at a date subsequent to his acceptance of his office as Provincial Grand Master was elected as a joining member of the Apollo (24 June 1779).

He does not appear to have taken much active interest in the affairs of the Province, and did not attend the meetings of the Lodge with any regularity. In the spring of 1780 Bro. Spencer wished to resign his position as D.P.G.M., and his resignation was specially considered at a meeting summoned to be held "at 4 o'clock on Tuesday the 23rd of May on very particular business,"—but the P.G.M. was not himself present, and Bro. Spencer's resignation having been accepted he was "desired to write to Sir W. Vavasour, and that the Lodge recommends Bro. R. Garland." Bro. Garland's appointment was duly notified at the next meeting of the Lodge.

The Warrant for the St. George's Lodge, Doncaster, was dated 11 July 1780: and again reproduces the characteristics of those issued under Sir Thomas Tancred.

The preamble states that it is issued by the authority of the Provincial Grand Master, Sir Walter Vavasour, but he nowhere attaches his signature.

The signature at the top left corner is that of Richard Garland D.P.G.M., and at the foot of the document that of George Russell P.G.S., and there is no signature of a witness.

It is embellished with Masonic emblems of the same character as before, and contains the final phrase "Executed in the presence of."

On December 23rd of the same year a similar Warrant was issued to the Alfred Lodge at Wetherby. This Lodge was erased in 1797, and the Warrant is preserved in Grand Lodge.

The name and authority of the P.G.M. are recited in the preamble, but he does not sign. Richard Garland D.P.G.M. signs at the top, where is also the number 433, and the wafer seal of Grand Lodge. John Camidge signs at the foot as P.G.S., and there is no witness cited.

The usual emblematic decorations occur, and the phrase "if there should not happen to be," &c., is used, as well as the line "Executed in the presence of."

Payment for the Constitution of this Lodge was not credited in Grand Lodge until 1783.

The Brethren then taking the leading part in the Apollo Lodge, and practically ruling the Province were excellent and enthusiastic Masons, and at that time were keeping in close touch with Grand Lodge: frequently the presence of G.L. officials,—Jas. Haseltine G.S., Rowland Berkeley G.Treas., and others,—is noted at the meetings of the Lodge: but gradually these Provincial officials became more and more independent and managed the affairs of the Province entirely themselves, meeting the requirements of Grand Lodge by the payment of dues, but otherwise assuming complete authority within the Province. Bro. Hughan's *History of the Apollo Lodge* details the evidence of the Masonic zeal and quality of these Brethren at that period, and it is outside the scope of this enquiry to deal more largely with their excellencies. But the generous amounts of money which Brethren in the various Yorkshire towns were prepared to pay for Masonic purposes needed scrupulously careful administration, and, in time, it was laxity in this respect that led to the decline in the prestige and influence, as well as the prosperity of the Lodge. As time went on there were larger and larger arrears due from the members: the P.G.M. himself in 1787 owing over £11, and moneys received for transmission to London were often retained for an unduly long time,—and sometimes not remitted at all.

The Lodge appeared to be satisfied with its Treasurer, Bro. Jno. Watson, but on 17 Sep. 1788 we read the Minute:—

"A letter was read from Bro. White G.S. saying that a complaint was made by the Alfred Lodge, that they had paid different sums into

Bro. Garland's hands, then D.P.G.M., which he had never remitted to the Grand Lodge. Upon enquiry the Lodge was informed by Bro. Rule that the charge was just. In consequence of which and on acct. of Bro. Garland's present unhappy circumstances, it was ordered that the deficiency should be made up out of the Lodge Fund."

But of this there was as yet no portent, the Apollo Lodge was supreme, and Richard Garland ruled the Province.

As with the Benevolent Lodge constituted at Middleham in 1774, so with the Rodney at Kingston on Hull in 1781, the only evidence of their having been constituted by the Province is that of payments made to the P.G.Treas. for their Constitution.

There is no evidence that separate Minutes or Accounts were kept for the Province as distinct from the Lodge.

Sir Walter Vavasour continued indifferent to his duties as P.G.M., and in 1783 Bro. Garland proposed in open Lodge that he should be asked to resign.—and a letter was accordingly sent him intimating that the presence of the P.G.M. was absolutely necessary on certain Masonic occasions, and asking him to answer "whether or no it would be convenient to him on these principles to continue P.G.M. for the County of York."

Sir Walter courteously pointed out that he had realized and urged his unfitness for the post when first asked to take it, but "he is very ready to resign it into more proper hands"; whereupon on 24 June 1784 "Bro. Garland proposed Richard Slater Milnes Esq. to be a member of this Lodge, and to be raised to the Sublime degree and being a case of emergency he was ballotted for and admitted." On 22 Sep. 1784 it was proposed and carried "That Bro. Garland be requested to write R. S. Milnes Esq., desiring he would please to appoint a day when he would attend the Lodge to be installed into the Office of P.G.M." He attended on 3rd Nov. and was duly installed and "was pleased to appoint Bro. Garland as his deputy."

It reminds one of Bro. Charles Shirreff's comment on the like occasion in Shropshire a couple of years later. Very few of the other Lodges had any representatives at the meetings or any voice in the appointment: the formalities with Grand Lodge appear to have been secondary considerations with Bro. Garland, and the Patent of appointment did not arrive until the end of the year.

This period of Provincial History between the jettisoning of Sir Walter and adoption of the new fledged Mason Slater Milnes (March 1783 to Nov. 1784) was not, however, without its Provincial events and Provincial duties: Brethren at Hull petitioned for the Constitution of a Lodge: what was to be done?

It was not likely that a little thing like that would be any difficulty to Richard Garland. Grand Lodge would be satisfied with its dues, a wafer seal and number were easily to be obtained: a very capable and amenable young man, quite new to Masonry had just been appointed as Secretary—why hesitate?

So a Warrant was issued in due form, based entirely on the Apollo wording, and serves to this day as the authority for the Minerva Lodge No. 250 Hull.

Richard Garland signs at the top left, with the letters P.S., and the Number and Seal of G.L. are duly affixed: then he proceeds to the preamble:—

"To all and every our Right Worshipful, Worshipful and Loving Brethren, We, Richard Garland, Esquire Provincial Superintendent of the Most Ancient and Honourable Society of Free and Accepted Masons for the County and City of York, under the Authority of the Grand Lodge of England of which His Royal Highness Henry Frederick Duke of Cumberland is at present Grand Master."

He includes, with no compunction, the direction: "if there should not happen to be a Provincial Grand Master for the County of York": and the document ends:—

“ Given at York under our Hand & Seal of Masonry this 15th day of
September A.L. 5787: A.D. 1783.

Executed in the presence of

Chris^r. Wilson

Prov. Gnd. Sec^y. ”

The document is embellished as former ones. Bro. S. O. Watson, the present Secretary of No. 250, most courteously sent me the following details:—

“ All the engrossing is in one hand, the names of the founders are in bolder block letters in blue ink.

There is a general similarity in the handwriting of the whole document, including Chris^r. Wilson’s signature.

All the embellishments are in gilt, a few of the principal words of the document are also in gilt, and the names of Coulson and others are in blue ink, as stated, otherwise all the wording is in black ink.”

As noted before, it should be realized that Chris^r. Wilson, who was himself the engrosser and illuminator, had only been initiated in the Apollo Lodge a few months previously, and was not at the time this Warrant was issued a Master Mason.

It was not long before the new P.G.M. and the new P.G.S., both scarce fledged Masons, were called upon to lend their aid to the real ruler of the Province in issuing another Warrant.

The Newtonian at Knaresborough was constituted on 22 Jan. 1785, and the Warrant follows the wording of the Apollo.

It is coloured and gilded, and embellished like the Minerva document by Chris. Wilson. The Lodge having been erased in 1851, the Warrant is preserved in the Grand Lodge Library, but is too worn and defaced for successful reproduction.

It bears the signature of R. S. Milnes at the top left, as well as citing his authority in the preamble. It is signed at the bottom by Richard Garland D.P.G.M., and by W^m. Johnson P.G.C. and witnessed by Chris^r. Wilson P.G.S. The expression “ Executed in the presence of ” is no longer used; Bro. Garland must have felt a little more comfortable about this issue, with the support of the Provincial Grand Chaplain.

But with the issue to the Duke of York’s Lodge No. 529, Doncaster, on Aug. 23 1788, a new phase in Yorkshire practice regarding the constituting of its Lodges begins.

I have no knowledge of the whereabouts of this document, and the Lodge was erased in 1828, but in the Supplement to Delanoy’s *History of No. 242*, a copy is given:—

“ Richard Slater Milnes Esq., Provincial Grand Master for the County of York

To the Worshipful Charles Plummer, Richard Staveley, and Thomas Girdler, Members of the Most Ancient and Honourable Society of Free and Accepted Masons and respectively Master Masons.
Brethren.

In consequence of an application from you and several other respectable Brethren, residing in or near the Town of Doncaster, in the County of York, to me as Provincial Grand Master for the said County (under the authority of the Grand Master of England) requesting a Constitution for the holding of a regular Lodge of the Order under his authority, at the Black Boy Inn, in Doncaster aforesaid by the style or title of the Duke of York’s Lodge

I do, by virtue of the power and authority committed to me by the Most Noble and Worshipful Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, Supreme Grand Master of the Order, hereby authorise and empower you, the said Charles Plummer, as Master, and you the said Richard Staveley and Thomas Girdler as Wardens, with the assistance of a proper number of other brethren, to open a Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons, under the title of the Duke of York's Lodge, at the Black Boy Inn in Doncaster aforesaid, whenever you may think proper and therein to make, pass, and raise Masons, and do and transact all Masonic business according to the regular forms of the Order. And this authority shall continue in force until you shall have received the Patent of Constitution by you applied for as aforesaid.

Given at York under our Hand & Seal of Masonry the 23rd day of August A.L. 5788. A.D. 1788

Richard S. Milnes P.G.M.

Witness. John Watson G.T.

Chris. Wilson G.S.

Bears the Seal of the Apollo Lodge, York."

It will be noticed that Richard Garland has disappeared and that no D.P.G.M. is mentioned.

The Royal Yorkshire Lodge, Keighley (or, as it was at first called, The Milnes Lodge), received a document of the same date and (*mutatis mutandis*) in identical terms and signatures.

This Dispensation—for it can be called nothing more—has continued in force in the Lodge (now No. 265), and no Warrant has ever replaced it. A Centenary Warrant was granted the Lodge on 22 Aug. 1888.

The Correspondence of Chris. Wilson with the Gd. Secy. given previously indicates that the Constitution of the Lodge at the Old Globe, Scarborough (1788), was obtained through the P.G. Lodge: the Lodge passed to the Antients in 1791.

Concerning the Albion, Skipton, I have no information: it is entered in the G. Secy.'s Register, but without note as to Provincial issue,—which is probably an oversight as it is unlikely under conditions obtaining in the Province that any exception would have been made in this instance.

On 6 Nov. 1789 the Lodge of Harmony, Halifax, received a Dispensation in similar terms to the Royal Yorkshire at Keighley—except that it is not definitely issued by the P.G.M. but by Tho^s. Thackray, who was now D.P.G.M. It is very well engrossed on vellum by Chris. Wilson, and is in very good condition, now preserved in the G.L. Library, since after fifty years' service it was superseded in 1839 by a Warrant of Confirmation, and surrendered to Grand Lodge. It is this glorification of the Dispensation (usually issued to authorise the preliminary meetings of a Lodge before its Warrant can be prepared) into an elaborately executed document, engrossed on parchment, with some pretence to permanency, that distinguishes this Yorkshire practice from that of all other Provinces.

The function which it was now made to serve was quite an irregular one; and it is evident that this is so since no ordinary Dispensation would have to be surrendered on issue of the permanent Warrant it necessarily forecasted.

The Halifax Dispensation states, after the recitation of the petitioners and terms of their application, that it is issued "by virtue of the Power and authority committed to me . . . Grand Master . . . and of the request of Richard Slater Milnes Esq^{re}. Provincial Grand Master for the County aforesaid."

It states that it is:

“Given at York under our Hand and Seal of Masonry the 6th day of Nov. A.D. 1789. A.L. 5789

By the Provincial Grand Master's Command

Tho^s. Thackray. D.P.G.M.

Witness. John Watson P.G.T.
Chris. Wilson P.G.S.”

It has the G.L. wafer seal attached, but no Lodge number. There is some variation in lettering but no emblematic embellishments.

The Loyal & Prudent, Leeds, was constituted in 1790 by the P.G.M., but the character of its constituting document is not known; the circumstances arising in connection with the delay in getting its Number assigned have already been detailed.

The Samaritan Lodge, constituted at Keighley in 1792 (now No. 286 Bacup) has a document similar to that issued to No. 275 Halifax—a Dispensation simply, citing the G.M. and P.G.M. as authorities for its issue, signed by Thomas Thackray and witnessed by Jonas Thompson A.M., P.G.C., and John Watson P.G.T.

It is dated July 4 1792, and the name of Chris. Wilson does not appear. The Rev. Jonas Thompson had been initiated in the Apollo Lodge on Nov. 2 1785; and at this meeting Bro. Wm. Spencer M.D. (P.M., P.D.P.G.M.) attended the Lodge for the last time. We shall see, however, that he continued to exercise Provincial authority long after this date.

This Dispensation to 286 has continued to be their sole authority, and a Centenary Warrant was granted them on 4 July 1892: Fidelity, Leeds (No. 289) received a Dispensation from the Provincial Authorities on 24 Sept. 1792, and continued acting under this Authority until a Warrant of Confirmation was issued by the P.G.M. Robert Pemberton Milnes (son of Slater Milnes) in 1806; and it is interesting to see the signature of John Watson P.G.T. still appearing.

Another of these Dispensations, issued for the White Hart Lodge, Huddersfield (now 290), continued in force as the sole authority for the Lodge working until a Warrant of Confirmation was received from Grand Lodge in 1822—when the Dispensation was sent to G.L. and is there preserved. Its wording is as for Harmony, Halifax; it is engrossed on vellum, much torn and defaced, with a small portion of an original seal left but not decipherable. It was issued by Tho^s. Thackray D.P.G.M., and witnessed by Jonas Thompson A.M., P.G.C., and John Watson P.G.T., and dated 1 Jan. 1793. Here also the lettering is varied, but there is no elaborate decoration.

The application for a Warrant of Confirmation is quite likely to have been prompted by the bad condition of the document, and not by its irregular character considering how common the latter circumstance was in Yorkshire.

For some unexplained reason the Brethren at Beverley received in 1793 a full Warrant: perhaps the petitioning Brethren were given the option which they preferred, and a tariff of costs arranged,—as would appear from the letter to Whitby from the Prov. G. Treasurer quoted previously.

This Warrant of the Constitutional Lodge No. 294 Beverley is in all respects after the G.L. model, has the G.L. wafer seal, the Lodge number, the P.G.M.'s signature at the top, the D.P.G.M.'s (Thomas Thackray) below, and is witnessed by John Watson P.G.T. and Chris. Wilson P.G.S.

The Royal Brunswick No. 296 Sheffield also is in this form with the same signatures, except that Wm. Spencer M.D., P.D.P.G.M., signs in place of Thomas Thackray, while the decorations and illuminations are in Chris. Wilson's best style.

In 1794, however, there is a recurrence of the Dispensation form: the Lodge of Hope, Bradford, No. 302, received one dated 23 March 1794, in the same form of words as those issued to Huddersfield, Keighley, and Halifax.

A seal is attached, apparently not the G.L. wafer, but a seal of red wax, very much cracked and not easily decipherable.

The document is described by Bro. Allan Wood as being probably written on paper, much folded, worn and frayed, but now mounted and framed, and the engrossing is of poor quality and undecorated. It is not signed by the P.G.M., his name only occurring in the body of the document, and it states:—

“ Given at York under our hand & seal of Masonry this 23rd day of March. A.D. 1794. A.L. 5794

By the Provincial Grand Master's Command

W^m. Spencer. A.D.P.G.M.

Witness. Jno. Watson P.G.T.”

This has remained the sole authority for the working of the Lodge, and a Centenary Warrant was issued on May 7 1894.

In the short History of the Lodge of Hope published for the Centenary Proceedings of the Lodge in 1894 this Dispensation is described as “ A Warrant issued by the Grand Lodge of All England, at that time established at York and exercising certain of the powers of Grand Lodge.

This, of course, it is *not*, as will have been made abundantly clear: it is a temporary Dispensation issued by an Acting Deputy Provincial Grand Master under authority of the “ Moderns ” Grand Lodge: and one of which the authority has been indefinitely prolonged by the transparent device of stating in the last paragraph of the document that “ this Authority shall continue in full force until you shall have received the patent of Constitution by you applied for,” and then taking no further steps to obtain it.

It need hardly, I hope, be mentioned that in putting this issue with regard to these Yorkshire Dispensations thus plainly I am in no way impugning the validity or regularity of the Lodges still working with these most interesting documents. They have been duly registered in Grand Lodge, paid dues continuously, been recognised at the Union, and rewarded for their Century of Masonic work by the grant of a Centenary Warrant: but all that does not alter the fact that the founders of their Lodges had had foisted upon them very irregular “ Constitutions.”

The Philanthropic, Leeds, No. 304, was constituted 21 Aug. 1794 by Provincial Dispensation, and worked under this document—which, it appears, is not now extant—for five years, and then had a Provincial Warrant issued on 21 Aug. 1799. Lane states in error in his *Masonic Records* (2nd edition, p. 232) that this was a G.L. Warrant. It is in usual G.L. wording, signed top left by R. S. Milnes P.G.M., and at the bottom by Wm. Spencer P.D.G.M., and witnessed by John Watson P.G.T. and Chris. Wilson P.G.S., the engrossing and embellishments being all the usual production of Chris. Wilson.

It has the Lodge number and the G.L. wafer seal attached.

The document is very faded and indistinct.

The occasion of the issue of this regular Warrant in place of the Dispensation will be understood from the Minutes of 14 Nov. 1797:—

“ An affair was brought forward respecting Bro. Wm. Wright accusing us as not being legal Masons, for witch he was verrey sorrey for, and freely forgiven by the Master and Members ”:

and 16 April 1799:—

“ Brother Senior Warden made a move that the Lodge should have a Warrant of Constitution, agreed unanimously that the Secretary should write to Brother Watson to now the expense of the same.”

It is interesting to note that this Warrant was actually issued after the passing of the Act of 39 Geo. III., cap 79: but of course the two months' grace had not quite expired.

The Alfred Lodge, Leeds (No. 306) had a still briefer Dispensation, but has not the original document now in its possession: there is a copy of it in the original Minute Book.

The Lodge now works with a Warrant, but I have no information as to the date or origin of its issue except that in the Treasurer's Book there is an entry dated 18 April 1796 that £5. 15. 6 was paid for Constitution &c., and Lane gives the Constitution date as 27 April 1795, which is that of this document.

The Copy of the Dispensation reads:—

To Brothers W^m. Hodgson, John Simpson, Geo. Ireland, Matthew Vicars and John Kemplay, Members of the Most Ancient and Honourable Society of Free & Accepted Masons
Brethren

You are hereby authorised to assemble as a regular Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons under the Title or Denomination of the Alfred Lodge at a private Room in the Borough of Leeds and to make, pass and raise Masons as occasion may require and also to do every other act as a regular Lodge until a Warrant of Constitution shall be made out.

Given at York under our Hand & Seal of Masonry

This 27th day of April A.D. 1795. A.L. 5795

By the Provincial Grand Master's Command

W^m. Spencer P.D.P.G.M.

Witness. John Watson P.G.T.

The Loyal Halifax Lodge was constituted at the Ring of Bells, Upper Kirkgate, Halifax, on 28 Jan. 1796, and continued working in Halifax till it lapsed about 1806; three years later it was revived, without further authority, and became the Lodge of Prince Frederick at Heptonstall, moving to Hebden Bridge in 1822, where it still works with the number 307.

All this time it has worked under the authority of the Dispensation issued by William Spencer signing, as we have seen he signed many documents, as Past Deputy P.G.M.: there never has been any confirming Warrant, and the Brethren have never applied for one.

Bro. Baxter, who specially inspected this document for me, states that it is on paper, and is so beautifully written that it is hard to believe that it is not printed from a plate; the seal is slightly cracked and not at all clear.

Its wording is, *mutatis mutandis*, identical with that of the Alfred Lodge, and it is signed by Spencer and witnessed by Watson.

No. 308 Eastwood was originally founded as the Prince George at Haworth, and from 13 Feb. 1796 to 2 Dec. 1818 worked with a similar Dispensation, issued as the others entirely by the veteran P.D.P.G.M., and witnessed by the P.G.T., but at the later date, they obtained a Warrant of Confirmation signed by the Duke of Sussex, and were granted a Centenary Warrant on Dec. 12 1895. The Dispensation was retained by the Lodge when the Confirming Warrant was issued.

Of the Ebenezer, Pateley Bridge, 1796-1822: Allman's, Almonbury (1799-1832) and Mariner's, Selby (1799-1822), the only evidence is that they are cited in the G.Sec.'s Register as having been constituted by the P.G.L. of York.

The letter respecting the Constitution of the Lion, Whitby, written by the P.G.T. John Watson to Bro. G. Newball the Secy. of the Britannia Lodge has already been given.

The Lodge decided to incur the expense of a Warrant, and it was issued by the P.G.M. and dated 14 Jan. 1797.

It is not signed by Milnes, but has the seal of G.L. and number.

The wording entirely follows the G.L. model.

The signatures are the usual ones of Wm. Spencer P.D.P.G.M. with Watson and Wilson as witnesses.

The engrossing and decorations are by Christopher Wilson.

The Warrants issued by the Grand Lodge of All England do not come within the category of Provincial Warrants, since that body was acting by independent authority, and recognized no obligations to the other governing bodies.

CLASS 5. CHESHIRE.

Although it is regarding this Province that the term Provincial Grand Master is first used,—for Col. Francis Columbine is cited as such in 1725 in the “List of Regular Constituted Lodges,” in G.L. records,—yet it is not without advantage that it should be the last in our survey, for the essential differences in its Warrants can now be better appreciated.

Provincial Masters continued to be elected annually by the Chester Lodges (though in 1727 Capt. Hugh Warburton was also *appointed* by G.L.) until 1756, after which the appointment was made by the Grand Master alone.

The interesting “Book of the Provincial Grand Master” now in the Bodleian Library gives no clue as to its date; it may have been prepared at any time before 1750; its injunction that the “Armes of all the Provincial Grand Masters” are to be “painted, Quarter’d with the Mason’s Arms,” may lend strength to the contention that this book (prepared for the names of the Provincial Grand Officers, but never used) dates back to the time of the Herald Randle Holme III.—but that is at best a mere conjecture.

There is nowhere any evidence of an early issue of Warrants.

The Certificate of Constitution of the Lodge meeting at the Star in Watergate Street, Chester, in 1766, is still preserved, and reads:—

“We whose names are hereunto subscribed did meet at the house of our brother Daniel Coleclough at the Star in the Watergate Street and did then and there Constitute a new and regular Lodge in full form and thereof did appoint our Brother John Griffith Master, our Brother Charles Kerney Senior Warden and our Brother Charles Haswell, Junior Warden.

(Signed)	John Page	P.G.M.
	Edward Orme	D.P.G.M.
	Will ^m . Blackett	S.P.G.W.
	R. Wilbraham	J.P.G.M.

Charles Townsend P.G.S^r.

This may have been the usual certificate to Grand Lodge after the official action taken in response to a Deputation, and is no indication of a Provincial Warrant.

The earliest indication of Constitution—*i.e.*, Warranting—by the Provincial G.M. occurs with the beginning of the G.Sec.’s Register, which cites all the Lodges after 1786 (except Independent Congleton 1789, and a Lodge in the Cheshire Militia 1794) as having been constituted by Sir R. Salusbury Cotton, the P.G.M.

But evidently the hold of the Moderns Grand Lodge upon the Province was not strong.

The D.P.G.M. Pattison Ellames, writing to the G.S. on Sep. 7 1786 about non-payments by Lodges, says: “I believe it will be prudent in you to make up the affair at any rate; for I have much reason to fear that otherwise there will be a defection of *all* the Cheshire Lodges.”

And Bro. John Brady P.J.G.W., “Master of the Provincial Lodge at the Feathers in Chester,” writes to the G.Sec. on Dec. 28 1786 on the same subject, and says: “You may rest assured that in this Lodge you are treating with Gentlemen, & the main support of Masonry in the County Palatine, and as the thread of Masonry is very finely spun we must not strain too hard.”

The relation between the rulers of the Province and the Lodges of the Antients is shown by the following letter written by Sir R. S. Cotton in 1786.

It has kindly been supplied to me by Bro. H. Kelly, of the Combermere Lodge of Union No. 295, and he states that he recently discovered the original

Minute Book of the Lodge No. 47 (Knights of Malta) meeting at Macclesfield from 1764 to 1794 in which the Minute appears:—

“ June 12 1786.—Received a letter from R. S. Cotton of which the following is a copy:—

The Officers of the Grand Lodge at Chester have desired me to request the attendance of you, the Wardens & Brethren of your Lodge, with your aprons jewels & medals at 10 o'clock on Monday morning the 26th day of this month, at the Exchange in Chester to go in procession to S^t. Johns Church there.

As we hear you act under the Irish Constitution we will ensure your admission that day among the Brethren at Chester by granting you our dispensation, which we hope will induce you to submit to hold your Lodge in future under our Provincial jurisdiction as we should be very happy to Constitute you in ample form.

I am Brother

Yours affectionately.

R. S. Cotton. P.G.M.

Combermere Abbey. June 6 1786.

To the Master of a Lodge of Freemasons at the New Angel Macclesfield.
To the Care of Mr. Samuel Lankford. Treasurer.”

The allusion to “ an Irish Constitution ” with reference to the Antients is notable.

I am further indebted to Bro. Kelly for information of another valuable find. He recently discovered a Copy of the 1784 Book of Constitutions “ hidden away in a drawer by itself.” There were some sixteen or eighteen blank pages bound at the end of the printed book on most of which some written matter had been entered by Brother Timothy Jones, who died about 1830.

Of this worthy brother, Bro. Kelly says: “ We have his portrait in oils hanging over the entrance door to the Lodge with sword in hand as Tyler; he filled every office in his time and must have been an enthusiastic Mason. Whilst Secretary his Minutes are very interesting to read, and he seems to have been a stickler for etiquette and strict conformity to the Book of Constitutions.”

On one of these pages was a Copy of the Warrant for founding the Beneficent Lodge No. 545 in Macclesfield in the year 1789.

Bro. Kelly adds: “ I am afraid the original is not in existence as the P.G. Lodge documents were, I believe, burnt many years ago in a disastrous fire.”

Copy of the Warrant of the Beneficent Lodge
545 Macclesfield. Granted 19 June 1789.

In the name of the Most High God, to Whom be Glory & Honour
Sir Robert Salusbury Cotton, Baronet

Provincial Grand Master of the Antient and Honourable Society of Free and accepted Masons in Cheshire, to all the Brethren wherever dispersed throughout the world—Sendeth Greeting.

Know Ye that by and with the advice & counsel of our Grand Officers we do *Constitute* and *Form* certain of our brethren into a Regular Lodge of Free & Accepted Masons, by the name of The Beneficent Lodge, and hereby empower them to meet, from time to time at the New Angel in the Town of Macclesfield in the County of Chester, or elsewhere, to make & raise Masons and to do all other Acts, which may lawfully be done by Masons in Lodge assembled, and we do appoint John Legh Esquire Master of the said Lodge for one whole year next ensuing the date named, strictly charging the Lodge aforementioned to appoint his Successors, the Masters of the said Lodge, according to the Laws of Masonry. And whereas at a meeting held under our Dispensation for the Election of Officers for the ensuing year Nathan Jackson gentleman, & Charles Roe esquire have been elected Wardens of the said Lodge, Samuel Lankford Esquire Treasurer and

John Bertles gentleman Secretary we do approve the Election of the said Brethren and hereby confirm them in their office.

Given under our hand and seal of Masonry the nineteenth day of June in the Year of Masonry Five thousand seven Hundred & Eighty nine.

R. S.

Seal

Cotton. P.G.M.

Endorsed on the back appears:—

Officers present—P. Ellames D.G.M.: John Buckley D.G.W., J. Ready J.G.W., Thomas Crane G.O., John Larden G.S. & Ed. Thelwal G.C.

Note. Inspected, T. Jones by whom this Warrant is returned. 1 August 1822 Year of Masonry, 5826 to the Provincial Grand Lodge, Chester.

Strangely enough, a few weeks afterwards I received from Bro. E. W. Rowsell, of Colwyn Bay, another Copy of this same Warrant also made by Bro. Timothy Jones, of which a reproduction is given. It has come to light quite independently of the other. Bro. Rowsell states: "It was brought to me by a man with whom we do a little business who says that he found it among various papers belonging to his father, lately deceased. I understand his father was a Manx Mason who, no doubt, migrated from Cheshire."

This Copy has been written by Timothy Jones on an indenture parchment: certain of the words (which come out least distinctly in the photograph) he has written in a pale red ink, and he has affixed a seal bearing a crown surrounded by the word Macclesfield boldly printed.

Below the Copy of the Warrant appears in the same handwriting the following notes:—

"N.B. The members of the above Lodge (with the exception of Bro: Tim^y. Jones) were suspended by a Decree of the Provincial Grand Lodge (by and with the consent and approbation of the Grand Lodge of England) bearing date the 15th day of September A.D. 1820 And in the year of Masonry 5824—for disobedience of orders, and acting contumaciously, contrary to the Constitutions of Masonry for which they were suspended.

And the following Members (only) were Restored on the recommendation of Bro. Tim^y. Jones by a Decree of Restoration bearing date the 14th day of July 1821 under the hand and of the R^t. Worshipful Edward Venables Townshend D.P.G.M. in the Year of Masonry 5825—

Seal
cut out

Charles Graves	Master (not legally Installed).
Enos Cope	S.W.
Rob ^t . Smith	J.W.
Edward Johnson	S.D.
John Frost	J.D.
Isaac Lowe	I.G.
Peter Swindells	
Tho ^s . Pennington	P.Master.

Not admitted—

W^m. Bolton and Cha^s. Bradbock not included in the order of Restoration."

On the back of the document there has been written the names of the Officers present—(presumably at the Constitution of the Lodge)—with their ranks exactly as in Bro. Kelly's copy, followed by the note:—

“ The Warrant, a Copy of which is exhibited on the other side hereof was Returned to Chester by Bro. Tim^y. Jones 1st August 1822 and in the year of Masonry 5826. Tim^y. Jones.”

Comparison of the wording of this copy in the photograph with that given from Bro. Kelly's book shows only a difference of spelling the name Lankford and Langford, and the use of the word “ named ” instead of “ hereof.”

Although the Lodge of the Antients to whom Sir R. S. Cotton had addressed his kindly and persuasive letter three years before continued payments to their Grand Lodge until 1794, and then returned their Warrant which was issued to a New Lodge at Hinckley where it still meets as the Knights of Malta Lodge, it is evident that a considerable section of the Lodge yielded to his blandishments, for there is a note in the Antients G.L. Minute Book:—

“ Feb. 1791, received information from Macclesfield that in 1790 No. 47 took a ‘ Modern ’ Constitution ”;

and this new Warrant shows that their Treasurer Samuel Lankford was among the captured ones, while the names of John Legh, Charles Roe and John Birtles which appear in this Warrant are all included in the Membership Roll of No. 47 Antients.

The unusual wording of this Warrant will not have escaped notice: except that it definitely constitutes Brethren into a regular Lodge and appoints Officers, it has little in common with the Grand Lodge model with which we are so familiar, nor does it appear to derive greatly from the P.G.M.'s Patent.

In view of the Provincial issues which follow it will be of interest to look at a Warrant issued by the Antients.

This is the wording of the Warrant of the Lodge first held at Mottram in Longdendale, now No. 104 Stockport:—

		Kelly	Grand Master
No. 139.	L. Dermott for	W ^m . Osborn	J. Gibson
	W ^m . Dickey S.G.W.	D.G.M.	J.G.W.

To All whom it may Concern

We, the Grand Lodge of the most Ancient & Honourable Fraternity of Free and Accepted Masons (according to the old Constitutions granted by His Royal Highness Prince Edwin at York, Anno Domini nine hundred twenty and six and the Year of Masonry Four thousand nine hundred twenty and six) in ample form assembled, viz. The Right Worshipful and Right Honourable Tho^s. Erskine Earl of Kelly, Lord Viscount Fenton, Baron of Dittenween, in Great Britain. Grand Master of Masons; the Worshipful Mr. William Osborn. Deputy Grand Master; the Worshipful Mr. William Dickey Senior Grand Warden; and the Worshipful James Gibson Esq^{re}. Junior Grand Warden (with the approbation and consent of the Warranted Lodges held within the Cities and Suburbs of London and Westminster) do hereby authorise and empower our trusty and well beloved Brethren, viz. Captain Daniel Whittle, one of our Master Masons. Mr. John Turner his Senior Warden, and Mr. Thomas Stead his Junior Warden, to form and hold a Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons aforesaid, at the sign of the Star in the Town of Mottram Longdendale, and County of Chester upon the first Thursday in every Kalendar month, and on all seasonable & lawful occasions; and in the said Lodge (when duly congregated) to admit and make Free Masons, according to the most ancient and honourable custom in the Royal Craft in all ages and Nations throughout the known world.

And we do hereby further authorise and empower our said trusty and well beloved Brethren Messrs. Daniel Whittle, John

Turner, and Thomas Stead (with the consent of the members of their Lodge) to nominate chuse and install their successors to whom they shall deliver this Warrant, and invest them with their Powers and Dignities as Freemasons &c. And such successors shall in like manner nominate chuse and install their successors &c. &c. &c. Such installation to be upon (or near) every St. John's Day during the continuance of this Lodge for ever.

Providing the above named Brethren, and all their Successors always pay due respect to this Right Worshipful Grand Lodge, otherwise this Warrant to be of no force nor virtue.

Given under our Hands and the Seal of Our Grand Lodge in London, this twenty first day of October, in the year of Our Lord, One thousand seven hundred sixty and five and in the year of Masonry Five thousand seven hundred sixty and five

Sg^d. Lau. Dermott

Grand Secretary.

Note. This Warrant is Registered
in the Grand Lodge Book. Vol. 3rd. Letter C.

Except for the Copy of the Warrant to the Beneficent Lodge, we have no record of the earlier Warrants issued by Sir R. S. Cotton, who had shown his brotherly kindness towards the Brethren of the rival Grand Lodge by enticing them under his own banner.

But the Warrants of 287, 293 and 295 are preserved, and these show that it was the Antients form of words that most influenced him in the issues he made.

No. 287 Unanimity, Stockport, received its Warrant in the following terms; it was then numbered 509 on the register of the Moderns:—

To All whom it may Concern

We the Provincial Grand Lodge of the most Ancient and Honourable Fraternity of Free and Accepted Masons in the County of Chester in ample form assembled. The Worshipful Sir Robert Salusbury Cotton, Baronet, Provincial Grand Master in and for the said County of Chester do hereby authorise and empower our trusty and well beloved Brethren Peter Sidebotham, being our Master Mason, Alexandra Parkinson his Senior Warden, and Patrick McDonald his Junior Warden to form and hold a Lodge of free and accepted Masons at the sign of the Anchor in Stockport or elsewhere in Stockport in the County of Chester on the first Wednesday of each full moon every Month and on all seasonable times and lawful occasions by the name and style of the Lodge of Unanimity and in the said Lodge when duly congregated to admit & make Freemasons according to the Most Ancient & Honourable Customs of the Royal Craft in all ages and nations throughout the known world, and we do hereby further authorise and empower our said trusted & well beloved Brethren Peter Sydebottom, Alexandra Parkinson and Patrick McDonald to nominate, chuse, and install their successors to whom they shall deliver this Warrant and invest them with their powers and dignities as Freemasons, and such persons shall in like manner nominate, chuse and install their successors, such Installation to be upon or near every St. John's Day during the continuance of the Lodge for ever: provided the aforesaid Brethren and all their successors always pay due respect to this Right Worshipful Provincial Grand Lodge otherwise this Warrant to be of no force or value.

Given under the hand of the Deputy Provincial Grand Master, and the Seal of our Provincial Grand Lodge in Chester the 12th day of July in the Year of Our Lord one thousand seven hundred and

ninety two, and the Year of Masonry five thousand seven hundred and ninety two.

P. W.

Seal

Ellames D.P.G.M.

This Warrant, 'it will be seen, emanates from the *Provincial Lodge*, not as the usual Moderns type from the G.M. himself as the fountain of honour and authority. And this is in keeping with the traditions of this Province. All Lodges to be constituted had to journey to Chester and meet the Provincial Lodge there, paying their own expenses, and a good deal towards the Provincial Lodge expenses as well.

The next Lodge Constituted was the King's Friends at Nantwich (now 293), and its terms are practically the same: but it leaves out all reference to the P.G.M., and is issued as from the P.G. Lodge over the signature of the D.P.G.M. alone.

On the back of the Warrant the following signatures occur:—

“Provincial Officers present,—Tho^s. Cowley P.G.S. John Wilbraham P.J.W. Page Godfrey P.G.O (*i.e.*, P.G.Orator). Geo. French P.G.Sec^y.”

A Warrant was also issued to a new Lodge at Macclesfield the same year, and bears date June 24 1793: this is now No. 295 The Combermere Lodge of Union.

Evidently the Warrant had not been actually prepared by that date, but was dated back, as we have seen was so commonly done elsewhere, for there is a letter to the G.S. in the G.L. Library which reads:—

“Chester. 28 June 1793.

Sir . . . I shall be glad you will let me know the number of the New Lodge, and a Copy of Warrant as soon as you can, likewise of a Certificate, and to know what fee I must Charge upon a Dispensation and Constitution . . .

Geo. French P.G.S.”

Whether any dissatisfaction had been expressed with the wording of former Warrants is not disclosed, but we may be sure that Grand Lodge did not supply the Copy for the Warrant that was actually issued, for again it is of the same Antients' model; differing only that the name of the P.G.M. does not occur in the preamble, which says: “We, the Right Worshipful Provincial Grand Lodge . . . in ample form assembled, Do hereby &c.” and that it is stated to be “Given under the Hand of the Deputy P.G.M. and Seal of our P.G. Lodge in Chester,” but is signed by R. S. Cotton P.G.M.

The Warrant issued to the now extinct Lodge at the Crown Inn, Nantwich, in 1794 has not survived: the information that it was a Provincial issue being the entry to that effect in the G.Sec.'s Register.

Considerable interest must always centre round the Warrant of No. 320, for it was the last to be issued before the Act of 39 Geo. III., c. 79, put a stop to New Warrants.

It is of some importance to our general study to trace a few details in the history of the founding and warranting of that Lodge, for it helps us to realise how completely this eighteenth century organisation had become overlooked and forgotten even in quite recent years by responsible officials in Grand Lodge.

I am indebted to the much respected veteran P.M. of the Lodge, Wor. Bro. John Wagstaffe, for much of the following history.

The Dispensation granted on 22 Sep. 1798 by Charles Hamilton has already been referred to.

Extant Minutes show that a meeting was held on Sep. 29, when seven Brethren were "reported," *i.e.*, nominated as Candidates. The next day an item is recorded:—

"To expenses at the Installation of the Officers at the
opening of the Dispensation ... £1. 19. 7."

Oct. 24 1798, Six of the above initiated (including James Kershaw who became Secretary on Jan. 1 1799) and four others nominated, and so the Lodge continued in active work till on Sep. 1 1799 the following letter (which is quoted in full by Lane in the Preface to his 2nd edition of *Masonic Records*) was received:—

"Chester. 1 Sept. 1799.

Sir and Bro.,

I am directed by the D.P.G.M. to acquaint you that he and the other officers of the P.G.L. will be ready on Friday the 6th inst. to Constitute your Lodge, for which purpose he requests the attendance of your officers at the Feathers Inn at 12 o'clock on that day.

The reason of his wishing this to be done so soon is that your Lodge may be registered in due time according to the late Act of Parliament, and the 11th inst. is the last day allowed for that purpose.

To prevent delay or confusion I have sent a messenger on purpose, by whom I shall be obliged for your answer.

The D.P.G.M. will hold a special Lodge on Friday at which no other business than the constituting of your Lodge will be transacted.

I am, Sir

Your very obedient Servant & Brother

C. D. Henchman P.G.S.

To Mr. James Kershaw

Secretary to the Lodge of Freemasons. Mottram. Manchester."

A Minute of the Provincial Grand Lodge of Cheshire, dated Sep. 6 1799, reads:—

"The Dep.Prov.G.M. held a special Prov. G. Lodge and Constituted the Lodge of Loyalty at the Feathers Hotel, Chester. The New Lodge paid for the entertainment."

And the Loyalty Lodge account of Sep. 7 1799 reads:—

To Cash paid for Warrant	£5. 5. 0
.. .. The Prov ^l . Grand Sec. & Tyler	1. 11. 6
.. .. A Messenger from Chester	12. 6
.. .. Provincial Grand Lodge bill for entertainment	9. 18. 6
To Expenses of Six Officers going to Chester to have the Lodge Constituted	10. 8. 7

A total expense of £27. 16. 1—no small sum in those days: perhaps equivalent to about £100 to-day.

The Warrant achieved at such cost is still preserved in the Lodge. It is written on parchment, pasted upon boards, glazed and framed in a very old fashioned but somewhat common style:—

To all and every Worshipful & Loving Brethren.

Seal of
of
P.G.L.

We, Sir Robert Salusbury Cotton Baronet Grand Master of the Most Ancient and Honourable Society of Free and Accepted Masons, in the County of Chester send greetings.

Know ye that we, of the great trust and confidence reposed in our trusty and well beloved Brother John Postlethwaite of Mottram in the County of Chester, do hereby Constitute and appoint him the said John Postlethwaite Master of the Lodge of Loyalty No. 585 in the said County of Chester with full Power and Authority, in due form, to make Masons and also to do and execute all and every such other Acts and Things appertaining to the said office as usually have been and ought to be done and Executed by other Masters of regular Lodges, and that he promote on all occasions whatever may be for the honour and advantage of Masonry and the benefit of the Grand Charity.

Given at Chester under our hand and seal of Masonry this tenth day of October A.L. 5799. A.D. 1799

By the Grand Masters Command.

Sg^d. Chas. Hamilton D.P.G.M.
Sg^d. F. W. F. Smith P.S.G.W.

Witness

Sg^d. C. D. Henchman P.G.S.

This could only have been given after due reference to Grand Lodge since it cites in the body of the Warrant the number of the Lodge in the G.L. Register No. 585, and moreover the entry has been duly made in the G. Sec.'s Register.

It appears, however, that it was not until the following April that the necessity for registration with the Clerk of the Peace was complied with. Minute. 1800. April 9th:—

	£	s.	d.
To Cash paid Joseph Bond for three journeys to Stockport on Lodge Business (Registration of Members under the New Act) ...		6.	0
„ Cash paid. Clerk's Fee for making affidavit to the Register		2.	0
„ Cash paid for Postage of the Register to Chester		1.	0

and the Lodge then continued a long and honourable career of full Masonic life till on Jan. 5 1898 a petition was made for a Centenary Warrant, only to find most unexpected obstacles at Grand Lodge, where it was stated that the authorities could not trace issue of any Warrant, though they admitted having received fees for 100 years.

Rather than be baulked of their rights the Brethren petitioned for a Warrant of Confirmation, though the Warrant of Oct. 10 1799 had been taken to G.L. for inspection, the Minute reading that:—

“After Inspection by Grand Lodge Officers of the Lodge's Warrant it was deemed advisable, in order to remove any possible doubts, informalities or irregularities, with respect to the Lodge Warrant (it having been granted by the Provincial Grand Master) that this course should be adopted.”

The Warrant of Confirmation, dated 23rd June 1898, was duly received, solemnly stating in its recital:—

“And whereas the Brethren comprising the said Lodge have by their Memorial represented to us that their said Warrant has been lost and cannot be found,”

and cost the Lodge two guineas.

The Centenary Warrant quickly followed, dated 1 Sep. 1898, for which a further five guineas were paid.

It must be rare for a Lodge to have been so unfortunate as to experience such mulcting at both ends of its century of Masonic work.

Could anything better illustrate the contention made at the opening of this study of Provincial Warrants that their significance and authority had with the lapse of time been forgotten, and many of the details connected with the important Provincial organisation of the Moderns passed quite out of mind?

5. CONCLUSION.

Not only the importance but the surprising independence of the Provincial organisation of the Moderns during the latter half of the eighteenth century will be realized from the detailed survey we have given to its Warrants and other forms of "Constitution."

But the final impression is, that however useful this organisation may at first have been, and however successful in maintaining the supremacy of the Moderns Grand Lodge against the increasing competition of the Antients, yet there were within it very dangerous elements making for disintegration, the effects of which were increasingly apparent in certain parts of the country, and became still more pronounced in the early years of the new century before the Union happily put an end to the system, and secured a firmer central control.

The Moderns Grand Lodge had increasing troubles within and without, and its chief concern with outlying Lodges was that dues and returns should be regularly made, to maintain its central Charities and relieve its crushing burden of debt.

As from this distance of time we are able to take a broad view of the circumstances, we can better appreciate how essentially necessary the Union was, if the Grand Lodge of the Moderns was to survive and maintain the supremacy of English Freemasonry throughout the world.

After the Union the troubles of the Craft were by no means over; wars, and social and economic crises, retarded its growth; conflicts still arose within its ranks—not always wisely quelled, and calling for judicious and sympathetic management.

Not least among the troubles the Craft has had to survive was the flood of verbose speculation poured out by such men as Dr. Oliver—well meaning but pernicious in its amazing credulity—which, while appearing to advocate Freemasonry to thoughtful and right-minded men, tended to alienate those with any pretensions to sound learning.

So we feel that it was not until the middle of the nineteenth century that the organisation became strongly welded, capable of controlling effectively the affairs of the Order throughout the whole British Empire.

Some of the difficulties and the dangers and the problems to be solved have been apparent in our eighteenth century survey, and we can even see how the very conflicts and misunderstandings of the time were slowly and unconsciously making for a fuller realisation of Masonic truths.

Our difficulties and dangers and problems are to-day of different kinds, but none the less real.

The whole of our concern in this study has been with the externals—the scaffolding—of our Craft: it is the unquenchable spirit that lives through it all, that, reaching to a wider and fuller expression of itself in human affairs, slowly moulds the organism to its needs: and we humbly trust that, whatever dangers may lie ahead, T.G.A.O.T.U. will ever continue to shape our crude, rough hewing.

It must be obvious that a compilation such as this could not have been made without many willing co-operators, and I must not omit to thank the numerous Brethren who have been so generous with their help.

Especially am I grateful to the secretaries of Lodges who have so readily responded to my requests for information.

The life of a Lodge Secretary is not an easy one, and, amid the multitude of duties pertaining to present activities, it is no small thing to have fired at him a point blank charge of questions about an old document, which it is true his Lodge may treasure, but no one really has much occasion to look at or think about; it adds a new terror to his life if he is to be asked innumerable questions about such things.

Many investigators in the past have complained of the difficulty in getting replies from Lodge Secretaries; my happy experience has been to have the most generous response to my enquiries, and offers of more help if wanted; and I cannot sufficiently express my thanks.

To Bro. Baxter for especial help in inspecting and giving me transcripts of Lancashire Warrants: Bros. Stokes, Flather, and Bain in Yorkshire; Bros. Wagstaffe and Kelly in Cheshire; to Bro. Tuckett for generous use of his library; to Bro. Gordon Hills and the Staff at Grand Lodge Library, and our former Secretary, Bro. Songhurst, I tender many thanks for much assistance; as well as to those who have kindly given permission for reproductions of documents.

If I may be permitted one word of advice, I would earnestly urge all concerned to guard these old documents against further damage.

Most are now being protected by mounting and framing, but very few are protected from direct sunlight, and in a few years but little will be left to be seen; perhaps it is well that a paper about them has not been left too long unwritten.

A hearty vote of thanks was unanimously passed to Bro. T. M. Carter for his interesting paper, on the proposition of Bro. H. Poole, seconded by Bro. W. W. Covey-Crump; comments being offered by or on behalf of Bros. Gilbert W. Daynes, Ivor Grantham, A. E. Richmond, G. Trevelyan Lee, J. O. Manton, and Geo. W. Bullamore. The Master also referred to the great kindness of Bro. F. C. Stoate in putting his Lantern at the disposal of the Lodge.

Bro. IVOR GRANTHAM *writes*:—

In the course of his exhaustive treatment of the subject of Provincial Warrants, rendered all the more fascinating in its communication to the Lodge by the use of the magic lantern, Bro. Carter has called attention to the printed Warrant (dated March 7th, 1801), which constituted the South Saxon Lodge of Lewes the Provincial Grand Lodge for the Province of Sussex, and offers the suggestion that the issue of such Warrants without the cognizance or approval of Grand Lodge may be attributed to the ambition of certain members of the Lodge concerned who may have taken advantage of the personal relationship existing between the Grand Master and their respective Provincial Rulers. That this was so in the case of the promotion of the South Saxon Lodge is highly probable, in view of the fact that the Provincial Grand Master of the period was Treasurer to the Prince of Wales, the then Grand Master; while it is of interest to note that it was William Lee (a printer), Provincial Grand Secretary, and "Right Worshipful Master" of the South Saxon Lodge, who—by virtue of the Warrant which in all likelihood he himself printed—became "Acting Grand Master" for the Province of Sussex. Not only did William Lee retain this position during the currency of the Warrant, but his preferment to such an exalted rank enabled him to continue in occupation of the chair of his Lodge for a period of twenty-four consecutive years! Of the nineteen "Grand Officers" named in the Warrant (amongst them a "Provincial Grand Portrait Painter"), no less than seventeen were members of the South Saxon Lodge.

Although the Warrant is dated March 7th, 1801, the Lodge was already exercising the functions of a Provincial Grand Lodge in the summer of the preceding year, as is clear from the contents of a communication addressed to the Grand Secretary on September 11th, 1800, in the course of which the Master of a local Lodge gives expression to the feelings aroused in other Lodges by the preferment of the Lewes Lodge. In the absence of all minutes for this Lodge—117 leaves have been deliberately cut from the first Minute Book—it may never be possible to determine how or when the South Saxon Lodge first came to be appointed the Provincial Authority. Bro. Carter mentions the fact that the seal attached to this Warrant bears every appearance of having been manufactured for the occasion. In the light of these facts, may it not well be that this *printed* Warrant (complete with seal) was prepared for the signature of the Provincial Grand Master by the person to whose interest it would be to possess some semblance of written authority—an individual whose integrity was subsequently called into question, if any reliance can be placed upon contemporary correspondence, of which a quantity is preserved at Freemasons' Hall? This suggestion is advanced as a possible solution to the problem presented by this printed Warrant—a curious document without duplicate in the written records of the Craft.

As the Warrant itself, as printed in *A.Q.C.*, xli., 72, contains a few errors of transcription, I attach a fresh transcript. It will be noted that the conclusion speaks in terms of the *Seal of the Lodge*. The name of the Brother who presented the Seal was not Belcombe, as given on p. 73, but Balcombe Langridge.

TO ALL and Every to whom these Presents shall come and may concern.

KNOW YE that I, SAMUEL HULSE, Esq. LIEUTENANT GENERAL of His Majesty's Forces, TREASURER to the PRINCE OF WALES, COLONEL of the 19th Reg^t. of Foot and PROVINCIAL GRAND MASTER of FREE and ACCEPTED MASONS for the COUNTY of SUSSEX, DO, by Virtue of my said Office, and under immediate Sanction and Authority of HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS GEORGE AUGUSTUS FREDERICK PRINCE of WALES &c. &c. &c. GRAND MASTER of ENGLAND, first had and obtained, especially for this Purpose, hereby nominate constitute and Appoint the SOUTH SAXON LODGE held at LEWES, THE PROVINCIAL GRAND LODGE of the COUNTY of SUSSEX, to consist of the GRAND OFFICERS hereunder named, and Twelve GRAND STEWARDS, (subject nevertheless to such new Elections as occasion may from Time to Time require) with full Power to make MASONS, Constitute REGULAR LODGES, and to frame and enforce such Bye Laws and Regulations as may be deemed necessary for the good Government of the INSTITUTION, also to do and execute all and every such other Act or Acts, Thing or Things, as appertain to the Duties of a Regularly Constituted PROVINCIAL GRAND LODGE.

(citation of 19 Grand Officers)

Given under my Hand and Seal of the LODGE at London, this Seventh Day of March A L 5801 A D 1801

S. Hulse P.G.M.

Bro. GEO. W. BULLAMORE writes:—

It is interesting to note that Bro. Carter distinguishes between the spread of the Moderns' organization and the spread of Freemasonry. The Moderns of the original Grand Lodge were something less than the Fellows, and therefore had no Freemasonry to spread. The copies of the Old Charges and the occasional mention of Lodges not included in lists compiled by the Moderns renders it probable that the old traditions of the Guild Fellowship

were transmitted in the ordinary way until in process of time the various units of the Fellowship were absorbed by the more efficient organization of the Moderns. Bury was one of the few exceptions where the provincial holders of a Modern warrant practised Modern Masonry, the higher (or Freemason) degrees being usually worked under cover of the Modern Warrant. If the Freemasons of higher degrees were the last to abandon their secrecy and accept a constitution we have a simple explanation of the alleged manufacture of degrees.

Bro. J. O. MANTON writes:—

Bro. T. M. Carter's paper is likely to be of much local value in the Provinces, and for this reason I suggest that where there are items which may possibly lead to error, detailed particulars should be inserted to save misinterpretation, or a suggestive note might be inserted.

Under Group *b*, the Patent dated 25 Mar., 1789, of T. B. Parkyns' appointment as Prov. Gd. Master of the three Counties, grouped together, is quoted. The date 25 Mar., 1789, might be taken as the date his mastership commenced in *each* of the Provinces named. I therefore submit the following:—

Leicestershire.—Wm. Kelly, F.S.A., Prov. Gd. Master, Leicestershire and Rutland, 3rd January, 1870, to 28th July, 1873,¹ in his History of the Provincial Grand Lodge of that combined Province, says²:—"Sir Thos. Fowkes dying on the 7th November, 1786, the office of P.G.M. became vacant and so remained for two years, when it was conferred upon Thomas Boothby Parkyns, Esq., M.P. for Leicester, who was also P.G.M. for the Counties of Derby and Nottingham and . . . continued to hold the office of P.G.M. for this County until his decease in the year 1800."

His Mastership of the Province of Derbyshire commenced in 1789 and of Nottinghamshire in 1783.³

Presumably the "two years" interregnum in the position of P.G.M. of Leicestershire after the death of Sir Thos. Fowkes on 7th November, 1786, covered a period to 25th March, 1789, the date of the Patent for T. B. Parkyns' Mastership of the three Counties, and the latter date may be accepted as the date of his appointment for Leicestershire.⁴ As he was then P.G.M. of Derbyshire, this latter appointment, stated to be in 1789, would only be a few weeks prior to 25th March, 1789. His Mastership of Notts. is stated to have commenced in 1783.

Nottinghamshire.—In the *Transactions* of the Notts. Installed Masters' Lodge, No. 3595,⁵ there is a transcript of a Provincial Warrant, No. 595, issued by Admiral Sir John Borlase Warren, K.B., Prov. G. Master of Notts., dated 16 November, 1802, for the constitution of a Lodge "under the Title and Denomination of the WARREN LODGE, at the Milton's Head Inn in Nottingham." (Erased March 5th, 1828.)

¹ Page 92.

² p. 23.

³ See Masonic Year Book.

⁴ Not 1793, as published.

⁵ Vol. 2 (1913), pp. 51-53.

GILD OF MASONS AT LINCOLN.

BY BRO. W. J. WILLIAMS.



IN the late Canon Westlake's book *The Parish Gilds of Medieval England, 1919*, is an Appendix being an Analysis of The Gild Certificates of 1389 which are preserved in the Public Record Office. Among these Nos. 134 to 160 relate to Gilds in Lincoln. Several of these were Craft Gilds, viz., No. 150, Archers; 151, Barbers; 152, Cordwainers; 153, Fullers; 154, Masons; 155, Mercers; 156, Minstrels and Actors; 157, Tilers (including Craft ordinances); 158, Sailors; 159, Tailors (including Craft statutes); 160, Weavers (including Craft statutes). It would seem that so far as the Provinces are concerned such a series of Craft Gilds was unique at that time.

A transcript of the original Certificate as to the Masons' Gild follows this note. It will be seen that the Masons are described in the heading as *Cimentariorum* and that the date alleged for the formation or organisation of the Gild is 1313. There is a strong probability that this date is correct, as from the other returns from Lincoln it would appear that the dates ascribed to the Gilds there are given in a way which indicates that care was taken in alleging them, and furthermore the Gilds would act as mutual checks on each other and so prevent unjustifiable allegations of antiquity.

A few words are left blank in the transcript as they could not be deciphered with certainty. The abbreviations in the original have been extended.

I wrote to Canon Srawley, the Chancellor of Lincoln Cathedral, asking whether he was aware of the Gild or of anything specially relating to it. He kindly replied that he had no information in the matter, but suggested that there might possibly be some reference to it in old Wills proved at Lincoln. This possible clue must, however, for the present remain so far as I am concerned.

Lincoln appears to have been specially favoured in the matter of Gilds. Under the word "Guild" the *New English Dictionary* refers to a Charter dated 1189 by Henry II. (recorded in Rymer's *Foedera* [1816], 1. 40) by which all liberties, customs and laws which the City had in the times of Edward, William and Henry, kings of England, and their gild merchant (*gildam suam mercatorium de hominibus civitatis et de aliis mercatoribus comitatus*) were confirmed and continued.

In the printed Charter Rolls, vol. 3. p. 7 (29 Edward I.), 25 February, 1301, is the record of an inspection and confirmation of certain Charters including one by *Henricus rex Anglorum et dux Normannorum et Aquitanorum et comes Andegavorum* which preserved the rights of the gilds against outsiders.

Reverting to the date at the beginning of the Certificate (1313) it is to be observed that during the fourteenth century considerable work was in progress at Lincoln Cathedral. The following extracts from Allen's *History of the County of Lincoln*, vol. 1, p. 159 (British Museum 2063c) will illustrate this. Allen quotes from *Archæologia*, vol. 9, where is a communication from Mr. Bradley to Governor Pownall:—

1306. The Dean and Chapter contracted with Richard de Stow mason to attend to and employ other masons under him for the new work at which time the new additional east end as well as the upper parts of the great tower and transepts were done. He contracted to do the plain work by measure and the fine carved work and images by the day.

1313. The Dean and Chapter carried the Close still further Eastward so as to enlarge the Canons' houses and mentions the Chancellery and other houses at the end of the minster yard.

1321. In this year the new work was not finished for Bishop Burghwas finding that those who were entrusted to collect the money given by voluntary contribution and legacies to the Church detained the same and were backward in their payments published an excommunication against all offenders in this way which tended in retardationem fabricae.

1324. It may be collected the whole was finished about 1324 but this is nowhere specified.

The next item in the extract is dated 1380.

A concluding note states that "this work is of the regular order of Gothic Architecture as I have supposed it to be finally established by the Freemasons. The rest of the Church is in part opus romanum and partly of the style of the first essays of the Gothic."

CERTIFICATE OF THE GILD OF MASONS AT LINCOLN

transcribed from

Chancery Miscellanea, Bdle. 41, No. 154.

(All abbreviations have been expanded.)

Civitas Lincolnie

Certificacio Gracemanni sive Magistri cuius¹ gilde fundate in honore domini nostri Jhesu Christi & beate Marie virginis & omnium sanctorum videlicet per communem assensum ordinationem & consilium commune cimentariorum virtute proclamacionis per breve domini Regis inde facte sequitur in hec verba.

In festo Pentecosten Anno Domini M^oCCC^o Terciodecimo Prouisum & statutum per communem assensum & commune consilium istius fraternitatis quod omnes fratres et sorores— . . . convenient ad certum locum illis assignatum sub pena vnus libro cere vbi candela gilde fuerit acta & sument ibi suam candelam & . . . coniunctim ad ecclesiam ordinatum & ibi solempniter honorifice & deuote predictam candelam ad talem locum debent offerre quo predicta candela . . . omnibus diebus festiuis per annum ardebit cum tempus fuerit Item prouisum est secundum communem assensum fraternitatis quod habebunt suam loquelam matutinalem in Crastinum Pasche sine dilacione. Ita videlicet quod ad illum diem cum utilitate eiusdem gilde & honore possint & viderint qualiter melius & commodius ordinare prouidere & in suis negociis expedire Et si contingat quod aliquis de fraternitate ad predictam loquelam citatus fuerit & non compareat erit in misericordia vnus dimidie libre cere sine relaxatione obcausam sui defectus nisi rationabiliorem causam habeat pro se excusacionis quare venire non potuit Item si aliquis vel aliqua fratrum vel sororum ad terram sanctam vel Romam vel ad sanctum Jacobum velit peregrinare & transeat mare omnes fratres & sorores conuenient illi & illum vel illam ducent cum honore ad exitum ville & quilibet & quelibet eorum & earum dabit illi vnum obolum nisi quis vel que curialius ei dare voluerit Item si aliquis in peregrinacione vltra mare transeat vt predictum est in redditu vero suo contra illum vel illam conuenient omnes fratres & sorores ad portas Civitatis & ducent illum vel illam ad matricem ecclesiam cum gaudio & honore Item si quis fratrum vel sororum moriatur infra villam omnes fratres & sorores conuenient ad corpus cum quatuor cereis & ibi ardebunt a principio seruicii quousque corpus sepelliatur Similiter quod omnes fratres & sorores communiter sint in Crastinum ad oblacionem Graicemanus vero debet offerre vnum denarium de catallis domus & quilibet duorum Custodem obolum & quilibet aliorum fratrum & sororum dabit obolum ad emendum panem & erogandum pauperibus pro anima defuncti Et si aliquis non dederit predictum obolum antequam corpus sepelliatur dabit vnum denarium sive relaxatione Et si deteniat illum denarium vltra triduum dabit dimidiam libram cere. Item si aliquis frater vel soror moriatur extra Civitatem & de morte eius certum habeant rumorem fiet pro anima eius sicut mortuus esset inter eos in propria sua parochia Item si quis frater vel soror in nundinis vel foro propter aliquod delictum preter furtum & homicidium fuerit retentus mandabit fratribus suis & stabunt secum in consilio & auxilio sicut fratribus suis facere debent Item prouisum est & statutum per commune consilium fraternitatis vt qui electus fuerit ad Graicemanum et negauerit dabit duas libras cere sine relaxatione Et qui ad Custodem vel decanum electus fuerit & negauerit dabit vnam libram cere & suam penam (?) pro misericordia debat solui infra triduum sub pena duplicacionis Item ordinatum est quod si aliquis frater vel soror dicte fraternitatis habeat de catallis domus debet ponere catalla domus super seakarum infra tertium diem post loquelam matutinalem sub pena duarum librarum cere sine vltiori dilacione Item prouisum est & ordinatum quod die quo offerunt suam candelam quot sunt fratres & sorores in fraternitate tot pauperes pascent pro amore dei de bono pane & ceruisia & de vno ferculo carnis vel piscis cum dies carnis

¹ Sic: presumably for 'cuiusdam.'

vel piscis aduenerit. Item provisum & statutum est quod si aliquis vel aliqua fraterum vel sororum alicui maledicat vel litigare presumat dum ad solacium societatis (?) p . . . quod dabit predictæ gilde vnam libram cere sine aliqua relaxatione. Item provisum & statutum est quod si aliquis vel aliqua frater aut soror predictam fraternitatem intrare voluerit quod predictæ gilde quatuor solidos vel vnum quarterium de meliore ordeici dabit ad tres anni terminos & quatuor denarios videlicet vnum denarium decano gylde & vnum denarium clerico & duos denarios ad civos. Item provisum & statutum est quod si aliquis vel aliqua bona predictæ gilde in manu habuerit & ea integre & fideliter reddiderit post solutionem bonorum si deuenit in paupertate quod per tres annos de catallis gilde habebit octodecim denarios videlicet per singulum annum sex denarios sed cum ad meliorem statum peruenerit predictum argentum sibi datum catallis gilde iterum persolvet. Item provisum & statutum est per certe consilium fraternitatis quod si aliquis vel aliqua fraterum vel sororum in articulo mortis predictæ gilde duos solidos vel valorem duorum solidorum legauerit in quolibet anno si defunctus fuerit ad diem obitus sui vnam missam pro anima sua semper habebit [et si] quatuor solidos legauerit vel valorem quatuor solidorum in quolibet anno duas missas habebit & si dimidium marcam vel valorem dimidiæ marce legauerit [in quolibet] anno tres missas semper habebit. Item provisum & statutum est per certe consilium fraternitatis quod omnes cementarii istius gilde assenserunt quod quilibet cementarius qui accepit prenticiam dabit quadraginta denarios ad emendacionem candeles & si contingat quod si aliquis noluerit dare duplicabit predictam pecuniam. Item provisum est & statutum est quod omnes fratres istius gilde quod omnes pacauerint vnum quadrantem in vna septimana per annum & si aliquis defecerit et negauerit et noluit pacare duplicatum est a termino fine. De terris & tenementis ad gildam predictam mortificatis vel non mortificatis nil habent & catalla aliqua in manibus ipsorum fratrum & sororum ad vsu dictæ gilde non existunt nisi ad predictas deuociones sustinendas & comunia non faciunt nisi tamen pro dilectacione inter eos sequius (?) sustinenda.

TRANSLATION.

[In the following translation the verbiage of the original, in which every clause is introduced by a long formula, has not been preserved. The brothers and sisters are always specified, and *he and she* is written each time. So also every fine is stated to be "without any remission." The Graceman as the principal officer of a gild is a word apparently peculiar to Lincoln and its neighbourhood.

It suggests a Teutonic derivation, sc. Grossmann.]

City of Lincoln.

The certificate of the Graceman or Master of a certain gild founded in honour of our Lord, and the B.V.M., and of all saints by the common assent, direction and advice of the *cementarii*, by virtue of a proclamation by the letter of our lord the King, as follows:

On the Feast of Pentecost, A.D. 1313, it was enacted by the common consent of this fraternity that all brothers and sisters should meet at the specified place allotted to them under the penalty of one pound of wax, where the candle of the gild should be set up, and should there take up their candle and [proceed] in a body to the appointed church, there offer the said candle with all solemnity and devotion in the place where it is [to be set up] and there it is to be lit on every feast day throughout the year in perpetuity.

They shall have their morningspeech on the morrow of Easter without any postponement, so that on that day they may the better and more conveniently be able to see to all the affairs of the gild and transact its business to its advantage and honour. And if it should chance that any of the fraternity be summoned to the said morningspeech and do not appear he shall be penalised half a pound of wax on account of his disregard of his duty unless he have a reasonable cause of excuse.

If any brother or sister wishes to go on pilgrimage¹ to the Holy Land or to Rome or to St. James [of Compostella] and goes over sea, then all the brethren shall assemble and conduct him or her with all honour to the outgoing of the city, and each shall give one halfpenny, unless they desire to give more generously. And when any such pilgrim shall return from over seas, all shall go to meet him, to the city gates and shall conduct him to the mother church with joy and honour.

When any member dies within the city all shall assemble with four candles there where the body is, and shall light them at the principal mass where the body is interred. Similarly when all are gathered together on the next morning

¹ Cf. Toulmin Smith, *English Gilds*, pp. 177, 180, 182.

the Graceman shall pay one penny from the goods of the gildhouse, and each of the two wardens one halfpenny, and each of the other brothers and sisters one halfpenny, to provide bread to be given to the poor for the good of the soul of the deceased. And should anyone not pay the said halfpenny before the funeral he shall give a penny. And should he withhold the penny for more than three days he shall give half a pound of wax. Should any brother or sister die outside the city, and certain information is received of the death, they shall take measures for his soul's benefit as though he had died in the city, in his own parish church.

Should any brother or sister in the town or market be in custody for any fault, saving theft or murder, he shall send word to the brethren and they shall come to his aid and assist him as brethren should do.

Whoever is elected Graceman and refuses to take the office shall pay two pounds of wax, and whoever being elected warden or deacon refuses the office shall give one pound, and the penalty shall be paid within three days under pain of being doubled.

If any member shall have any of the property of the gild in his possession, he shall return such property to the gild chest¹ within three days from the morningspeech under a penalty of two pounds of wax.

On the day on which the gild offers its candle they shall for the love of God, feed as many poor persons as there are brothers and sisters in the gild, with good bread and mead, and a dish of meat or fish according as meat or fish is procurable on that day.

If any brother or sister curse another or hastily commences litigation while the gild are still endeavouring to compose the quarrel² he shall give to the gild a pound of wax.

Every brother or sister on entering the gild shall pay four shillings or one quarter of best barley at the three terms of the year, and four pence, namely, one to the deacon, one to the clerk and two to the ale.

If any brother or sister have had in their hands goods of the gild and shall have faithfully returned them intact, after settling the account of their dealings,³ should such an one fall into poverty he shall have from the gild funds for three years 18 pence, namely six pence each year but when he comes again into better circumstances he shall repay.⁴

Should any brother or sister on his or her death-bed bequeathe to the gild two shillings or goods to that value, and dies, there shall be on the day of his death one mass said annually in perpetuity, and for four shillings or goods to that value, two masses, and for half a mark three.

All *cementarii* of this gild shall agree that any *cementarius* who takes an apprentice shall give 40 pence to the maintaining of the candle, and if he be unwilling to give, the amount shall be doubled.

All brethren shall pay one farthing a week throughout the year, and should any one fail or refuse, then at the end of the term the amount is to be doubled.

Of lands and tenements, whether under license of mortmain or not, the gild possesses none; goods in the hands of the members themselves for the use of the gild, do not exist, save what is for the maintenance of the devotions specified: and they have no general meetings save such as are held for their social purposes among themselves.⁵

¹ Lit. put it upon the treasury, *cf.* Toulmin Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 174, para. 2.

² Conjectural; words missing.

³ ? But this seems to be the sense.

⁴ It is interesting to compare this with the provision in the Gild of St. Benedict, a translation of the text of which is given by Toulmin Smith, at p. 172. The rule there is that, when any brother or sister falls into poverty, there shall be advanced to him, out of the goods of the gild, in the first year sixpence, in the second sixpence, and in the third sixpence. If he can repay let him; if not let him keep them as a free gift. Toulmin Smith's note on this is that sixpence a year is simply absurd, and that there must be some copyist's error. He suggests six shillings. But here it is again, and written not in figures but in words.

⁵ One word uncertain.

FRIDAY, 1st MARCH, 1929.



THE Lodge met at Freemasons' Hall at 5 p.m. Present:—Bros. Gordon P. G. Hills, P.A.G.Sup.W., P.M., D.C., as W.M.: Bro. W. J. Songhurst, P.G.D., as I.P.M.: H. C. de Lafontaine, P.G.D., S.W.; Thos. M. Carter, P.Pr.G.St.B., Bristol. I.G., as J.W.; and Lionel Vibert, A.G.D.C., P.M., Secretary.

Also the following members of the Correspondence Circle:—Bros. J. F. Tarrant, Henry S. Neilson, S. W. Rodgers, P.A.G.Reg., J. Chas. McCullagh, L. G. Wearing, R. R. Moor, Geo. Elkington, P.A.G.Sup.W., A. Adams, E. B. Young, C. F. Tyson, Leslie Hemens, Wallace Heaton, as I.G., H. F. Mawbey, F. F. Halls Dally, D. A. Burl, John Lawrance, H. Thornton Gurner, E. S. M. Perowne, Ed. B. Holmes, F. Lace, P.A.G.D.C., E. Eyles, Wm. Lewis, R. H. B. Cawdron, P. A. Wilson, W. Davison, A. Gault Macgowen, G. Kenudey Barnes, T. H. Thatcher, H. Spencer, Allan Ramsay, Geo. A. Hoskins, A. L. Simpson, R. A. Hill, W. Francis, H. E. McMeel, B. Ivanoff, C. F. Sykes, W. E. Hoare, F. M. Atkinson, Geo. Simpson, H. Johnson, E. W. Marson, J. H. Clark, Ivor Grantham, W. Stubbings, A. E. Gurney, G. C. Williams, and H. L. Attwater.

Also the following Visitors:—Bros. R. H. Lay, W.M., Zenith Lodge No. 4892: H. Willis, Mt. Edgcumbe Lodge No. 1446: W. F. Mackay, Lodge Star in the East No. 67: R. McIntosh, J.W., Acacia Lodge No. 276 (Vic.C.); H. B. Lodge, W.M., and A. H. Gwinnell, Ebbisham Lodge No. 2442: G. E. Roebuck, P.M., Chingford Lodge No. 2859: F. J. Lewenson, Exonian Lodge No. 3415: P. S. Meaby, Good Samaritan Lodge No. 4991: W. H. M. Smeaton, W.M., Thornhill Lodge No. 3163: H. H. Young, W.M., Emulation Lodge No. 21: Campbell Lee, J.W., Royal Somerset Lodge & Inverness Lodge No. 4: Henry J. Hallett, Earl of Warwick Lodge No. 2504: Arthur E. Peacock, P.M., Lambeth Borough Council Lodge No. 2941: A. J. L. Sykes, I.G., T. Square Lodge No. 3265: and P. A. Aitchison, P.M., King's Colonials Lodge No. 3386.

Letters of apology for non-attendance were reported from Bros. Sir Alfred Robbins, P.G.W., Pres.B.G.P., P.M.: R. H. Baxter, P.A.G.D.C., P.M.: Ed. Conder, L.R., P.M.; Rev. H. Poole, P.Pr.G.Ch., Westmorland & Cumberland, W.M.: Rev. W. W. Covey-Crump, P.M.: John Stokes, P.G.D., Pr.A.G.M., West Yorks., P.M.: A. Cecil Powell, P.G.D., P.M.: Gilbert W. Daynes, J.W.: George Norman, P.G.D., P.M.: J. T. Thorp, P.G.D., P.M.: and J. Heron Lepper, P.G.D., Ireland, P.M.

The WORSHIPFUL MASTER read the following

IN MEMORIAM.

JOSEPH WALTER HOBBS.

It is with very great regret that I have to report to the Lodge and Correspondence Circle the death of Bro. J. Walter Hobbs, which took place on Monday last, February 25th, at 11 p.m. Bro. Hobbs was born on 24th June, 1860, and by profession was a Solicitor's Managing Clerk, being at one time President of the Solicitors' Managing Clerks' Association. He was initiated in the Piccadilly Lodge No. 2550 on February 2nd, 1905, and exalted in the Junior Engineers' Chapter No. 2913. He was a Founder and first Master of the St. Mary Balham Lodge No. 3661, and a Founder of the Chapter No. 3661 as well. He joined our C.C. in March, 1907, within eighteen months of his being initiated. In the Craft he received London Rank, being one of the first to hold that honour, and had the rank of P.A.G.D.C. conferred on him in Grand Lodge in 1927, being appointed P.G.St.B. in the Grand Chapter in the same year. He was also a P.G. Deacon (1924) in the Mark Degree and in the Societas Rosicruciana Recorder General: for many years he was Secretary of the Metropolitan College. He was a member of the 18°, and a Life Governor of the three Masonic Charities.

He was a very talented man with unusual musical gifts, and was greatly interested in archæological subjects. In particular he made a special study of prehistoric and megalithic remains as to which he held views and developed theories of considerable interest in his various lectures on these subjects. He was very soon attracted to Masonic research, and in this his knowledge of architecture, in particular of Westminster Abbey, to which he had devoted many years of study, stood him in good stead. In 1920 he helped to found the *Masonic Record*, and was on its staff to the last in the capacity of Advisory Editor. In connection with that journal he wrote a small work on *Lodge and After Dinner Speaking*, which was later replaced by a more extended work on *Masonic Speechmaking*, as also a valuable little handbook on *Masonic Ritual*; and it is generally understood that two of the other publications in the 'Record Library', *Masonic Enquire Within* and *Your Lodge Work*, although published anonymously, owe a good deal to him. He also at various times wrote papers in the *Masonic Record*, of which I may mention *The Liberal Arts and Sciences* and *The Art of the Craftsman*. For our own *Transactions* he wrote papers on *An Irish Minute Book, 1782-1797*; *The Antiquity of Freemasonry*, a paper which produced a discussion of exceptional interest; *Anthony Sayer, Gentleman*, which represented many years of inquiry, and finally *The Travelling Masons and Cathedral Builders*. Before this paper was in the press he was already so seriously ill that he was unable to reply to the many comments made on it; it was full of interesting and valuable material.

To the very last he kept up his keen interest, not only in Masonry generally, but especially in our Lodge and its work. He leaves a widow and son, to whom our sympathy goes out in their great loss.


Three Lodges, one Library, one Consistory, and fifty-six Brethren were admitted to membership of the Correspondence Circle.

Bro. W. J. WILLIAMS read the following paper:--

A MASONIC PILGRIMAGE THROUGH LONDON.

BY BRO. W. J. WILLIAMS.

PART I.



LONDON stands pre-eminent in its attractions for those who contemplate a Masonic pilgrimage.

It is true that the first three Grand Lodges are stated to have been held at the foot of Mount Horeb in the Wilderness of Sinai in the time of Moses: in the bosom of Mount Moriah in the time of King Solomon, and at Jerusalem in the time of Zerubbabel. The tabernacle in the Wilderness,—the Temple in the City of Jerusalem,—the restoration of that Temple.—all these have attractions for the mind and heart of the Pilgrim, and have furnished materials for our fancy, and food for our thoughts: but, from the Masonic point of view, they had to await their culmination and exposition until in the City of London and its precincts, their promise and potentiality came to be realized in a manner not achieved elsewhere. Our itinerary will include matters pertaining as well to the OPERATIVE as to the SPECULATIVE aspect.

We speak of London in its larger sense as including the County of London. Let us begin our pilgrimage at the

BRITISH MUSEUM.

There we shall find the Ancient and the Modern worlds meeting.

A great part of the Museum is on the site where until about 1845, stood Montagu House, which was built in majestic style by Ralph the First Duke of Montagu. Above its main frontage stood in prominence Four statues representing the Four Cardinal Virtues which are so forcibly spoken of in one of our Charges. Montagu House descended to his son John, the Second Duke of Montagu, who was Grand Master 24th June 1721, to 24th June 1722. He died on 5th June 1749, at Whitehall, without male issue.

The Government acquired Montagu House and grounds, and in 1754 the British Museum collections were stored there until, after many years, the building became overcrowded.

Let us inspect a few only of the chief items of Masonic interest there treasured up.

First in the Egyptian gallery on the Entrance floor, in a room at the far end, we shall see a beautiful monument in the form of a false door (dated the equivalent of B.C. 3650) in honour of an official holding a position much like that of the Architect to Grand Lodge, who was born in the reign of the Builder of the Third Pyramid at Gizeh. His most important office was that of "Chief Superintendent of all the works in the Royal Palace and Temples," and so diligent was he in his work that it is stated "he made the heart of his lord glad every day." The monument, which is 11 feet 9 inches high and 13 feet 6 inches wide, represents the deceased, seated on his chair of state and holding his staff of office, with two inscriptions, one being "The Chief Superintendent of Works Ptah—Shepses." There are numerous things sculptured on the Memorial. The portrait is on the top left hand corner.

Here also may be seen (in addition to pieces of the Beard and Head covering of the Great Sphinx) portions of two of the Seven Wonders of the World which are masterpieces of the Art of our operative ancestors:

- (1) Some of the casing stones of the Great Pyramid:
- (2) and in the Mausoleum Room very substantial parts of the Memorial at Halicarnassus erected by his widow to Mausolus King of Caria, who died B.C. 353.

Some account of these two wonders is given in Dr. Anderson's *Constitutions* published in 1738, at pages 6 and 25.

The department of Manuscripts next claims our attention. We may be permitted to see the oldest purely Masonic Manuscript in the world, viz., the Regius Manuscript, a poem in archaic English the reference to which is:—
“MS. BIB. REG. 17A.”

The approximate date of the writing is 1390 A.D. The fact that such a Manuscript was in existence was unknown until it was discovered by Mr. J. O. Halliwell, F.R.S., who published a printed copy of it in the year 1840 in a book entitled “The early History of Freemasonry in England.”

In this poem are set forth a short history of the Craft and expositions of the Seven Sciences together with fifteen Articles and fifteen Points, the Legend of the Quatuor Coronati, and several other matters of Masonic interest.

The Cooke Manuscript next claims our attention. It is quaintly bound in a wooden binding and is the earliest of all the Old Charges. The writing is beautifully executed in Gothic letters. The reference is “Additional MS. 23,198.” It is written on 69 pages of vellum $4\frac{3}{8}$ inches high and $3\frac{3}{8}$ inches wide.

The approximate date of the writing is the first half of the fifteenth century. It was purchased for the Museum on 14th October 1859.

This has been proved to be the same Manuscript as that produced at a meeting of Grand Lodge at Stationers' Hall on 24th June 1721. My authority for this statement is to be found in a note by Brother G. W. Speth in *A.Q.C.* iv., pp. 171-2, of which as I have been asked to give evidence in support of my assertion, it is well I should give a transcript of the main portion, especially as vol. iv. is not easily accessible to all readers of this paper.

“The Stukeley-Payne-Cooke MS.: Dr. Stukeley records in his diary under date 24th June 1721, that at the meeting of the Freemasons on that day in Stationers' Hall, Bro. Payne, Grand Master exhibited a manuscript of the Constitutions ‘about 500 years old.’ The Rev. W. C. Lukis, editor of the *Diary for the Surtees Society*, states in a footnote that Stukeley had copied the first and last pages into a book of drawings in the present possession of the Rev. H. F. St. John. Anxious, if possible, to identify this MS. I communicated with Bro. Lukis, who informed me that he had made a copy of Stukeley's copy for Bro. Whytehead of York. Bro. Whytehead at once lent me this copy of a copy, and as it appears that each copyist has taken pains to make a *facsimile* of his original, the very first glance showed me that Payne's MS. was none other than the well-known Matthew Cooke MS. now in the British Museum . . . At the foot of the copy, Bro. Lukis has imitated a footnote of Bro. Stukeley's as follows:—

The first and last page in Velum MS.
being Constitutions of the Freema-
sons exhibited at the Yearly Meeting
of the same, at Stationers Hall on
St. John's day 1721 by Mr. Payn then
Grand Master, 24 June
W. Stukeley.”

This little book was to all intents and purposes lost sight of until Brother Matthew Cooke re-discovered it in the Museum and edited a reproduction which was published in 1861 by Mr. R. Spencer. Hence it is called the Cooke MS.

It has been produced in *facsimile* in vol. ii. of the Antiquarian Reprints published by Quatuor Coronati Lodge, and is perhaps the most interesting of all the Old Charges, being the first document in which the term "speculative" is applied to a Mason. That Mason was described as the youngest son of King Athelstan.

There is only time for a brief glance at one other precious Manuscript, namely, the Lansdowne Version of the Old Charges. The date ascribed to it by experts is about 1600 A.D. It is written on one side only of four large sheets of stout paper.

It concludes thus:—

"These be all the Charges and Covenants that ought to be had read at the making of a Mason or Masons. The Almighty God who have you and me in his keeping, Amen."

The British Museum has also four other MSS. of the Old Charges, viz.: Harleian MS. No. 1942, attributed to second half of the seventeenth century; Harleian MS. No. 2054 fo. 22 (associated with Chester and second half of seventeenth century); Sloane MS. No. 3848 (associated with Warrington and dated 1646); Sloane MS. No. 3323 (date 1659).

The Reading Room next attracts our attention. Here the Masonic Student may see many unique copies both in MS. and in print of Volumes of The Sacred Law, the Great Light of Freemasonry.

The Coverdale Bible issued in 1535 is interesting because in II. Chron. ii., 13. and II. Chron. iv., 16, the name of one of the Hiram's who helped when Solomon was building the Temple, is given in a form different from that now in the Authorised and subsequent Versions. A similar rendering also appears in Martin Luther's translation published 1534 and in the modern German versions of the same.

In the Genevan version, of our English Bible which preceded the Authorised Version (200 editions being published between 1560 and 1616), and was for many years the Bible of the common people, appear various words used now with a special Masonic reference, and a glossary of words gives their interpretation, *e.g.*, *Ahiman Rezon* was the name Dermott gave to the version of the Constitutions prepared by him for the so-called Antient Masons. The glossary gives the word "Ahiman" as meaning "a brother of the right hand." And the word Rezon as meaning "Secretary." Putting these together, Dermott arrived at the meaning "Faithful Brother Secretary."

There is also a word which is translated in the glossary as meaning "the smiting of the builder," although experts say it is a mistaken translation. Further particulars can be supplied to Brethren on application, or they can find them by using a Concordance.

It looks very much, therefore, as though the compilers of our ceremonies were people who used the Coverdale Bible (and editions derived from it) and the aforesaid Genevan version with its glossary.

In order that there may be some method in our peregrination, I now propose to visit certain Churches, and first

LAMBETH CHURCH.

The Church of St. Mary, Lambeth, is a prominent and picturesque object on the Surrey side of the Thames next to Lambeth Palace. Its ancient square tower has been preserved, although the main body of the building has been reconstructed.

Elias Ashmole was interred here. Aubrey transcribed the inscription on his tomb, and it is recorded on Aubrey's authority in *A.Q.C.* xi., 161, and also in T. Allen's *History and Antiquities of Lambeth*, London 1826. I now quote from Allen:—

At the entrance into the Vestry is a large blue slab, the inscription nearly obliterated.

Hic jacet inclytus ille et eruditissimus ELIAS ASHMOLE Lichfieldiensis Armiger, Inter alia in repulcia munera, tributis in cervisiis contra rotulator, fecialis autem Windsoriensis titulo per annos plurimos dignatus qui, post connubia (duo) in uxorem duxit tertiam, Elizabetham Gulielmi Dugdale, militis garteri principalis regis armorum, filiam; mortem obiit 18 Maij 1692 anno ætatis 76: sed durante Museo Ashmoliano Oxon. nunquam moriturus.

Near this tomb was formerly placed an atchievement quarterly *sable* and *or*; the first quarter charged with a fleur-de-lis of the second; the coat of Ashmole impaled with that of Dugdale *argent* a cross moline *gules* and a torteaux.

Motto: Ex uno omnia.

Crest: On a mount verdant, Mercury preparing to fly, between two naked boys (the celestial sign Gemini) sitting at his feet proper.

The statement in a book dated 1826 that the inscription was nearly obliterated suggested the desirability of considering whether anything ought to be done to perpetuate so interesting a memorial. Accordingly in October 1923 I visited the Church and enquired for the tomb, which was found under a carpet, immediately in front of the steps leading up to the Holy Table in a side chapel on the South side of the Church. But instead of an "inscription nearly obliterated," the blue stone slab (which measures about 6 feet by 3 feet) bears on its surface a clear and sharply cut inscription in the words above recorded. Furthermore, although the original atchievement (or hatchment) said to be near the tomb has disappeared, the Arms appear incised at the top of the stone above the inscription.

In the Churchyard is an Altar Tomb in a prominent position. It is a Memorial to John Tradescant who died in 1638, to John Tradescant his son who died 25th April 1662, and to John Tradescant the grandson who died 11th September 1678. The top slab records their deaths and then follow fourteen lines of verse referring to the fact that Tradescant the first and second were "Gardiners" to the King and that Tradescant the son had a collection of curiosities. Then it is stated:—

The Tomb originally erected on this spot in the year 1662 by Hester relict of John Tradescant the younger being in a state of decay was repaired by subscription in the year 1773.

After the lapse of nearly two centuries since its erection it was entirely repaired by subscription in the year 1853.

The two long sides of the Tomb are decorated by carvings in relief of broken columns, a pyramid, crocodile, sea-shells and other matters of antiquity and curiosity. The two ends of the Tomb have carvings: (1) The Tradescant Arms: (2) A Hydra and an emblem of mortality.

It is well known that Ashmole obtained from Tradescant the collection of curios above referred to, which afterwards with additions formed the original collection of the Ashmolean Museum. Ashmole did not obtain possession of the collection without litigation between himself and Tradescant's widow.

As the Tradescant tomb had been restored it seemed a fair inference that the parties who restored that tomb would have been interested in the other. Investigation justified the surmise. *Tanswell's History and Antiquities of Lambeth* (1858), shows what happened:—

page 156. Near this tomb [of Ashmole] was formerly placed an atchievement. The following inscription was re-cut in 1853.

page 143. The monuments were shifted, on the Church being rebuilt, from the position which they originally occupied. Many of the more ancient inscriptions recorded by Aubrey having long since been taken away or destroyed.

page 164 gives an account of the restoration of the Tradescant Tomb.

The names of the Committee are given as Rev. C. B. Dalton (Rector of Lambeth), Sir Charles G. Young (Garter), Sir William J. Hooker, K.H., Philip Bury Duncan, Esq., Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford: and two others. Through their exertions Tradescants' tomb after a lapse of nearly two centuries has been entirely restored according to the original form and design and erected over the grave in the Churchyard, raised on a granite plinth.

Opposite page 164 are illustrations of the Tradescant Tomb as in 1662 and as restored in 1851.

Lambeth Church History by Masters states at page 32 that in July 1850 the Churchwardens applied to Mr. Philip Hardwick for plans for a thorough restoration of the Church. Care was taken to preserve the outline of the original foundation. Demolition began on 6th January 1851, and the work was completed February 2nd 1852. "The fine old tower remained without alteration."

It is sufficient to state that Ashmole was made a Mason in the provinces, namely, at Warrington on 16th October 1646, and recorded the fact in his Diary, as well as his attendance at Masons' Hall on 10th March 1682 pursuant to a summons. The entries have proved to be of the utmost importance in relation to the History of Speculative Freemasonry. I do not know whether attention has hitherto been drawn to the fact that Elias Ashmole, Esquire, was (in or about 1690) the Comptroller of the Excise Office in Broad Street in the City of London at a "Salary" of £1,240 per annum for himself and clerks and that it would only have been a very short walk for him to proceed from that office to Masons' Hall. (See Tho. De Laune's *Present state of London*, Edition published 1690, page 339.)

Another very interesting Masonic Memorial is to be seen in the Porch at Lambeth Church. It is on the right as you enter and at a height and in a gloom which makes the reading of the inscription difficult. The monument is of dark marble and was formerly in the Leigh Chapel. The inscription runs:—

Here lyeth 4 foot distant from this wall the body of *William Suthes Gent.* a man adorned with the gifts of Grace Art and Nature. By Grace he was religious and charitable By art he was in Masonry exquisite He by God's appointment changed his mortal life of misery for a glorious immortality on the 5th October 1625.

His sorrowful and grateful wife Mistress Ann Suthes as the loyal testimonie of her love to her deceased husband caused this monument to be erected for an exemplary token of his worthiness and her affection. He was Master Mason of Windsor Castle A Citizen and Goldsmith of London and an Assistant of the said Worshipful Company. He left 3 sons towardly and hopeful to be each of them the imitators of their Father's virtues.

John, James, Matthew

And herein the reader may see expressed the goodness of the deceased husband and the faithfulness of the surviving wife.

He now sings praises among the heavenly host
To God the Father Son and Holy Ghost.

His Arms are thus recorded in Hatton's *New View of London* 1708, p. 384:—

Arms: Sable on a Bend between 2 Cottises argent, 3 Martlets
Gules: Impaled with Barry of 8 Or and Sable, 3 Escutcheons Ermin.

Considerable interest attaches to this inscription which seems to have escaped the notice of former Masonic writers:—

- (1) The fact that he was Master Mason of Windsor Castle;
- (2) That he although a Mason was a member of the Court of Assistants of the Goldsmiths' Company.

Probably there is no other instance in this country of such a combination. I wrote to the Clerk of the Goldsmiths' Company for information as to William Suthes and his sons, but he replied on 4th January 1927 that the records for the period are not indexed and he cannot trace either of them; but that William Suthes cannot have taken a prominent part in the Company's affairs. The Will of William Suthes was proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury in 1625, his designation being "Citizen and Goldsmith of London Lambeth Surrey" (Register 107 Clarke). The following particulars of the Will will probably interest the greater number of readers. I obtained them from Somerset House. The Will was made but two days before he concluded his earthly pilgrimage, and is a somewhat lengthy document.

It begins thus:—

In the name of God, Amen, the 3rd day of October Anno Domini 1625 and in the first year of the reign of our Soverayne Lord Charles by the Grace of God Kinge of England Scotland and Ireland Defender of the Faith &c. I William Suthes Citizen and Goldsmith of London being of good and perfect memory laud and praise be unto Almighty God do make ordain and dispose this my present testament and last Will in manner and form following that is to say First and principally I commend my soul unto Almighty God my Maker and Saviour who bought me with his precious blod trusting and faithfully believing through the merit of his most precious passion all my sins be cleanly forgiven And my body to be buried in the Parish Church where I shall fortune to depart this life without any mourning apparel to be given at my funeral either to my wife children or friends in regard to the dangers of this contagious time.

The Testator then proceeded to dispose of his personal chattels and refers to the customs of the City of London applicable thereto. The principal beneficiaries were his loving wife Anne Suthes and his three sons John, James, and Matthew.

He mentions and disposes of land in Hackney, Hollowell, Hoggersdon in the Parish of St. Leonard, Shoreditch, and at Good Green and Brownd Greene, in the Parish of Totenham High Crosse. He also dealt with Copyholds at Kennington, a Lease of houses near Horsleydowne, and part of the Manor of 'ffauxhall, and at Spurr Alley in the Parish of St. Martin in the Fields.

He refers to the custom of the City of London as to guardianship and directed that when of fit age for appentice or other services his sons were to be bound forth and placed.

He gave a small sum to the poor and made some disposition in favour of the family of one who had been his debtor. He appointed Anthoney Gibson, Henry Barnes and Robert Gott of the Parish of Water Lambeth to be his Executors and left them four pounds a piece to buy them rings. And he entreated his good friends Mr. George Starkey of Windsor Gent. William Gold of Lambeth and Thomas Styles of Westminster *Freemason* to be Overseers of his Will and gave them 40/- each to buy them rings.

The Executors renounced Probate of the Will and it was proved by Ann Suthes the Widow on 25th October 1625 in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury.

As to the operative career of William Suthes, I know of no work of reference which alludes to it. Search made at the Record Office has revealed the following:—

By letters patent dated 10th October in the 3rd year of King James 1st (1605) the King granted to William Suthis the office of maker of balls of stone and iron for brass and iron ordnance in the Tower of London. This may have been our William Suthes.

There may also be seen at the Record Office the enrolled copy of the letters patent conferring upon William Suthis (for so his name is therein spelt) the office of Master Mason to the King "for all our Buildings and Reparations within our honor and Castle of Windsor." It is dated 2nd May (1610) in the

8th year of the reign of King James I. The reference to the Roll is No. 11 of part 12 for that year. The grant is for life. The wages 12 pence per day payable quarterly on the four usual feast days namely the Feast of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist &c.

The form is similar to the grant to Joshua Marshall a copy of which is included in this paper. It followed ancient precedents.

Before leaving Lambeth Church inspection should be made of a marble grave font for baptism by immersion. This was given as a memorial of the late Abp. Benson. There is a Greek inscription on the railing and on one side of the font grave is inscribed:—

“Grant O Lord that through the grave and gate of death, we may pass to our joyful resurrection. Amen.”

These words are taken from the Collect for Easter Eve and may cause us to think of more than one passing and raising.

WESTMINSTER ABBEY.

Crossing the Thames from Lambeth we come to this venerable fane. It is impossible in this essay to do more than touch upon a few points. Many historians have written volumes on the theme, which has by no means been exhausted.

From the Masonic standpoint, Bro. J. Walter Hobbs has made an important contribution by articles in the first volume of the *Masonic Record*. Probably the most attractive volume on the subject is that issued in 1924 by the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments which contains 220 sheets of plates some containing as many as ten illustrations. This deals with the period up to 1714.

The names of the whole line of men who presided over the building from its inception are given at page 6 and must on no account be omitted here. We may claim them as our Operative ancestors. They were:—

Master Henry, the mason, perhaps more exactly “of Reyns.” who, says Professor Lethaby, “must be considered as the architect of the building in all its parts.” From 1245 to about 1253.

John of Gloucester 1254.

Robert of Beverley 1261.

These three were the directors of the building under Henry III.

For the rebuilding of the Nave:—

Henry Yevele, from 1388 (at least).

William of Colchester, from 1400.

John Thirsk, from 1420. He was responsible for the chantry of Henry V.

John Smith, from 1452.

John of Reading, from 1460.

Robert Stowell, from 1471, followed by

Thomas Redman in 1505, and

Henry Redman in 1516.

For Henry VII.'s chapel the records are not yet forthcoming. Robert Vertue, Robert Jenins and John Lebons are named as the King's three Master-Masons of this date.

An ecclesiastic William Bolton, Prior of St. Bartholomew's, Smithfield, is styled Master of the Works in the King's Will, but he may have been concerned merely with the finance of the works. The Royal Commission awaited further light.

SIR ROBERT MORAY.

The last resting-place of this Brother is marked by a modern inscription on a floor-slab in the East aisle of the South Transept. Canon Westlake wrote to me that he "could find no trace of any monument or inscription ever having existed, but the period of Moray's death is one of the worst documented in Abbey history."

Sir Robert Moray died on 4th July 1673. He was interred in the Abbey on 6th July 1673 by command and at the expense of Charles II. The Abbey Register styles him Sir Robert Murray. He was one of the founders of the Royal Society. He is the first person concerning whose initiation on English soil a definite Minute remains on record. The Minute, as quoted in Bro. Murray Lyon's *History of the Lodge of Edinburgh*, runs thus:—

"At Neucastell the 20 day off May 1641. The qwhilk day ane serten number off Mester and othere bing lafule conwined, doeth admit M^r thie Right Honerabell Mr Robert Moray Generall quarter M^r to the Armie off Scotlan and the sam bing aproven be the hell Mester off the Mesone off the Log off Edenbroth quherto they heawe set to ther handes or markes. A. Hamilton. R. Moray. Johne Mylln. James Hamilton."

The writer of the Minute had his own free views as to orthography. The ceremony appears to have been on the lines of what our Brother Heron Lepper calls an ambulatory Lodge. It was an admission of a Scot on English soil by Scottish Freemasons.

In a book published in 1753, entitled *An Historical Description of Westminster Abbey*, the following statement is made:—

Not far from Davenant lies Sir Robert Murray, a great Mathematician and one of the founders of the Royal Society, of which he was the first President, and while he lived was the very Soul of that Body. He was a great Admirer of the *Rosy Crusians* and well versed in Chemistry, and Experimental Philosophy, in great Favour with King Charles II., to whom he was Secretary for Scotland and a Privy Counsellor. He died suddenly July 4, 1673, in the Garden at Whitehall, and was buried at the King's Expenche.

JOHN WOODWARD, M.D. (1665-1728).

At page 168 of the book just mentioned, reference is thus made to a Monument to John Woodward, M.D., which stands in the North Aisle of the Nave:—

This is a most beautiful Monument and the figures most admirably finished. The head of the deceased in profile is very masterly, and the Lady that holds it, inimitable. The inscription is a kind of Panegyric upon the great parts and learning of the deceased which entitled him to the great distinction he received.

Dr. John Woodward was probably a Freemason, as the name John Woodward appears in the 1725 List of Members of the Lodge at the Crown behind the Exchange.

A biography of Dr. John Woodward appears in the *D.N.B.*, vol. 62, page 423.

MARTIN FOLKES.

There is a monument to this Freemason (who died in 1754) in the South Aisle of the Nave. He was not interred in the Abbey.

He was appointed Deputy Grand Master on 24th June 1724 by the Duke of Richmond, and was a Member of the Bedford Head Covent Garden Lodge

(1725 List) and of the Maids Head Lodge at Norwich (1725 List). He is the subject of an article in the *D.N.B.*

MONUMENTS BY MASONS IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY.

Nicholas Stone (1586-1647), of whom more shall be said hereafter, was King's Master Mason and sculptor of the following Monuments in the Abbey. The references are to the report of the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments:—

Sir Richard Core, 1623 (p. 50b). In South Transept. A black and white marble tablet with consoles, swags, cornice, broken pediment and achievement of arms.

Sir George Holles, 1626 (p. 48a). An alabaster and free stone wall monument against E. wall of East Aisle of Nave Transept.

Francis Holles, 1622 (p. 42b). In St. Edmund's and Thomas Chapel. A Freestone pedestal supporting a seated alabaster figure in Roman Armour.

Sir George Villiers, 1605 (p. 41b), plates 72, 27 and 195. This is an altar tomb of Sir George and his second wife. The tomb and effigies are of white marble. (In St. Nicholas' Chapel.)

Dudley Carleton, 1631-2 (p. 36b). In St. Paul's Chapel a combined altar tomb and wall monument of black and white marble with reclining effigy.

Edmond Spenser the poet, 1598 (p. 51a). On South wall of East Aisle. S. Transept. A white marble monument partly of the seventeenth century and by Nicholas Stone, restored 1778.

Dr. Isaac Casanbon, 1614 (p. 50a). A wall monument of black and white marble and serpentine erected 1634. On West wall of S. Transept.

Lionel Cranfield, first Earl of Middlesex, 1645. and his second wife. A large altar tomb of touch and white marble, "possibly by Nicholas Stone," with effigies (p. 44b and plate 197).

Brother James Gibbs (1682-1754, and of whom more hereafter) designed the following Monuments in the Abbey:—

James Craggs, 1720/1. Monument S.W. Tower.

Dr. John Freind, 1728. Monument S. Aisle of Nave.

Ben Jonson, 1637. Monument (erected 1728) S. Transept. E. Aisle.

The *Anandale* Monument, 1723. In South Aisle of the Nave.

Matthew Prior, 1721. Monument and floor slab. S. Transept. E. Aisle.

Sir John Smith, 1718. Monument in S. Aisle of Nave.

The authority for attributing these to Gibbs is the *D.N.B.* The monuments are shortly described in the aforesaid report (List of Monuments and Floor Slabs after 1714).

Roubiliac (Louis Francisco), born 1695 at Lyons, died 1762. (In *Q.C.A.* x., 185, called Mr. Louis Francisco Rowtilliac, and a Member of the White Bear in King's Street, Golden Square). In Dean Stanley's *Westminster Abbey*, at page 252. &c., Roubiliac is named as the sculptor of the following Monuments. (I take the description from the list in the Commission's report):—

Field-Marshal George Wade, 1747-8. Monument and floor slab: Nave.

Major General James Fleming, 1750-1. Monument S. Aisle of Nave.

Lieut-General William Hargrave, 1750-1. Do. Do.

Nightingale, Joseph Gascoigne, 1752. Lady Elizabeth, his wife 1731. Monument: N. Transept. E. Aisle (St. Michael's Chapel). This is probably the most dramatic funeral monument known. The emblems of mortality are very prominent if not ghastly.

George Frederick Handel, 1759. Monument and floor-slab. S. Transept. Dean Stanley, at p. 252, quotes Goldsmith thus:—

“I find in Westminster Abbey several new monuments erected to the memory of several great men. The names of the great men I absolutely forget, but I well remember that Roubiliac was the statuary who carved them . . . Alas! alas! cried I, such monuments as these confer honour not on the great men, but on little Roubiliac.”

In a room in the triforium at Westminster Abbey may be seen the clay models of the monuments by Roubiliac to the memory of John the Second Duke of Montagu (the first Noble Grand Master of Freemasons) and his Duchess. The monuments themselves are in the Church at Warkton, near Kettering.

Other works of Roubiliac may be seen at the British Museum, especially (in the entrance Hall) a large statue of Shakespeare, presented by the celebrated David Garrick.

Roubiliac's bust of himself is now in the National Portrait Gallery, Trafalgar Square. He was interred in the Churchyard of St. Martin in the Fields.

ST. MARGARET'S, WESTMINSTER.

This Church is in close proximity to Westminster Abbey. In its Churchyard was interred the body of George Payne the 2nd Grand Master, proclaimed as such on 24th June 1718 and again in 1720. In the same year he compiled the General Regulations embodied, with some alterations, in the 1723 Edition of the *Constitutions*. His name appears at page 74 as one of the signatories to the approval of that edition. He was a very active member of the Craft for many years afterwards. He died on 23rd February 1757, at his house in New Palace Yard, and the date of his interment was 28th February 1757.

Probably there was a memorial of some kind erected to his memory in the Churchyard, but the ground was levelled about fifty years ago and no record of any inscription has been traced. His Will was proved in London on 9th March 1757 by his Widow, and may be seen at the Probate Registry. He was Secretary to the Tax Office, and appears to have left a substantial fortune. He was a member of the Lodge which met at the Horn, Westminster.

ST. JAMES'S, PICCADILLY.

By making a slight digression we can visit this Church. It was built from the designs of Sir Christopher Wren and consecrated in 1684. The spire, however, was not added until the latter part of the eighteenth century, so probably Wren was not responsible for its design.

The reredos was executed by Grinling Gibbons and includes in high relief a carving of a Pelican in her piety.

The most definite item of Masonic interest in the Church is a large monument to the Memory of Peter Gilkes (1765-1833), who is honoured by historians of the Emulation Lodge of Improvement as being one of the foremost exponents of Masonic ritual after the Union in 1813 of the two Grand Lodges.

A photograph of the memorial is in Bro. Sadler's *History of the Emulation Lodge of Improvement*. The monument itself is on the west side of one of the Pillars in the South Aisle.

The inscription is:—

SACRED
TO THE MEMORY OF
BROTHER PETER WILLIAM GILKES P.M.
A ZEALOUS ACTIVE AND DISTINGUISHED FREEMASON
WHO DEPARTED THIS LIFE DECEMBER 11TH 1833
IN THE 69TH YEAR OF HIS AGE
THIS MONUMENT WAS ERECTED BY SEVERAL OF THE
BRETHREN OF THE MASONIC ORDER TO COMMEMORATE
THEIR HIGH ESTIMATION OF THE CHARACTER AND
TALENTS OF THEIR DEPARTED FRIEND
1834.

The main feature of the monument is a charming group of a Woman (Charity) attending three young children under the All-Seeing Eye. The Square and Compasses and the interlaced Triangles appear on the Pedestal.

The celebrated Dr. Arbuthnott, whose name is recorded in Grand Lodge Minutes in the 1725 List as a Member of the Lodge at the Bedford Head, Covent Garden (see *Q.C.A.* x., p. 27), was also interred in St. James's. He died in 1735 at Hampstead.

ST. MARTIN'S IN THE FIELDS.

ST. MARY LE STRAND.

ST. CLEMENT DANES.

These three Churches may be grouped together for three reasons: First, they are in or contiguous to the Strand. Secondly, they each have a steeple. Thirdly, they each display the work of one Architect, namely, Brother James Gibbs. He was the sole Architect of the first two Churches, but was responsible only for the steeple of St. Clement's. This last named Church is mainly the work of Wren, who cased in the old work of the Tower on which the steeple by Gibbs is erected. The first two Churches depart from the usual rule in that they have no tower rising from the ground on which the steeples are supported.

The only evidence at present known to the writer as to Gibbs being a free and an accepted Mason is the statement of Anderson at page 121 of the 1738 Edition of *Constitutions*:—

“St. Martin's in Campis was at the charge of the Parishioners built strong and regular. And it being a Royal Parish Church, King George I. sent his Lord Almoner and Surveyor-General, attended by Brother Gib (the Architect of that grand Pile) with many Free Masons, in a solemn Procession from the Palace to level the Footstone of the South East Corner by giving it 3 Great Knocks with a Mallet in the King's Name, and laying upon it a Purse of 100 Guineas: when the Trumpets sounded, all join'd in joyful Acclamations and the Craftsmen went to the Tavern to drink To the King and the Craft.”

Anderson gives a copy of the Latin Inscription which was cut in the Stone and Lead put upon it. In the 1723 *Constitutions* he states that a sheet of lead was put upon it. It is probable the Foundation stone is beneath the ground. Bro. McMaster in his *History of St. Martins in the Fields* says so, but adds that another stone was laid above ground by a member of the Grand Lodge. *Mist's Weekly Journal* 26th May 1721 records that in that month the Society of Free-Masons laid with a great deal of Ceremony the first stone above Ground at the same corner 12 feet above the other.

I could not see any Foundation Stone with inscription when I looked for it.

The 1723 *Constitutions* translate the Inscription on the first Foundation Stone thus:—

SACRED TO GOD
HIS MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY KING GEORGE
BY HIS PROXY
THE RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN CHRIST
RICHARD LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY
HIS MAJESTY'S CHIEF ALMONER
ASSISTED (AT HIS MAJESTY'S COMMAND)
BY SIR THOMAS HEWET KNIGHT
OF HIS MAJESTY'S ROYAL BUILDINGS
PRINCIPAL SURVEYOR
THE FIRST STONE OF THIS CHURCH
LAID
THIS 19TH OF MARCH ANNO DOMINI 1721
AND THE EIGHTH YEAR OF HIS REIGN.

Neither in the Latin nor in the English does the name of the Architect occur, and Anderson does not mention him in the 1723 Edition, though it is not always safe to argue from the silence of Anderson. The front of the Portico has the Royal Arms and beneath is the inscription (I copy from McMaster's *History*, p. 78):—

“D Sacram Ædem S. Martini Parochiani extrui fec
A. D. MDCCXXVI.
Jacobus Gibbs, Architect.”

The Church Accounts show that Gibbs was paid £632.4.6 for his work. McMaster says “There is a fine bust of him by Rysbrach in the Church, and a good portrait by Hogarth in the Vestry Hall.”

Both Gib or Gibbs and Anderson came from Marischal College, Aberdeen, where Gibbs entered two years after Anderson, namely, in 1696, and their periods were: Gibbs (1682-1754), Anderson (1680-1739). Gibbs took the degree of M.A. He is named as a Subscriber to Anderson's book on *Royal Genealogies* (see *A.Q.C.* xxxvi., 95).

It would be interesting to know whether Gibbs was made a Mason in Scotland or in London later on and subsequent to the 1730 List in Grand Lodge Minute Book. He was living when the 1738 *Constitutions* were published with his name as Brother Gib. Reference has already been made to monuments in Westminster Abbey designed by Gibbs. He was responsible for much other work, but his fame mainly rests upon St. Martin's and St. Mary le Strand. He was interred at his own request in the old Parish Church in High Street, Marylebone, which was rebuilt in 1743. A wall tablet is there to his memory on the North wall below the Gallery.

The inscription is:—

UNDERNEATH LIE THE REMAINS OF
JAMES GIBBS ESQ.
WHOSE SKILL IN ARCHITECTURE APPEARS BY HIS
PRINTED WORKS AS WELL AS THE BUILDINGS DIRECTED
BY HIM AMONG OTHER LEGACYS AND CHARITYS HE
LEFT ONE HUNDRED POUNDS TOWARDS ENLARGING
THIS CHURCH
HE DIED AUGUST 5th 1754 AGED 71.

The interior of the former old chapel at Marylebone is faithfully depicted in Brother Hogarth's “Rake's Progress,” where the Marriage Ceremony of the Rake is shown in progress.

Brother James Figg, the celebrated prize-fighter, was also buried in the Old Churchyard at Marylebone in 1734. (See his name in *Q.C.A.* x., 26, and his biography in *D.N.B.*, *sub. nom.*)

NICHOLAS STONE.

When dealing with Westminster Abbey, reference was made to the Monuments there constructed by this Master Mason.

His own Monument was in the old Church of St. Martin in the Fields, which was demolished to make way for Gibbs's building.

The following inscription is also (with others relating to the Stone Family) recorded in *A.Q.C.* xxvi., pp. 302-3, but I am copying the record now as given in Hatton's *New View of London* (1708), page 351, at the time the Monument was extant:—

“A very neat Monument at the W. end of the Church by the Door, adorned with his Head finely carved between several tools for sculpture work and a Square, a pair of Compasses &c. each pendant from a Chaplet, and finely done in Basso Relievo: this Inscription:—

TO THE LASTING MEMORY OF NICHOLAS STONE ESQ.
MASTER MASON TO HIS MAJESTY. IN HIS LIFETIME
ESTEEMED FOR HIS KNOWLEDGE IN SCULPTURE
AND ARCHITECTURE WHICH HIS WORKS IN MANY
PARTS DO TESTIFY: AND THO MADE FOR OTHERS
WILL PROVE MONUMENTS OF HIS FAME.
HE DEPARTED THIS LIFE ON THE 24th OF AUGUST
1647 AGED 61 AND LYETH BURIED NEAR THE
PULPIT IN THIS CHURCH:

and round the Effigies these words:—

NICHOLAS STONE, SCULPT AND ARCHITECT &c.”

Later on when we come to St. Paul's Cathedral we may see the remains of the tomb of the celebrated Dr. Donne, who was Dean of St. Paul's in 1621. This tomb was executed by Nicholas Stone. He also executed, under the supervision of the celebrated Architect Inigo Jones, the Banqueting Hall in Whitehall outside of which Charles I. was beheaded, and also the old Water Gate in the Embankment Gardens at the foot of Buckingham Street, Strand. He was appointed Master Mason to James I. in 1619 and to Charles I. on 21st April 1626. A copy of the latter grant is given in full in *Rymer's Federa*, vol. xviii., p. 675. It appoints him “Master Mason and Architect for all our buildings and reparations within our honour and Castle of Windsor” in succession to William Suthes deceased. His wages were fixed at “12 pence of lawful money of England by the day” payable quarterly out of the Treasury. The enrolled copy at the Record Office is thus referred to:—Part 2 Car. i. part 12 number 13. He also received another and more general appointment in 1632. (8 Car I. pars prima No. 5.)

His Will dated 30th January 1640 is on record at the Probate Registry, Somerset House (Reference 31 Essex). It begins thus:—

“I Nicholas Stone of the Parish of St. Martyn in the Feildes in the County of Middx Esquire Mr. Mason unto his Majesty knowing the uncertainty of my life finding my body disposed to be sickly but my memory perfect thanks be to God for the same do for the settling that worldly estate which it hath pleased God to endow me with ordain this my last Will and Testament . . . I commit my soul into the hands of Almighty God hoping by the merits death and passion of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to be accompted amongst the number of the elect Saints unto whom shall be pronounced at the Great day of Judgment that glorious saying, Come ye blessed of my Father inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world And I commit my body to the earth from whence it came to be buried in such decent manner as it shall please Mary my most dear wife, one of my Executors hereinafter and herein named to think fit and appoint.”

The beneficiaries under his Will were (in effect) his wife, and his sons Henry Stone, Nicholas Stone, and John Stone. He gave them "All my books, manuscripts, draughts, designs, instruments and other things thereunto belonging which now remain in my study in my now dwelling-house to be equally divided amongst them."

The Will shows that he owned several leasehold and freehold properties in or near Long Acre in the Parish of St. Martin in the Fields.

Masonic students will remember the statement by Anderson that our ancestors in their scrupulous care of Craft secrets burnt a number of old Manuscripts, among them being a Manuscript writ by Mr. Nicholas Stone the Warden of Inigo Jones. (See *Constitutions* 1738, p. 111.) Brother Conder, the Historian of the Masons' Company, tells us that Mr. Nicholas Stone was Master of the Company in 1633 and again in 1634, and that he was also an Accepted Mason. (See *A.Q.C.* ix., 38.)

ST. MARY LE STRAND.

I am not aware of any Masonic association of this Church other than its erection according to the designs of Bro. James Gibbs. It was one of the fifty New Churches ordered to be erected by Statute of Queen Anne. They were all to have Steeples.

Bro. Nathaniel Blackerby, the first Treasurer of the Grand Lodge, was the Treasurer for these Churches and also for the new Westminster Bridge (now superseded) erected according to the designs of Bro. Labelye in the first half of the Eighteenth Century.

ST. CLEMENT DANES.

As already stated, the old work of this Tower was cased in by the now existing Stonework under the direction of Sir Christopher Wren. The Steeple was designed by Bro. Gibbs.

There is a definite fact of Masonic interest here in that here was interred

MATTHEW BIRKHEAD.

the Author of "The Enter'd Prentice's Song," the original version of which appears in the 1723 Edition of the *Constitutions*.

He was a Member of the Lodge now called The Lodge of Friendship No. 6, which was founded in 1721. He was also Master of Lodge V. in the List at p. 74 of those *Constitutions*.

"He died on December 30th 1722, and was buried at St. Clement Danes Church. At the Funeral the Pall was supported by six Freemasons belonging to Drury Lane playhouse; the other members of that particular Lodge of which he was a Warden, with a vast number of other Accepted Masons, followed two and two; both the Pall-bearers and others were in their White Aprons."

(Bro. J. T. Thorp quoted this from Read's *Weekly Journal* of January 5th 1723.)

The Rev. Bickford Pennington, the Rector of St. Clement Danes (who is a Freemason), states on enquiry that there is not, and so far as he knows never has been, any memorial or monumental inscription in connection with the interment.

ST. PAUL'S, COVENT GARDEN.

Retracing our steps we can visit this Church which was originally designed by Inigo Jones.

The Portico with its massive Doric columns (reproduced) has always been admired by competent critics. The Registers of the Church have been printed and show that many eminent persons (some of whom were doubtless Freemasons) have been buried there, but our first reference should be to the fact that Anthony Sayer, the First Grand Master of the 1717 Grand Lodge, was there interred. The date of the funeral was 5th January 1742.

In *A.Q.C.* xxx., 173 (1917) it was stated that Grand Lodge had decided to place a Tablet in the Church recording the matter. I went to the Church in 1925 to inspect the Tablet, but it was not there. Perhaps it may be done before this note is published. I have mentioned the matter to some eminent officers of Grand Lodge.

Grinling Gibbons (1648-1720), the famous carver in wood whose handiwork can be seen in St. Paul's Cathedral and St. James's, Piccadilly, was also laid to rest here. According to the 1738 Edition of the *Constitutions* he was one of two Grand Wardens in 1666 under Sir Christopher Wren as Deputy to Earl of Rivers as G.M. I do not ask that my readers shall accept this attribution as final. It seems that in some quarters there is a disposition to refrain from accepting some few of the statements made by Dr. Anderson in the historical and other parts of the 1738 *Constitutions*. Unfortunately, we have no account from Dr. Anderson of the principles (or want of them) on which he distributed Grand Lodge honours during the period prior to 1717.

James (or Jacques) Parmentier is named in the 1723 and 1725 Lists printed in *Q.C.A.* x. (pp. 8, 25, 42, 43). He was born in France in 1658, and died in England in 1730, and was buried at St. Paul's, Covent Garden, having been employed as a decorative painter. (See *D.N.B.*, *sub. nom.*)

THE CHAPEL OF THE SAVOY.

This building, which is on the West of Savoy Street, Strand, has suffered much from Fire and from the hands of the Restorer. It marks the place of interment of our Third Grand Master, the Rev. John Theophilus Desaguliers, LL.D., F.R.S., elected 24th June 1719, who died on 29th February 1743-4, at the Bedford Coffee House, Covent Garden. He was buried on 6th March 1743-4, in the Royal Chapel of the Savoy (it is not styled Royal any longer), but the exact position of the grave is unknown.


In the Churchyard at the South East corner is a tombstone showing within a Triangle the All Seeing Eye, a Cross and the Square, Compasses and Level. The inscription is:—"Sacred to the Memory of *Brother James Smith* late of Lancaster Place, Surgeon, who died December 15th 1835 in the 37th year of his Age."

THE TEMPLE CHURCH.

This very interesting Building is of interest for us if only because so many writers have alleged that there is a close connection between Freemasonry and Knight Templary. The Order of Templars, who were at first called the "Poor of the Holy City," and then "Poor Soldiers of the Temple of Solomon," was instituted in 1118 or 1119 A.D. for the protection of pilgrims to the Holy Sepulchre. When the *Articles of Union* of the Grand Lodges in 1813 defined the degrees of which pure Ancient Masonry consists, it was provided that such Articles were not intended to prevent any Lodge or Chapter from holding a meeting in any of the degrees of the Orders of Chivalry, according to the *Constitutions* of the said Orders. This proviso refers (among other Orders) to the Masonic Order of Knight Templars. In the Round of the Church we see the effigies of several Knights in a prone position, some of them having their legs or feet crossed.

In a stained glass window situate in the Round part of the Church and on the North section thereof are some medallions in glass. One of these is said to be copied from an old seal found on the site and portrays Joshua in the

ARS QUATUOR CORONATORUM.



The Marshall Monument in the Church of St. Dunstan, Fleet Street.

*Reproduced by the permission of H.M. Stationery Office,
to whom the copyright belongs.*

attitude of holding up his hands when supplicating that the light might be continued. It is alleged to be of Masonic significance, but I see no just ground for that conclusion. The glass was made in the nineteenth century, but it copies the old seal.

ST. DUNSTAN IN THE WEST.

The present Church building in Fleet Street, which probably incorporates some parts of the former structure, was erected after 1829, and consecrated in 1833. The former Church was in existence in 1421, and just escaped the Great Fire of 1666. It is illustrated in Besant's *Survey of the City of London* at p. 368. William Tyndale the Reformer, who died in 1536, was Minister there.

The old Church was beautified and repaired in 1701 and has certain Masonic associations which ought to be perpetuated in our memories. I am indebted to a book published in 1829 by Rev. J. F. Denham, B.A., entitled "Views exhibiting the Exterior and Interior and Principal Monuments of the very Ancient and Remarkable Church of St. Dunstan in the West in the City of London to which is added an historical account of the Church." (The B.M. press mark is 557* g 17.)

The old Church had what is usually called "a Glory," consisting of the sacred name of Jehovah in Hebrew characters surrounded by rays emanating from it. The letters and irradiations were formed by inlaid pieces of the finest oak and box.

Below that was an emblem frequently seen in ancient churches. It consisted of a pelican surrounded in its nest by its young ones for whose sustenance it is in the act of perforating its bosom with its beak. Our author states that antiquarians are not exactly agreed as to the origin and signification of this mysterious symbol, and then proceeds to give some explanation of it.

At page 27 of the same book the following inscription is recorded. It was on a Monument then in the South Gallery at the East End. The Monument itself is depicted later in the book and is a good specimen of a mural memorial. The main inscription is enclosed by two pillars with Corinthian capitals. A Coat of Arms surmounts the whole. I give the inscription (but not line for line) as in Denham's book, and preserve the spelling. The Monument itself is still extant in the Church, but the interior is very gloomy when no service is on, and consequently the Monument is as a rule difficult to see in detail. It is on the nearest wall of the first recess on the left after the Church is entered from Fleet Street.

A full description of the old Church and its Monuments is also given in Hatton's *A New Survey of London*, published in 1708 (vol. i., p. 230). It also records the inscriptions on the Marshall Monument (except that to Katharine, who survived until 1716), and gives the following heraldic description of the Coat of Arms:—

"Sable 2 Bars Argent; A Canton Ermin, impaled with Argent on a Fess ingrayled Gules between 3 Falcons Sable, as many Bezants, each charged with a Lion's head erased of the third."

In ye middle Ile of this Church near ye Chancell are interred ye Bodiies of EDWARD MARSHALL Esq. formerly Master Mason of England togeather with ANNE his wife by whom he had 9 Sons and 5 Daughters whereof JOSHUA (the eldest) only survived him hee was loyall to his King usefull in his Parish, Charitable to ye Poore whilst hee was living and left several Memorials of it at his Death & Departed this life ye 10 of December 1675

Aged 77 yeares

Neer him lyeth ye body of his Son JOSHUA MARSHALL Esq. late Master Mason to King Charles ye 2nd hee walked in the steps of

his Father and succeeded not only in his office but vertues whereas his father in his life tyme did give 10 per annum issuing out of a house in fetter lane during the terme of ye lease for ye dayly reading of Divine morning servic^e in this Church he hath Perpetua^{ted} it for ever he was twice Master of his Companie and bequeathed unto them above C C to y^e end that by thm 10 p.ann. should bee for ever distributed to their poor widowes and hee gave Several other Charitable bequests

In whose Memory this Monem^t. is erected by CATHERINE his wife out of y^e tender affection She bore to her husband she was the only daughter of JOHN GEORGE Cittizen of LONDON who had issue by him 5 Children viz Joshua George Anne Edward & John. Anne & Edward yett suviving y^e other 3 are buried by him hee died Aprill 16 Aged 49 years 1678.

where also lies the Body
of KATHARINE MARSHALL
Widdow who Survived him 38
years and departed this life Sept.
the 15th 1716. Aged 66 years.

The Wills of Edward Marshall, Joshua Marshall and Katherine Marshall were duly proved and may probably be seen at the Probate Registry, Somerset House. Brother Conder, however, states that Joshua's Will could not be found at Doctors Commons.

Joshua Marshall, in addition to being Master Mason to Charles II., was twice Master of the Masons' Company. In his Will he says that he is a Member of the Company of Masons of London, and gives them £200 for the benefit of poor widows.

Edward Marshall and Joshua Marshall are both subjects of short memoirs in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Edward was admitted to the Freedom of the Masons' Company in 1626 and to the Livery in 1631-2. He carried on business as a Stone-cutter in Fetter Lane, and was much employed as a Tomb-maker.

Joshua Marshall executed the pedestal designed by Grinling Gibbons for the Statue, still at Charing Cross, of Charles I., and was also employed in the building of the Temple (off Fleet Street) before 1670. He was one of the two original Masons (Thomas Strong was the other) who began foundations at the East of St. Paul's Cathedral. (See *Masonic Record* ii., 617.)

It also appears from Brother Conder's book *The Hole Craft and Fellowship of Masons* that the Marshalls were contractors for the building of Temple Bar and the Monument on Fish Street Hill. Further information as to the Marshalls is given in Brother Conder's book, but I think he does not make any mention of their Memorial in the Church. Edward Marshall was admitted to the freedom of the Masons' Company in 1626, and became Master in 1650. (Conder erroneously gives Edward Marshall's age at death as 97 instead of 77). Joshua Marshall was elected to the Court of Assistants of the Masons' Company in 1665 and filled the Master's Chair twice, one of the years being 1670.

Most of my readers will remember the account of a service held at St. Dunstan's in the West on 27th December 1777, when Rev. M. H. Eccles, the Chaplain to the Lodge of Antiquity, preached an anniversary sermon. Certain members of the Lodge of Antiquity attended that service and clothed themselves as Masons in the Vestry. After the service they walked back to the Lodge Room, then situate at the Mitre Tavern just across the street, without doffing their Masonic clothing. As a result of the dissension arising from this not very reprehensible act, the Lodge of Antiquity became divided and under the guidance

of Bro. William Preston the new "Grand Lodge South of the Trent" was formed. The breach was not repaired until 1789. (For further particulars see Gould's *History*, vol. ii., p. 424, *et seq.*)

Brother John Gordon, named in *Q.C.A.* x., 24, and *D.N.B.* (*sub. nom.*), was buried at St. Dunstan's in the West in 1739.

ST. BARTHOLOMEW THE GREAT, SMITHFIELD.

This Church should not be omitted from our perambulation. It is one of the finest specimens extant in England of old Norman work. The beautiful tomb of Rahere is on the North side of the Sanctuary in the Church. He died in 1143 and is still above ground beneath an effigy and tomb of tabernacle work of about the year 1410. His epitaph is: "Here lieth Rahere, the first Canon and first Prior of this Church." He was the founder of the Church and of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, which is adjacent. Lodge No. 2546 is named "Rahere" after him.

The Baptistry at St. Bartholomew's contains the font used when Hogarth the Painter was christened. It is one of the three pre-Reformation fonts in London.

Hogarth was a Freemason, and acted as Steward for the Festival in 1735. He also engraved some pictures bearing upon Masonic subjects, of which nothing more need now be said.

The Lady Chapel at St. Bartholomew's has seen many vicissitudes. At one time it was converted into a dwelling-house and fell into the hands of Samuel Palmer, the printer and letter founder, who employed here, in the year 1725, Benjamin Franklin, the great American philosopher and politician. He was also a Freemason, and when he went to America he printed and published in 1734 the first American edition of the *Constitutions*: "By special order for the use of the brethren in North America 1734."

ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL.

This magnificent Church next claims our attention. Before dealing with the subject generally, the following two items are mentioned as relating to the period before the Great Fire of 1666:—

(1) A monument to John Donne (1573-1631). He was Dean of St. Paul's for some years before his death. The monument is in white marble and is said to be the only uninjured monument from Old St. Paul's. It is in the North Aisle, close to Dean Milman's monument. The sculptor was the Master Mason Nicholas Stone, to whose work several references have already been made. Dr. Donne is represented as in his shroud. The *Ency. Britt.* (11th Edition) says that he stood for his statue before a fire in his study at the Deanery with his winding sheet wrapped and tied round him, his eyes shut, and his feet resting on a funeral urn.

(2) On either side of Dean Milman's monument are fragments of stone said to have belonged to the Temple at Jerusalem. Whether they were part of Solomon's, or Zerubbabel's, or Herod's Temple does not appear, but if they formed part of either they are certainly of definite Masonic interest.

SIR CHRISTOPHER WREN (1632-1723).

His body is in the Crypt under the Choir.

The Cathedral itself is his Monument, as witness the celebrated epitaph:—

"LECTOR, SI MONUMENTUM REQUIRIS—CIRCUMSPICE."

The commemorative inscription on a black marble slab is in these words:—

HERE LIETH
 SIR CHRISTOPHER WREN
 The Builder of this Cathedral
 Church of St. Paul &c.
 who dyed
 In the year of our Lord
 MDCCXXIII.
 and of his age XCI.

(As in Milman's *Annals of St. Paul's Cathedral*, p. 474.)

Wren was knighted in the year 1674, and was Surveyor of the Royal works for fifty years. Certain infamous persons were responsible for his dismissal from that office a few years before his death.

Dr. Anderson in the 1738 *Constitutions* makes specific statements as to the offices of Grand Master and Deputy Grand Master being held by Wren, and he even names the Wardens who were associated with him. If Dr. Anderson had not given such details, but had only made the bare statement that Wren was a Freemason, his allegation might have passed unchallenged. Dr. Anderson's statements were not made in the 1723 Edition, which came out in the year when Wren died, but were deferred until the 1738 Edition. It is true that the 1738 Edition came out in the lifetime of Christopher Wren, the son of Sir Christopher, and that this son was a Member of what is now the Lodge of Antiquity No. 2, and, so far as appears, never contradicted Anderson's statement; but suspicion will always attach to the allegations of Anderson owing to the precise but unconfirmed statements made by him as to the title of the Office in the Craft held by Sir Christopher. There are now two sets of opinion between which the reader must decide. But since my first draft of this paper I have discovered certain entries in the printed Calendar of Treasury Papers (1556-1696) in the British Museum Reading Room, Case 2080 (b), which are at least interesting and relevant.

A question had arise in 1689 as to the workmanship of certain walls at Hampton Court. A wall had fallen, and there was an official enquiry. This is an extract from a Minute dated 30 Decr. 1689:—"Sir Christopher thinks that (*i.e.*, a suggestion as to procedure) may not be so well and that he will go and examine upon oath and that their Lordships shall have affidavits of able men not interested: bricklayers, carpenters and *masons that have left off their aprons* and are without suspicion of being influenced." (The italics are mine.)

13 Jan. 1689-90. "Mr. Oliver says none of y^e masons Mr. Talman brought understand as good work as this. Mr. Talman says that Pierce, Thompson and another (in his certificates) are three masons that Sir Christopher employs."

LORD NELSON (1758-1805).

The Grave of Lord Nelson is in the Crypt of St. Paul's and his Monument is in the North Aisle.

Direct evidence that Nelson was a Freemason has not yet been adduced. There is, however, considerable secondary evidence, and (rightly or wrongly) the conclusion appears to have been reached in several quarters that he can properly be claimed as a Brother Mason. I think that my readers who feel interested will prefer to consider the evidence (such as it is) for themselves and form their own conclusion.

The subject is dealt with in *A.Q.C.*, vol. xii., 109. Reference is there made to the *History of Freemasonry in Norfolk* by R.W. Bro. Hamon le Strange, who concluded as follows:—

"There is not enough in the above facts to enable us to affirm positively that Nelson was a Freemason but the presumption points strongly towards that conclusion."

Subsequently to that *History* a Banner was discovered belonging to the Union Lodge, York, No. 331, now the York Lodge No. 236.

The Banner reads as follows:—

IN MEMORY OF
HORATIO VISCOUNT NELSON
WHO FELL IN THE MOMENT OF
VICTORY
OFF
CAPE TRAFALGAR
October 21st 1805
[*U.S.L. with S. & C. Moon & Seven Stars*]
WE REJOICE WITH OUR COUNTRY
BUT MOURN FOR OUR BROTHER.

A Minute of the Lodge dated December 16th 1805 states:—

Bro. W. Master proposed that a public Procession should take place on the Interment of our Departed Bro. and Hero Lord Nelson. Secl. by Br. P.M. Thirded by the S. WARDEN.

It is surmised that the Banner, which is preserved and exhibited in the Lodge, was made for that Procession.

In *The Medals of British Freemasonry* is an illustration of a Medal showing on one side a Portrait of Nelson surrounded by the words "Gallant Nelson died Octr. 21 off Cape Trafalgar"; and on the other side the words "Nelsonic Crimson Oakes commenced Jan. 19. 1808," surrounding several emblems sometimes associated with Masonry. I do not know why those emblems should be placed in conjunction with Nelson's name unless the medallist thought he had reason to believe that the Hero was a Mason. The Nelson of the Nile Lodge No. 264 meets at Batley and was founded in 1801, while Nelson was living. (See *Lane*, p. 218.)

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON (1769-1852).

The finest Monument in St. Paul's is that by Alfred Stevens to the Duke of Wellington. The Monument is in the Nave. The Duke was interred in the Crypt. He was made a Mason on the 7th of December 1790 in Lodge 494, which met at Trim, in Ireland. His actual signature, "A. Wesley" (before he changed his surname to Wellesley), is still preserved in the Bye-laws of that Lodge. (For further information see *A.Q.C.* xv., 108. The signature is reproduced opposite p. 116.) The Duke repeatedly expressed to Lord Combermere, P.G.M. of Cheshire and his old comrade, his regret that his military duties had prevented him from taking the active part in Freemasonry that his feelings dictated.

LORD KITCHENER, F.M.

The beautiful Cenotaph to Lord Kitchener is also to be seen in the North Aisle of the Cathedral.

WILLIAM PRESTON (1742-1818).

The founder of the Prestonian Lecture was buried in St. Paul's Churchyard, or, as it was reported in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, "under St. Paul's Cathedral." The date of his death was 1st April 1818, and a full and very interesting account of his Funeral appeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for April 1818, p. 372.

I wrote asking whether there was any Memorial to Preston, and Dean Inge replied that there is none. Singularly enough, the Burial Register omits any record of what must have been an event which on its day created no small stir. The Burial Register of St. Paul's has been reprinted by the Harleian Society (*Registers*, vol. 26, published 1898), and it only records two interments in 1818, and one of these two was of one Alexander Murray on 17th January 1818, from Dean Street, Fetter Lane, where Preston resided.

(The *Registers* do not record the interment of Wren, and the printed Copy starts off with a reference to interments which "my predecessor" had omitted to enter.)

PART II.

ST. HELEN'S, BISHOPSGATE.

WILLIAM KIRWIN, 1594.

The City of London being the headquarters of the Masons' Company, we might expect to find in that City some ancient Memorial to a Freemason.

The tomb of William Kirwin who died in 1594 is still preserved in the ancient Church of St. Helen, Bishopsgate, which has been called the Westminster Abbey of the City.

Vol. ix., Part I., of the *Survey of London*, published by the London County Council, contains two photographs of it. It is a small altar tomb with panelled sides bearing incised figures of children, two shields, and a lozenge of Arms. A plain wrought iron railing surrounds it. It was repaired and restored in 1868.

Bro. W. H. Rylands was the Author of an informative article on the subject which was entitled "An Old Mason's Tomb," and illustrated, and appeared in the *Masonic Magazine* for September 1881. It is also recorded in Hatton's *New View of London* (1708), p. 278.

Kirwin's own Arms appear in addition to the Arms (as granted in the 12th year of Edward IV., 1472-3) of the Masons' Company, and the Motto "God is our Guide." On the South side of the Tomb is the following inscription:—

HERE LYETH THE BODIE OF WILLIAM KIRWIN OF THIS
CITTIE OF LONDON FREEMASON WHOE DEPARTED THIS
LYFE THE 26TH DAY OF DECEMBER AN DO 1594.

and on the North side:—

AEDIBUS ATTA LIOIS LONDINUM QUI DECORAVI: ME
DUCE
SURGEBANT ALIIS REGALIA TECTA:
EXIGUAM TRIBUUNT HANC MIHI FATA
DOMV: ME DUCE CONFICITUR
OSSIBUS VRNA MEIS

which Gould thus translates:—

"The Fates have afforded this narrow house to me, who have adorned London with noble buildings. By me royal palaces were built for others. By me this tomb is erected for my bones."

(Gould, vol. ii., 155 and Hatton both read Attaliciis instead of Atta Liois. There seems to have been an error when the Tomb was restored.)

The tomb also commemorates the death of William Kirwin's wife and child, and on the West end of the frieze of the Monument are these words:—

CHRISTUS MIHI VITA
MORS MIHI LUCRUM.

In the same Church is the Altar Tomb of Sir Julius Cæsar. It has on the top a very striking representation of a parchment deed with seal and other embellishments. The sculptor was Nicholas Stone.

ST. OLAVE, HART STREET.

WILLIAM SMITH.

Brother Conder in his History of the Masons' Company noticed a Memorial in the Church of St. Olave, Hart Street, bearing this inscription:—

HERE LYETH THE BODY OF WILLIAM SMITH CITIZEN
AND FREEMASON OF LONDON WHO LIVED TO THE AGE
OF 66 YEARS AND DEPARTED THIS LIFE THE 25TH DAY
OF JANUARY 1646.

The tombstone bears the Arms of the Masons' Company with the plain chevron. William Smith was Master of that Company in 1640.

The inscription had also been noted by Mr. Wyatt Papworth, F.R.I.B.A., in *A.Q.C.* iv., 247. That is one of the few articles in *A.Q.C.* written by one not initiated.

St. Olave, Hart Street, is also celebrated as being the Church which Pepys the diarist attended and where he was ultimately interred.

BUNHILL FIELDS.

REV. JAMES ANDERSON, D.D.

The name of the Rev. James Anderson, D.D., must always be prominent in Masonic History.

He came on a pilgrimage to London from Aberdeen, where he was born some time before 19th January 1679, on which date his baptism is registered (*A.Q.C.*, xxxvi., 90).

He was largely responsible for the writing and publication of the First two Editions of the *Constitutions* dated 1723 and 1738. They were recognised as being his own property.

The Historical portions of those two Editions are regarded as being both indispensable and unreliable. He distributed the honours of Grand Mastership from the beginning of time with a flowing pen and no niggardly spirit.

I will not burden my readers with an account of the criticisms to which his writings have been subjected. As pilgrims we have no time for such disputable matters.

He was a Presbyterian Minister at the Church in Swallow Street, Piccadilly, where he had been preceded by the father of Dr. Desaguliers, who had ministered to a French Congregation.

The Church building was used for religious purposes until fairly recent years, but it has now been demolished.

Dr. Anderson died on the 28th May 1739, at Exeter Court, Strand. He was interred in Bunhill Fields Burial ground in the City Road, but no known trace remains of any gravestone or memorial inscription.

The Registers of that Burial ground are now deposited at the General Register Office, Somerset House. The following is a copy of the entry recording his interment there:—

June	Revd. Mr. Jeams Anderson from	
ye 3	the Strand in a grave	00-13-6
1739		

The following interesting account of the funeral proceedings is taken from *A.Q.C.*, vol. xxiii., 25, in an article by R.W. Bro. Robbins, P.B.G.P., who quotes from *The Daily Post* of Saturday June 2nd (The dates seem inconsistent—Perhaps the date in the Register is the date when the fee was entered up as received):—

“Last Night, was interr'd in Bunhill-Fields the Corpse of Dr. Anderson, a Dissenting Teacher, in a very remarkable deep Grave. His Pall was supported by five Dissenting Teachers, and the Rev. Dr. Desaguliers: It was follow'd by about a Dozen of Free-Masons, who encircled the Grave; and after Dr. Earle had harangued on the Uncertainty of Life &c. without one Word of the Deceased, the Brethren, in a most solemn dismal Posture, lifted up their Hands, sigh'd, and struck their Aprons three times in Honour to the Deceased.”

This paragraph was precisely repeated in the same day's issue of *The London Evening Post*.

Bunhill Fields was the Burial place used mainly for Nonconformists and a great number of Worthies are there interred, among them being John Bunyan the renowned Author of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, one of whose minor works is entitled *Solomon's Temple Spiritualised*.

John Newman (*Q.C.A.*, x., 13, 29 and *D.N.B.*), who died in 1741, was also buried at Bunhill Fields.

ST. MAGNUS, LONDON BRIDGE.

HENRY YEVELE.

In Dr. Anderson's own History issued as part of the 1738 *Constitutions* reference is made to 5 “Masters of Work.” Of these the 4th is in the time of Edward III. (who died 21st June 1377).

“4. Henry Yevele (called at first, in the old Records the King's Free Mason) built for the King the London Charter-house, King's-Hall Cambridge, Queenborough Castle, and rebuilt St. Stephen's Chapel, “now [*i.e.*, in 1738] the House of Commons in Parliament.”

In *A.Q.C.*, vol. xxi., 179, is a note by the Rev. Richard Peek (rector of St. Magnus-the-Martyr, London Bridge) giving an extract from a lecture given by him when conducting parties round that Church.

“In the Chapel of the Holy Virgin in the Old Church, was buried Henry Yevele, described by Stow in 1663 as Free-mason to Edward III., Richard II. and Henry IV. This Yevele (or Zeneley) assisted to erect the Tomb of Richard II. in Westminster Abbey, and constructed the Monument to Anne of Bohemia the Queen, 1395 to 1397, and about the same time was employed to prepare plans for raising the walls of Westminster Hall. He founded a Chauntry in the Chapel of St. Mary in this Church and died in 1400 A.D.”

“Beyond this point (said the Rector) I have discovered nothing so far. Should there have been any tomb with inscription to this Yevele it would no doubt have perished in the Great Fire of 1666, with the old St. Magnus' Church. Our registers do not go back to 1400 A.D.”

In the *London & Middlesex Archaeological Transactions*, vol. ii., pages 259-266, is a very interesting article by John Gough Nichols, F.S.A., on the said Henry de Yeveley, giving many interesting particulars of his life and work and a long abstract of his Will dated 25th May. I. Henry IV. enrolled in the Court of Husting at Guildhall by John Clifford mason and Martin Seman clerk two of his executors. By this Will he left his body to be buried in the Chapel of St. Mary within the Church of St. Magnus where his tomb was then already built.



Frontispiece to the 1756 Edition of Bunyan's *Solomon's Temple Spiritualized*. The couplet is adapted from the song, "Come Follow, Follow me," in *Ahiman Rezon*, 1756.

When Stowe wrote, he said "his monument remaineth," but he does not describe it further nor give the epitaph, of which no copy appears to be extant.

The existing Church of St. Magnus is one of which Wren was the Architect, so though we cannot see the Tomb prepared by Yevele for himself, we can journey to the burial place and at the same time admire one of Sir Christopher's most prominent works standing as it does near the City end of London Bridge.

There is also an Article by Bro. Wonnacott, entitled "Henry Yevele, the King's Master Mason," in *A.Q.C.*, xxi., 244 to 253.

The Patent Rolls preserved in the Record Office include several documents in which reference is made to the activities of Henry de Yevele. A few instances are now given (including a few other contemporaneous entries) at page 94 of the printed Patent Rolls for Edward III., 1367-1370. Henry Yevele is named as the Keeper of London Bridge and the works thereof.

27th August 1369. (43 Edward III., p. 2, m. 25.)

Grant to Henry de Yevele that whereas by letters patent dated 25 June in the 34th year of the King appointed him during pleasure to be disposer of the works of masonry in the Palace of Westminster and the Tower of London with 12d a day by the hands of William de Lambithe then surveyor of the said works. He shall take the 12d a day for life to wit during the works by the hands of the Clerk of such works and when the works cease at the Exchequer, as well as a Winter Robe yearly at the Great Wardrobe of the suit of the Esquire of the Household or such sum in the said Wardrobe for the Robe as one of the Esquires takes for one.

(Vacated and surrendered because Richard II. on 22nd October in his 13th year granted to him the Manors of Tamworth and Vannes, co. Kent).

1st March 1370. (44 Edward III., p. 1, m. 24).

Westminster.

Appointment of Master Henry Yevele to take 50 hewers of stone in London and the Counties of Middlesex Essex Kent and Surrey and bring them to Orewell or elsewhere as the King shall order so that they be there by 1st May next at latest ready to set out from thence at the King's wages whither he shall appoint and arrest and commit to prison until further order all contrarians.

The like of Master de William de Wynford to take 50 hewers of stone in the Counties of Somerset Dorset Oxford Berks Southampton Bedford and Buckingham and bring them to Orewell as above.

10th July 1377.

Appointment of Henry de Yevele to take plaisterers (cementarios) wherever found except in the fee of the Church and put them on the King's works at the palace of Westminster and the Tower with power to imprison the disobedient.

[*Note.*—The word "Cementarios" is usually and probably more accurately translated "Masons."]

The Masons who were press ganged under this order may have had some difficulty in regarding themselves as *Free* Masons. On 11th May 1381 protection for one year was granted for William Londeney's mason working with the Abp. of Canterbury on the new City walls of Canterbury.

7th March 1378.

Inspeximus and confirmation in favour of Henry de Yevele director of the "Plasterers" works in the Palace of Westminster and the Tower (dispositorem operacionum nostucerum *artem cementariam* tangenciam) in the late reign whom the King has retained of letters patent dated 27th Aug. Edward III. being a grant to him for life of 12d daily. By the Great Council.

Vacated by Surrender and cancelled because the King granted to him the Manors of Tremworth and Vannes co. Kent 22 October 13. Richd. II.

7th May 1378.

Appointment of Master William Wyndford and Master Henry Yevele to choose and take and set on work at the King's charge as many stonemasons and other workmen as shall be necessary for the works ordered at Southampton excepting the fee of the Church.

14th March 1381.

Appointment of Master Henry Yevele to take 30 Masons without the fee of the Church in the City and suburbs of London and the Counties of Kent Essex and Middlesex and deliver them to William Lakenhethe sergeant at arms for service in Brittany with the King's Uncle Thomas Earl of Buckingham.

12th February 1383.

This Patent mentions Master Henry Yevele Stonemason as supervisor re the Bridge at Rochester.

[There are 5 others of this kind dated in 1383 and another in 1384.]

22nd February 1384.

Ratification of the Estate of Henry Yevele Mason in 2 shops in the Parish of St. Martin Oteswich London and 4/- rent issuing from tenements therein let to John Totenham carpenter sometimes the possession of Martin Excestre which he lately acquired in fee simple but fears he shall lose by the false representation of rivals that the premises have escheated to the Crown.

In consideration of his great services to the King.

(By signet letter.)

9th December 1385.

£100 per annum was granted to be expended on the Walls of Canterbury by survey of (among others) Master Henry Yevele.

Tempus Richard II.

29 June 1386. Henry de Yvele, Mason, was one of the Referees to enquire what sums had been received from the Ferry between Rochester and Strode (The Patent was vacated and nothing was done under it).

22nd October 1389.

Grant for life as from Michaelmas last to Henry de Yevele the last King's Master Mason (dispositorem operacionem cementari tangencium) of the Manors of Tremworth and Vannes co. Kent to the value of £17 a year . . . upon surrender by the said Henry of (1) letters patent dated 25th January 34 Edward III. granting to him inter alia 12d. a day and (2) The King's Confirmation thereof dated 7th March—Rich. II. Henceforth he is to have during life 25/- surplus of the said 12d a day from the Clerk of the King's works in the Palace of Westminster and the Tower of London so long as those works last and from the Exchequer when they cease and a winter robe every year at Xmas from the Great Wardrobe of the suit of esquires or an equivalent sum. If the manours pass out of the King's hand the provision of the former grants revive.

[Note.—1/- a day would be 365/- per annum. £17 per annum would be only 340/- per annum, the difference being the above surplus of 25/-.]

3rd March 1390. (13 Rich. II., p. iii., memb. 21).

Appointment for 7 years of Master Henry Yevele and Master William Wynford master masons and Master Hugh Herlond master carpenter of the King's works throughout England to cause the walls turrets gates and bridges

of Winchester Castle and the houses within the Castle which have not fallen to be repaired for which the King has assigned 40 marks a year for that period to be paid by the Bailiffs of Winchester from their farm by assignment and advice of the said Henry William and Hugh and by the control of the Constable of the Castle. By privy seal.

15th June 1390. A document relating to expenditure on repairing a dongeon within the Castle at Canterbury by the advice of Master Henry Yevele &c.

29th August 1390.

Exemption for life, in consideration of his being the King's Mason and Surveyor of Works within the Palace of Westminster Tower of London and Castle of Canterbury and of his great age of Henry Yevele from being put on assizes juries . . . or other minister of the King against his Will.

20th October 1391.

Henry Yevele was appointed one of a Commission as to walls and ditches.

7th September 1392.

License for alienation in mortmain by William Bys and Henry Yevele citizens of London of five shops in parish of St. Magnus and St. Swithin, also:—

License for alienation in frankalmoin by Henry Yevele &c. citizens of London.

Alienation to prior and convent of the Salutation of the Mother of God of the Carthusian Order, London.

16th February 1393.

Henry Yevelee, mason, mentioned as grantee of Manor of Langton.

13th March 1393. (16 R. II., p. iii., m. 25).

Appointment of John Mayhew and John Russe the King's workers of marble columns in the Church of St. Peter Westminster to take personally and by deputies in Dorset at reasonable wages the necessary masons workmen and servants of that art and ships wains and carts for carriage for the said work.

The name *Yevele* is clearly a place name and was the contemporaneous mode of spelling *Yeovil*.

THE MONUMENT.

The Monument on Fish Street Hill commemorating the Great Fire of 1666 was designed by Sir Christopher Wren and the large Relief carving on the Western side of the die was carved by Gabriel Cibber. The stonework of the Monument was contracted for by Edward Marshall and Joshua Marshall (Master Masons to Charles II.), of whom more is said elsewhere in this paper.

Dr. Anderson says (1738 *Constitutions*, p. 106) that Gabriel Cibber was appointed one of Wren's Grand Wardens.

(Anderson's account of the Monument is at page 134 of the 1738 Edition).

This monument, which has 345 steps, was begun in 1671 and finished in 1677.

In Hattons *A New View of London*, published 1708 (pages 54, 55 and 56), is a full description of the Monument and of the Relief Carving by Cibber, which is an allegorical representation of the rebuilding of London. There are eleven principal Figures, but I only quote in part.

"6. Another of the said 3 women is Ichnographia with Rule and
"Compasses in one Hand (the Instruments whereby Plans and designs
"are delineated in due Proportion) and a Scrol partly unrolled in the
"other Hand whereon such designs are to be drawn: and near this a
"Bee-hive, the known emblem of Industry."

"8. Providence with his winged Hand containing an Eye."

I inspected this carving in September 1925 and it is very well preserved. The Bee-hive is prominent. It was a very favourite emblem on old Tracing Boards. In Noorthouck's edition of the *Constitutions* he substitutes "Architecture" for "Ichnographia" as the name of the said woman.

In the British Museum (K.24 16h) is a large engraving, size $17\frac{1}{2}$ x 21ins. (undated, but probably published soon after the Monument was completed) shewing a representation of the carved work on the West side of the Pedestal of the Monument. Sold by John Bowles.

This shows the Beehive (which is explained as representing Industry) very distinctly and it also shows a Mason's Square (which was by Hatton called the Rule) and Compasses in one of the hands of "Architecture." (The engraving is reversed: that is, it depicts the carving as it would be seen in a mirror. It was reproduced in *A.Q.C.*, xxxviii., 145.)

THE MASONS' COMPANY.

This Livery Company of the City of London had its Hall, which was rebuilt soon after the Great Fire of 1666, in the thoroughfare now called Masons' Avenue, until 1865, when they sold it. It has now no Hall of its own.

The Company or its progenitor was in existence before 1377. In the Letter Books kept at the Guildhall for the 50th year of Edward III. (1376-7) the "Fre-Masons" are mentioned as on the list of Misteries who sent representatives to the Court of Common Council for that year. I think that is the earliest known occurrence of the word Free-Mason. That particular entry was however struck through and the original shows an attempt to erase it. It was reproduced in *A.Q.C.*, xli., 136. The original grant of Arms (as still used by the Company) is now in the British Museum (Add'l MS. 19, 135). The grant is dated 12th Edward IV. (*i.e.*, 1472). The same arms (with slight alteration) are incorporated in those of The United Grand Lodge of England, but they were used for many years by the Grand Lodge formed in 1717.

The importance of this Company in the History of British Freemasonry is great. Its history has been written by Bro. Edward Conder in a volume entitled *The Hole Crafte and Fellowship of Masons*. He comes to the conclusion that even before Reformation times the Company had an 'Acception' consisting of members of the Company who were 'speculative' as distinguished from 'operative' Masons. Elias Ashmole records in his Diary that on 10th March 1682, he received a summons to appear at a Lodge to be held the next day at Masons' Hall, London. He attended accordingly when *about noon* (that is, when the sun was at its meridian in England) Sir William Wilson, Knight, Capt. Rich. Borthwick, Mr. Will. Woodman, Mr. Wm. Grey, Mr. Saml. Taylour and Mr. William Wise were admitted into the Fellowship of the Free Masons. Ashmole was the Senior Fellow then present, having been admitted 35 years before. "We all dyned at the Half Moon Taverne in Cheapside at a Noble dinner prepared at the charge of the New-accepted Freemasons."

Many celebrated names of Operative and Speculative Freemasons appear in the Records of the Masons' Company. Unfortunately their oldest records were either cast away as things of no worth, or stolen, so that the earliest document now held by the Company is an account book dated 1620.

In 1620 (page 146) is an entry noting the receipt from six persons named, of money paid as their gratuities at their acceptance into the Livery. And in 1631 this item occurs:—

"Paid in goeing abroad and att a meeting att the Hall about the
"Masons that were to be accepted."

Some parts of the old Building re-erected after the 1666 Fire may still be seen in Masons' Avenue, Coleman Street. In the Crace Collection in the British Museum, Print Room Portfolio No. xxxvii., Sheet 31. No. 92, is a water colour drawing of the entrance to Masons' Hall which, as far as I know, has not been reproduced. The Fraternity of Masons, London, was in existence in 1388, for

it is referred to in the Will of William Hancock dated 12th February 1388, as founded at St. Thomas de Acres (The Mercers' Hall is on the site now).

MEETING PLACES.

The four Lodges named as joining with other old Masons in forming the Grand Lodge of England met at The Goose and Gridiron Ale house in St. Paul's Churchyard, The Crown Alehouse in Parkers Lane, The Apple Tree Tavern in Charles Street, Covent Garden and The Rummer and Grapes Tavern in Channel Row, Westminster. None of these four houses remain: but we can visit the sites of the first three.

The Goose & Gridiron remained in existence until 1894, when it was pulled down and now forms part of the warehouse of Messrs. Hitchcock Williams & Co. in London House Yard, St. Paul's Churchyard. The great interest it has for us is that the first Grand Master Anthony Sayer was elected in 1717 and there the Grand Lodge met on St. John the Baptist's Day (24th June) in the years 1717, 1718, 1719 and 1720. Also on St. John the Evangelist's Day 1720 and Ladyday 1721. The Lodge which met there is now represented by the Lodge Antiquity No. 2 which meets at Freemasons' Hall.

The Apple Tree Tavern was in Charles Street, Covent Garden. Charles Street is now in the northern section of Wellington Street, Strand, between Russell Street at the North and Tavistock Street and York Street at the South. Many enquiries have been made by me with a view to identifying the exact site, but it was not until December 1928 that success was attained. It was the first house from York Street at the South end and on the East side of Charles Street. It was here that the first meeting was held at which it was decided in 1716 to form a Grand Lodge. The Lodge which met there removed to the Queen's Head, Knave's Acre in 1723 or earlier. It had the honour of supplying its Member Anthony Sayer as the first Grand Master and is now the Fortitude and Old Cumberland Lodge, No. 12, which meets at Princes Hall, Piccadilly. The evidence as to identification of the site of the Apple Tree Tavern is contained in an Appendix to this paper.

The Lodge at the Crown, Parkers Lane, did not stay there for more than a few years. It appears in the Engraved List of Lodges for 1736 as meeting at the Bull and Gate, Holborn, but was struck off the roll at the renumbering in 1740. Parker's Lane is now known as Parker Street and runs from Drury Lane to Kingsway at the rear of the North side of Great Queen Street. The Crown, which was on the North side towards the Easterly end remained in existence until 1920, when it was demolished. It was near to the present Freemasons' Hall (See note by W.J.S., *A.Q.C.*, xxxiii., p. 184).

Channel Row, Westminster, was partly demolished in order to make room for Westminster Bridge. The Lodge held in 1717 at the Rummer & Grapes afterwards met at the Horn at Westminster. The Horn at Westminster was situate in New Palace Yard, Westminster. George Payne died in New Palace Yard. New Palace Yard still exists, but it is very different from the Yard of that name in which the Horn Tavern was situate.

It was a Lodge of which the Members moved in a higher circle of Society than any of the other three Lodges and is now represented by The Royal Somerset House and Inverness Lodge No. 4 which meets at Freemasons' Hall in Great Queen Street.

In its early days Grand Lodge was peripatetic in its nature. Until Ladyday 1721 the Assemblies were held at the Goose & Gridiron Ale House and the largest room there was but of small dimensions. On that date Grand Master Payne "observing the number of Lodges to encrease and that the General Assembly required more room proposed the next Assembly and Feast to be held at Stationers Hall Ludgate Street which was agreed to." The following places were accordingly resorted to by Grand Lodge and we can, as Masonic Pilgrims, accompany these old Masons to their various meeting places in the City and in Westminster.

The meeting of 24th June 1721 was as arranged held at Stationers' Hall, but before the Brethren held their Feast at that Hall they had met at the King's Arms Tavern in the morning, and having recognised their choice of Bro. Montagu, they made some new Brothers particularly the Noble Philip Lord Stanhope (afterwards the celebrated Earl of Chesterfield) and from thence marched to the Hall in proper clothing and due Form (Anderson 1738, p. 112).

From Anderson's *Constitutions* of 1738 and the Grand Lodge Minute Book it appears that the following other resorts were patronised by the then Grand Lodge, namely:—

The Fountain in the Strand.
 The White Lion, Cornhill.
 Merchant Taylors' Hall.
 The Crown Tavern behind the Royal Exchange.
 The Bell Tavern in Westminster.
 The Devil Tavern within Temple Bar.
 The Mercers' Hall in Cheapside.
 The Queen's Head in Great Queen Street.
 The Three Tuns in Swithin's Alley near the Royal Exchange.
 The Rose in Mary-la-Bonne.
 The Half-Moon in Cheapside.
 The Castle in Drury Lane.
 Fishmongers' Hall.

The places named include all those which were used up to the end of 1738.

As far as I am aware none of those old Taverns remain. Perhaps the only example of the sites of such Taverns being used as such still is that of the Rose of Normandy in High Street, Marylebone. Grand Lodge met there on 14th May 1731, and on reference to *Q.C.A.*, x., at page 204, it will be seen that there was a very distinguished attendance of Titled Brethren. The Rose was until 1731 the Headquarters of the Lodge now known as Old King's Arms Lodge, No. 28. There was a celebrated Bowling Green attached to the House and probably this was an attraction to the private Lodge and afforded scope for entertaining the Grand Lodge. The present "Rose of Normandy" occupies a larger site than the old building did, but it incorporates the old site (No. 33 High Street, Marylebone). The reference to Normandy was added at a later date apparently as a compliment to the French Colony who had a Chapel near by. The old Tavern is illustrated in Clinch's *Marylebone & St. Pancras* (London 1890), pages 43 & 44.

The Halls of the Four City Companies are still in existence, although the present Fishmongers' Hall is quite a new Building. It only dates from 1832.

The former Fishmongers' Hall was patronised for Masonic Grand Lodge purposes on 15th April 1736, 28th April 1737 and 27th April 1738.

The Stationers' Hall still remains and I think it can be safely said that it is, of existing places, the one which can show a record of sheltering our Brethren of the 1717 Grand Lodge at an earlier date than any other. Meetings are recorded as being held there on St. John the Baptist's Day (24th June) in the years 1721, when John, Duke of Montagu, was installed as G.M.; in 1722, when the Duke of Wharton was proclaimed as G.M. and on 27th December 1728, when Lord Kingston was proclaimed as G.M.

The Mercers' Hall in Cheapside and Ironmonger Lane was frequently used for the Installation or Proclamation of Grand Masters. The following dates are instances:—27th February 1726/7, 27th December 1727, 27th December 1728, 27th March 1731, 7th June 1733, 30th March 1734, and 17th April 1735. Mercers' Hall was rebuilt after the Great Fire and I have had the privilege of being shown over it and seeing the place where our ancient Brethren met. On this site the Fraternity of Masons, London, had their foundation at the Hospital of St. Thomas de Acres in or before 1388.

The Merchant Taylors' Hall, No. 30 Threadneedle Street, was also the scene of Grand Lodge assemblies on 24th June 1723, 24th June 1724, 27th

December 1725, 29th January 1730 and 19th April 1732. The Hall has been considerably altered since that date. This is the only one of the four City Halls which preserves any reference to the event. The sum of £7. 10. 0 appears in its accounts on a few occasions as having been paid for the hire of the Hall by the Freemasons.

ST. JOHN'S, CLERKENWELL.

One of the most ancient buildings in London is that of the Crypt under the Church of St. John, Clerkenwell, which forms part of the ancient Priory of St. John of Jerusalem. This Crypt dates back to about 1140 and 1180 A.D. Here are held the Assemblies of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, of which our Grand Master, H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught is head.

Near by is the Tudor Gatehouse of the same old Priory built in 1504 A.D. This latter edifice has seen various uses. It is now held by the above-named Order and contains their Museum & Library. The *Gentleman's Magazine* was published here for many years. The United Traders' Lodge so named in 1768, but constituted 24th December 1723, met from 1743 to 1751 at St. John's Gate. The Lodge was erased in February 1800.

In the Gateway premises is an early seventeenth century stone fireplace brought from the Baptist's Head Inn and inserted here in 1895. It is a choice piece of work. Our interest in it (apart from the Operative aspect) lies in the fact that the Members of the Lodge of Justice which met at the Baptist's Head in 1801 had the advantage of the cheery glow emanating from this old fire-place.

The Jerusalem Tavern or Old Jerusalem Tavern also formed part of St. John's Gate until the whole structure was taken over by the Order of St. John. The following Lodges met there:—

The Strong Man Lodge now No. 45, from 1870 to 1884.

The Jerusalem Lodge now No. 171, from 1771 to 1786.

The Lodge of United Strength now No. 228, from 1857 to 1877.

The Urban Lodge No. 1196, from 1867 to 1879.

The Crusaders' Lodge No. 1677, from 1877 to 1879.

THE PROBATE REGISTRY.

SOMERSET HOUSE.

Among the records of the past there are few documents more illuminating in some respects than the Wills of our departed Brethren. There is a personal touch about them.

The Probate Registry is the depository of the greater part of the Wills made in this Country for some hundreds of years back. It will be seen from this paper that extracts have been obtained thence from the Wills of two of the King's Master Masons namely William Suthes and Nicholas Stone.

I have also seen and handled there the voluminous Will and Codicils of our first Noble Grand Master John the 2nd Duke of Montagu and also the brief Will of the celebrated Laurence Dermott. Here also may be seen the Will of William Preston bequeathing the Fund for the Prestonian Lecture, as well as innumerable other testamentary documents recording the wishes of departed Brethren as to their worldly goods. Lists of ancient Wills of Masons and Freemasons going back as far as 1388 have appeared or will appear in *A.Q.C.*

THE GUILDHALL LIBRARY & MUSEUM.

Here may be seen the sign of the Goose and Gridiron as it existed in 1894 when the old Tavern in London House Yard by St. Paul's Cathedral was demolished. The Records of the City of London are a mine of wealth for the study of the old Guilds and Companies, but the document of the greatest interest here is perhaps Letter Book H fo 47 (referred to in Gould II. 145) which, as before mentioned, contains the list of the Misteries which mentions the 'Freemasons' and 'Masons.'

The Will of Henry Yevele the King's Master Mason is also recorded on the Husting Rolls. The same Will and Codicil are also registered at Somerset House.

THE RECORD OFFICE.

There is much of old Masonic interest to Freemasons in this building which extends from Chancery Lane to Fetter Lane. Whether a student will arise who has the necessary time and ability for coping with the investigation remains to be seen. I am able, however, to encourage any such potential student by recording a few samples, the results of some visits there. Some of such results are embodied in the former part of this paper relating to Henry Yevele.

When enquiring into matters concerning Edward and Joshua Marshall the point arose whether any document existed recording their appointment as Master Masons to the King. Kingly grants of office are still frequently recorded. Search was made and one result is that the Patent Rolls for the 25th year of Charles II. (which is equivalent to the year 1673) were found to contain the enrolled record of two patents, one appointing Joshua Marshall to the office of Master Mason and Architect for Windsor Castle, and the other appointing him as King's Master Mason for London and generally. The Windsor Castle grant is in English and dated 2nd October (1673), and the other grant 29th November (1673) is in Latin. They are both in the same roll, namely the Second part of the Patent Rolls for Anno vicesimo quinto of the reign of Charles II.

The following is an approximate copy of the Windsor Castle grant:—

“ Charles the Second by the Grace of God to all to whom these presents shall come Greeting. Know ye that we of our special grace certain knowledge and mere motion and for divers other good causes and considerations us hereunto moving have given and granted and by these presents for our heirs and successors do give and grant unto Josuah Marshall mason the office and place of our Master Mason and Architect of all our building and reparations within our honor and Castle of Windsor which said office and place John Stone deceased late held and enjoyed and him the said Josuah Marshall our said Master Mason and Architect for all our said Building and Reparations within our said honor and Castle of Windsor aforesaid we do make ordain constitute and appoint by these presents To have hold execute and enjoy the said office and place of our Master Mason and Architect for all our Building and reparations within our honor and Castle of Windsor aforesaid to the said Josuah Marshall or by himself or by his sufficient deputy and deputies during our pleasure And further of our more ample grace certain knowledge and mere motion we have given and granted and by these presents for us our heirs and successors We do give and grant unto the said Josuah Marshall for the executing of the said office and place the wages and Fee of twelve pence of lawful money of England by the day in as large and ample manner as William Suthis Nicholas Stone or the said John Stone late deceased or any other person or persons heretofore having executed and enjoyed the said office and place hath had or ought to have had and enjoyed the same To have and yearly to receive the said wages and fee of twelve pence by the day to the said Josuah Marshall and his assigns from the day of the death of the said John Stone during our pleasure out of the revenue of us our heirs and successors and at the receipt of the Exchequer of us our heirs and successors by the hand of the trusty Commissioners of our trusty Chancellor &c of the Exchequer of us our heirs and successors for the time being at the four usual feasts or terms of the

year that is to say the feast of St. Michael the Archangel the Birth of our Lord God the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin and the Nativity of St. John Baptist by even and equal portions together with all other profits and commodities and allowances to the same office and place due incident or in any wise pertaining in as large and ample a manner as the said William Suthis Nicholas Stone or the said John Stone or any other person or persons heretofore having executed and enjoyed the said office hath had or ought to have had held and enjoyed the same as though express mention of it In witnesses et witness the King at Westminster the second day of October."

(The grant was given under the Privy Seal).

[*Note*.—The spelling has been modernised. An office copy could be obtained for about £1. 10. 0.]

The patent dated 29th November (1673) is No. 16 in the said Patent Roll. It is in form much the same as the other grant, but is in the debased Latin used for legal documents at that time. (It is open to any Brother to obtain an office copy of it at 2/s per 72 words). It recites a former grant to Edward Marshall Cementar of the office of Cementar sive Master Mason on 25th June year of our reign duodecimo (enrolled in that year part 17, No. 45) and then appoints Joshua Marshall Cementar sive Master Mason opum. Joshua Marshall appears to be styled "Armiger de hospitio." His predecessors named are — Cure, William Cure, Edmund Young, Humfrid Lovell, Nicholas Stone and the said Edward Marshall. The name indicated by the blank is Cornelius [Cure].

The appointment extended as well to the Tower of London as to all and singular our honors castles &c.

The Record Office also includes the Patents granted to Dr. Christopher Wren as Surveyor in the Tower of London and all other his Majesty's houses. One was by Charles II. on 29th March in the 21st year of his reign (1670) and by James II. on 27th January in the first year of his reign (1685) to Sir Christopher Wren: also a patent to the Masons' Company dated 9th February in 2nd year of James II. renewing their Charter upon surrender of the old one. I have notes of many other Masonic entries in the Patent Rolls and other records in the said office, but they are too numerous and important to be dealt with in the incidental manner which alone is available in this paper.

KENSAL GREEN CEMETERY.

DUKE OF SUSSEX.

Although this Cemetery is just outside the boundary of the County of London it seems right to refer to the Tomb of H.R.H. the Duke of Sussex the First Grand Master of our present United Grand Lodge. He died on 21st April 1843 and had been Grand Master ever since 1813.

The Craft has always been served majestically by its Royal Masters and the unifying power of Royalty rightly exercised has seldom received a better exemplification than in the bringing about of the Union of the two great rival Grand Lodges of the Moderns and the Ancients in the year 1813, so happily accomplished under the active superintendence of the Duke of Sussex and his Royal Brother the Duke of Kent.

The following is an extract from Croft's *Guide to Kensal Green Cemetery* (1881), pages 25 and 26:—

“Above all our curiosity is aroused by a tomb the vast proportions and massive simplicity of which convey an indescribable impression of silent grandeur. It bears this inscription:—

‘In Memory of
His Royal Highness Augustus
Frederick Duke of Sussex K. G.
sixth son of H.M. George III.
Born 27th January 1773. Died 21st April 1843.’

“Among the remarkable funerals which have taken place in this Cemetery that of His Royal Highness on the 4th of May 1843 is certainly the most conspicuous. On that day for the first time in the annals of history a distinguished member of the Royal Family was laid by his own desire in the burial place of the people. Great public excitement was naturally caused by the fact of a Royal Duke preferring the more humble but no less beautiful resting place offered by Kensal Green to a gorgeous tomb at Windsor or Westminster.”

LAURENCE STERNE.

In the old burial ground belonging to the Parish of St. George, Hanover Square, situate in Bayswater, about 200 yards West of the Edgware Road, is a Memorial to the celebrated Laurence Sterne, the author of *Tristram Shandy*. The beautiful Chapel of the Ascension, with its marvellous paintings by Frederic Shields, occupies a considerable part of the frontage. At the rear of the building is a large burial ground. The headstone is about halfway down the Western side of the ground, and is quite easy to find.

The inscription runs thus:—

“Alas Poor Yorick
Near to this place
lyes the body of
The Rev. Laurence Sterne. A.M.
Dyed September 13th. 1768
aged 55 years
Ah! Molliter ossa quiescant.

If a sound head, warm heart and breast humane;
Unsullied worth, and soul without a stain
If mental powers could ever justly claim
The well won tribute of immortal fame
STERNE was THE MAN who with gigantic stride,
Mow'd down luxuriant follies far and wide,
Yet what though keenest knowledge of mankind
Unseal'd to him the springs that move the mind,
What did it boot him, Ridicul'd, Abus'd,
By fools insulted, and by prudes accused
In his mild reader view thy future fate;
Like him despise, what 'twere a sin to hate.

—

This monumental stone was erected to the memory of deceased by two BROTHER MASONS for although He did not live to be a Member of their SOCIETY yet all his incomparable Performances evidently prove him to have acted by Rule and Square, they rejoice in this opportunity of perpetuating his high and irreproachable Character to after-ages.”

Thus that inscription ends. In front of it is another and more decorative memorial stone inscribed “In Memory of The Revd. Laurence Sterne M.A.

Rector of Coxswould, Yorkshire, Born November 24, 1713. Died March 18, 1768 with a note that the headstone was cleaned and restored in 1893 by the owner of the "Sterne" property.

The discrepancy in the death date will be observed. The true date appears to have been 18th March 1768. The record interests us as honouring the humanity of the two unnamed Masons. They were human also in their inaccuracy. The original tombstone was noted by Bro. W. H. Rylands in *A.Q.C.*, vol. ii. The more recent stone was not then existing.

THE SOANE MUSEUM.

This Museum is on the North side of Lincoln's Inn Fields and although the original intention of the Founder that it should be regarded as a well-furnished private house is still deferred to, the Museum is open to inspection during the greater part of each week. Sir John Soane was a Freemason and was appointed Grand Superintendent of Works of the United Fraternity of Free and Accepted Masons of England. Some of his Masonic Testimonials or Votes of Thanks are in the Museum.

He was Professor of Architecture in the Royal Academy and Architect of the Bank of England and was born in 1753, died at 13 Lincoln's Inn Fields on 20, Jany, 1837; and was interred in Old St. Pancras Churchyard where a massive monument to the memory of himself, his wife and son was erected and is still extant.

The Museum contains much of architectural interest. The following items should be observed:—

- (1) The large monolithic Alabaster Sarcophagus of Seti I. who was King of Egypt about 1370 B.C. with numerous hieroglyphic and other inscriptions within and without. It is therefore about 3300 years old. The length is 9 feet 4 ins. and the greatest width 3 feet 8 ins. Substantial fragments of the cover are also in the Museum. It was brought from Egypt by the famous Egyptologist and explorer Belzoni, who was a Freemason and man of great stature. He was 7 feet 10 ins. in height. He had been known to carry 9 men on his back at one time. He was made a Knight Templar in 1828 at Norwich. (See *F.M. Magazine*, 1861, Novr. 16. at page 388).
- (2) A splendid collection of Paintings by Brother Hogarth. These alone will well repay the visitor. They include Four striking Election pictures and the series of eight pictures entitled "The Rake's Progress."
- (3) Nicholas Stone's account book. (This has been printed and published by the WALPOLE Society with Notes).
- (4) A diary kept by James Gibbs during his travels on the Continent.
- (5) A small bronze bust of the Rev. Wm. Dodd, D.D., who was executed for Forgery in 1777. He had been a Freemason and Grand Chaplain.
- (6) Three busts of Inigo Jones (one is in cast lead); an autograph of his signature, and his medallion portrait carved upon ivory.
- (7) The autograph signature of Sir C. Wren, and his Bust. Also a Silver Calendar Watch formerly belonging to Sir Christopher and said to have been given to him by Queen Anne. It was made by Langley Bradley (born 1670), who made St. Paul's Cathedral Clock, which did good service from 1708 to 1892.
- (8) Certain drawings &c. of a Masonic Hall designed by Soane (1826-8) for Freemasons' Hall, but now demolished.

FREEMASONS' HALL.

It behoves that we should visit this famous building in the course of our pilgrimage. It was erected in the eighteenth century and dedicated in 1777. A copy of the Inscription on the Foundation stone is appended.

Inscription on Foundation Stone as translated *European Magazine* (Vol. 59, Jan.-June 1811, at p. 330). (The original Latin is also there given):

In the 15th year of the reign of George the IIIrd. on the first day of May in the year of Man's Redemption 1775. This First Stone of Mason's Hall was laid by the Right Hon. Robert Edward Lord PETRE Baron of Writtle, Grand Master of the Masons of England accompanied by the Worshipful Rowland Holt Esq. Deputy Grand Master, the Worshipful John Hatch and Henry Dagge, Grand Wardens, with the whole Fraternity of Free-Masons; at which time the name of Masonry was highly honoured throughout Europe being protected and encouraged by the particular favour and regard of Kings and men of high rank and the Masons Lodge in England was by the whole brotherhood throughout the world made to preside over Masonry

From Heaven it descended

Know thyself

Thomas Sandby Esq., Professor of Architecture and A.R.A:
Architect.

The Architect was Brother Thomas Sandby, upon whom the title of Grand Architect was conferred. It is perhaps the oldest Masonic Hall in the world and has been used continuously for Masonic purposes ever since it was first opened.

It is obvious that every brother must be left to his own reflections in contemplating a place where so many important Masonic transactions have taken place. It was here that on St. John's Day, 27th December 1813, the final meetings celebrating the Union of the two rival Grand Lodges were held. Here (save in special cases) the Quarterly communications of Grand Lodge are held. It is to be hoped that a meeting place linked with the history of the Craft for so many years will be preserved notwithstanding the need which has arisen for a larger meeting place.

On the ground floor we must visit the Museum and Library. It is packed full of Masonic Treasures. I name but twelve items as representative.

- (1) The Minute Books of the Grand Lodge instituted in 1717. They begin in the year 1723. The first meeting recorded was held on 24th June 1723. The Duke of Norfolk, when Grand Master in 1730, presented the second existing Minute Book of the Grand Lodge, and it is a handsome well-preserved volume labelled "The Grand Lodge Book." The first Minute is of the meeting on 27th March 1731.
- (2) The Minute Books of the Grand Lodge of the Antients formed in 1751. The first entry is dated 5th February 1752.
- (3) A complete set of the various editions of the *Constitutions* of the 1717 Grand Lodge.
- (4) The like of the *Ahiman Rezon* adopted by the Lodge of the Antients.
- (5) A collection (nearly complete) of the Engraved Lists of Lodges which were issued from the year 1723 onwards until the growth of the Craft necessitated the issue of a Year Book.
- (6) The original executed Articles of Union between the two Grand Lodges dated November 25th 1813 and signed and sealed 1st December 1813.

- (7) A large collection of Masonic clothing, principally aprons, in great variety, including the Masonic clothing worn by King Edward VII. when as Prince of Wales he was Grand Master.
- (8) A most important collection of Masonic certificates. These include the collection formed by Bro. Crowe towards the purchase price of which Grand Lodge contributed £1,000.
- (9) A fine collection of Masonic Jewels.
- (10) The Sword of State presented to Grand Lodge in 1730 by the Duke of Norfolk. The blade was formerly the Sword of Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, who fell on the field of battle at Lutzen in November 1632.
- (11) Several original MS. rolls of the old Charges or Constitutions of the Craft in its Operative period, including the Grand Lodge MS. No. 1, dated 1583, which is one of the earliest dated copies of the Old Charges. There is also a "Grand Lodge MS. No. 2."
- (12) A very old Mason's maul. It may be 3,000 or more years old and is said to have been taken out of one of the rock tombs in Egypt as though left there by mistake or when the works in progress were hurriedly closed down.

(I may be permitted to add that our Brother W. Wonnacott, the late lamented Librarian of Grand Lodge, revised this section of my paper shortly before his death).

Conclusion.

My indebtedness to those who have travelled the ground before me is evident, but my gratitude to them all is hereby expressed. I have purposely omitted any reference to the contents of the Museum and Library of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge No. 2076. Any incidental description of its contents would be inadequate to the importance of the subject.

[Appendix as to Apple Tree Tavern.]

(Hatton's) *A new view of London* (1708), p. 16, states: "Charles Str. a very broad and pleasant str. near Covent Garden between Russell Street N.W. and the end of York Street S. Ely. Length 90 yards and from Charing + N.E. 780 yards."

The Street is shown and named in various maps published in the eighteenth century, including Rocque's engraved by our Bro. J. Pine.

Charles Street was in the Parish of St. Paul's, Covent Garden. The Rate Books for 1716 and onwards (with a few gaps) are preserved at the City Hall of Westminster. Several of these have been inspected by me.

The 1716 entries for the East side of Charles Street (p. 29) are:—

Mr. Rob ^t . Markcluar	2.6
Mrs. frances Wigg	5.0
Mr. Brewer	4.0
Mr. Geo. Hall	5.6
Mr. Abra de Mombray	6.6
Mr. Sam Gray	5.0
Mr. Jno Clansey	5.6
Mr. Swift	4.0

(It is unnecessary to copy the entries as to the West side. They run from North to South, as the last entry ends at Tavistock Street.)

The names in the Rate Books are kept in the same order during the whole period covered by my enquiry. For instance the name of Mr. Rob^t. MaClure is the

first on the East side in the Rate Book for the year beginning 25 March 1714. and the other names (allowing for changes of occupancy) run on in like order.

In 1720 the first name is altered to Mr. Thom. Taylor, and the last is Mr. John Swift.

Thom. Taylor's name continues until 1726.

In 1727-8 James Douglas takes the place of Thom. Taylor. James Douglas continued until at least 1748.

It is clear from the Rate Book for (*e.g.*) 1745 that the house South of John Swift's was then the Parsonage House of St. Mary Le Strand.

The Rev. F. Harcourt Hillersdon, M.A., has kindly written to me that the said Parsonage House is now represented by No. 40 Wellington Street, which is towards the North end of the street.

It is therefore evident that the house occupied by MaClure, Taylor and Douglas was at the other, *i.e.*, the South end of the East side of Charles Street.

The proof that such house was the Apple Tree Tavern is furnished by records of Taverns and Alehouses preserved in the Archives at the Middlesex Guildhall, opposite Westminster Abbey.

In the Returns of licensed houses for 1742-52, under date 20 Sept. 1745, mention is made of James Douglas at the Apple Tree, Charles Street (folio 11/4), and, under date 8 Octr. 1751, similar mention is made (folio 30/2). These entries have been personally inspected by me.

Perhaps the removal of the Lodge from that Tavern is accounted for by the change of occupancy, as MaClure, who was there in 1716, had given place to Taylor in 1720.

It seemed desirable to print this evidence, as owing to the records not being hitherto forthcoming, it had been thought by some that it was not unlikely that Bro. James Anderson had been an inaccurate recorder.

A cordial vote of thanks was unanimously passed to Bro. Williams on the proposition of Bro. Gordon P. G. Hills, seconded by Bro. H. C. de Lafontaine; comments being offered by or on behalf of Bros. E. Conder, G. W. Daynes, G. W. Bullamore, E. W. Marson, C. F. Sykes, and G. Elkington.

Bro. GORDON P. G. HILLS said:—

I have much pleasure in proposing a vote of thanks to Bro. Williams for his valuable and interesting paper. It will come as a surprise to many to realize the number of *facts* associated with the history of the Craft which are encountered in a walk through London, facts which fresh discoveries may add to any day.

Such a discovery has recently been made at the Bank of England, and a full account of it will be found at *A.Q.C.* xli., 160.

Congratulations are due to Bro. Williams for the success of his careful investigations, which have established the site of the Apple Tree Tavern at the Northern corner where York Street runs Eastward from the present Wellington Street on its East side. Hitherto the difficulty of identifying this tavern suggested a doubt about the accuracy of Dr. Anderson's record that the preliminary meeting of the old Lodges took place at the tavern in 1716, and the Doctor has been triumphantly vindicated on this particular point.

The "Nelsonic Crimson Oakes" medal is a comparatively rare specimen although not so rare as has been frequently stated. Examples are to be found at the G.L., Q.C., and Warwick Provincial Museums, etc., and in private possession. Despite the association of devices of a Masonic character with the portrait, there is no evidence so far that Lord Nelson was a Mason. I have been told that this medal refers to a Benefit Society formerly active in the neighbourhood of Birmingham.

Bro. Williams refers to one of John Bunyan's lesser known works of which the full title is:— *Solomon's Temple Spiritualized, or Gospel-light fetcht out of the Temple at Jerusalem*. 1688. It is curious that this title may owe its suggestion to an earlier work, Dr. Samuel Lee's *Orbis Miraculum or the Temple of Solomon portrayed by Scripture-Light*. 1659. This work by Dr. Lee was largely borrowed many years later by Christopher Kelly for his book *Solomon's Temple Spiritualized*, published under Masonic patronage at Dublin in 1803.

The noble monument in black and yellow marble to Sir Julius Cæsar at St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, of which Nicholas Stone was the sculptor, gives a quaint example of how the procedure of the law might be spiritualized somewhat as a speculative Mason is wont to treat the working tools of the Craft. Rev. Dr. Cox in his *Annals of St. Helen's* describes this monument and translates the Latin inscriptions as follows:—

In the South transept, is the singular altar-tomb of Sir Julius Cæsar Adelmare, who, feeling the ruling passion strong in death, moulded his epitaph in the form of a deed, to which he affixed his broad seal, which is "railed," and also its enrolment in a court—superior however to that in which he used to preside.

The following is the inscription:—

To all faithful Christian People to whom this writing may come. Know ye, that I JULIUS ADELMARE alias CÆSAR, Knight, Doctor of Laws, Judge of the Supreme Court of Admiralty of Queen Elizabeth, One of the Masters of Requests to King James, and of his Privy Council, Chancellor of the Exchequer and Master of the Rolls, by this my act and deed, confirm, with my full consent that by the Divine aid, I will willingly pay the debt of Nature as soon as it may please God. In witness whereof I have fixed my hand and seal

Feb. 27, 1634.

JUL. CÆSAR.

He paid this debt, being at the time of his death, of the Privy Council of King Charles, also Master of the Rolls: truly pious, particularly learned, a refuge to the poor, abounding in love, most dear to his country, his children, and his friends.

He died April 18, 1636, in the 79th year of his age. It is enrolled in Heaven.

His Widow, Lady Ann Cæsar, has erected this monument to his memory and here rests with him.

There is a reference in the paper, arising from the Sarcophagus of Seti. I. at the Soane Museum, to Bro. Belzoni. In John Britton's Autobiography he writes:—

A distinguished contemporary of the dramatic corps at the Wells about this time, was a gentleman who subsequently attained distinction in the annals of adventure and archæology. This was Signor Giovanni Battista Belzoni, with whom I became acquainted in 1803. He then appeared under the cognomen of *The Patagonian Sampson* and displayed muscular powers of strength which generally astonished the public. By the books in the Alien Office he is registered as 6 feet 6 inches.

I think this must be a nearer approach to fact than the 7ft. 10ins. Bro. William quotes. It seems that Belzoni had invented some ingenious hydraulic machines by the exhibition of which he hoped to make some money in England, but this project failed, and he undertook his exhibitions of strength, which started as street performances. His earliest stage appearances were at Sadler's Wells. A leading feat of the "Patagonian Sampson" was the fixing of an iron frame weighing 129 pounds to his body, on the steps of which eleven men

were supported in pyramidal form, the uppermost reaching the border of the proscenium. Carrying the weight, he walked freely about the stage. This exhibition, which on one occasion resulted in the whole company being precipitated—happily unscathed—into a tank of water beneath when the stage gave way, was repeated at Astley's Bartholomew Fair, Dublin, etc., with satisfactory results to the performer, and having saved some money "he sailed to Egypt to explore its pyramids, catacombs, and other antiquities."

The original idea in going to Egypt seems to have been the hope that his friend and patron of old, Mr. Henry Salt, the British Consul, who had introduced him to Astley's Theatre, might help him to put before the authorities a scheme of hydraulic engineering which he had devised to raise the waters of the Nile. Accordingly, the traveller left England in 1812, but after his arrival in Egypt this scheme fell through, and then it was that he started an exploration at Thebes, Karnac, Edfu, Phela and the Pyramids, etc., sites well known to-day, but at which in 1815 to 1819 there was pioneer work to be done. His achievements were recorded in his publications on his return to England, which also resulted in the despatch to London of a large collection of antiquities. Some were sold, and others exhibited by himself at the Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly, and later on by his widow in Leicester Square. The British Museum and Sir John Soane were among the purchasers, the latter paying £2,000 for the sarcophagus and having to take down the walls in order to get it into his museum. Mr. Salt put rather a different complexion on the transactions, claiming that he had employed and paid Belzoni to undertake the explorations and to dispose of the antiquities, which he claimed as his property, and this naturally led to considerable trouble between the parties. Finally the explorer, seeking a fresh field for his activities, set out to reach Timbuctoo, but was taken ill and died on his journey, at Gato, a village in Benin, on 3rd December, 1823, aged 45. The widow, who was an Englishwoman, published some descriptions of Egyptian antiquities, drawing parallels with Freemasonry; she was left in very poor circumstances, which were at length somewhat alleviated by a pension granted her by Queen Victoria in 1850.

There is a long article in the *Freemasons' Magazine and Masonic Mirror*, March 9th, 1861, p. 186, giving a full account of the presentation by Mrs. Sarah Belzoni to the G.O. of the Netherlands in 1844-45 of a copy of her husband's work: *A Narrative of the Operations and Recent Discoveries within the Pyramids, Temples, Tombs and Excavations in Egypt*, preceded by an essay written by Mrs. Belzoni herself, which dealt with the initiation into Freemasonry of Pharaoh Osirei (*sic*), as demonstrated by the inscriptions. The proceedings of the Grand Orient give a very full abstract of the essay.

Appropriately these comments may close with yet another reference to Egypt, to remind our Brethren that now we have *two* ancient Egyptian Mauls in the Grand Lodge Museum, one brought twenty-five years ago from Luxor and the latest a few months since from Sakkara; both may be dated back as in use 4,000 years ago.

BRO. GILBERT W. DAYNES writes:—

It has been a real pleasure to read Bro. Williams' paper for he has not only conducted us into very many buildings of considerable interest, but has also given us a mass of information as to what may be found attractive when within those buildings. In particular I would congratulate Bro. Williams upon having brought together so many items of Masonic interest. Although, to make the paper complete, much general Masonic information had of necessity to be given, yet there are many facts quoted which are, I think, new to Masonic students, particularly some of those relating to our Operative ancestors, William Suthes and Henry Yevele.

Bro. Williams refers to the Glossary in the Genevan version of the Holy Bible, but it may be pointed out that there were in the eighteenth century

other books in which the interpretations of Biblical words are given. In Cruden's *Concordance of the Bible*, the first edition of which was published in 1735, the word "Ahiman" is given as "A brother prepared, or brother of the right hand," and the word "Rezon" is given as "lean, or small, or secret, or prince."

Bro. Williams devotes a substantial amount of space to Westminster Abbey. Might I suggest that there are two further works that ought to be consulted by Masons with reference to the Abbey? One is *Westminster Abbey and the King's Craftsmen* (1906) and the other is *Westminster Abbey Re-examined* (1925). Both works are by Mr. W. R. Lethaby, who has made such an exhaustive study of his subject. In the latter book there are two interesting chapters upon King Henry VII.'s Chapel.

Sir Robert Moray will always be of peculiar interest to Freemasons. Although initiated at Newcastle in 1641, Sir Robert Moray visited his Mother Lodge on the 27th July, 1647, on the occasion when "William Maxwell doctor off Fisik Ordinare to his Majstie hines" was made a Mason. There is in Bro. Lyon's book an error as to the death and burial of Sir Robert Moray, for he says: "He died in June 1573, and was buried in the Canongate Churchyard." That this is an error seems clear after reading the evidence brought forward by Bro. Williams.

The question of whether James Gibbs was a Speculative Mason, or Freemason, under the Grand Lodge of England, is an interesting one. Has Bro. Williams been able to examine any of the printed works, which are referred to in the inscription on the Wall Tablet? It might be that they would afford some indication, and enable the query to be solved.

Bro. Williams refers to Lord Nelson and his connection with the Craft. It may be worth noting that there is, or was, at the Masonic Hall, Reading, Berkshire, a framed print with the representation of the banner referred to by Bro. Williams: also that there are in the Grand Lodge Library and Museum two specimens of the silver medal known as the "Nelsonic Crimson Oakes Medal."

In addition to the Lord Nelson of the Nile Lodge founded in 1801, there was, in the following year, a Lodge warranted at Caldwell Manor, Montreal, Canada, under the name of "Nelson Lodge."

It may be of interest also to point out that upon the visit of Lord Nelson to Great Yarmouth on 2nd March, 1801, he became a member of the Society of Gregorians. In *Perlustration of Yarmouth* we are told:—

Nelson also addressed a Letter from Yarmouth Roads to Mr. Pillans, Grand-Master of the Ancient Order of Gregorians at Norwich, with thanks for his election into that Society.

At the close of his references to Henry Yevele, Bro. Williams assumes that Yevele was of Yeovil. Mr. W. R. Lethaby, in his *Westminster Abbey Re-examined*, at page 152, offers another alternative. He says, with reference to the property left by Yevele at Alvythele and elsewhere in Essex, as follows:—

"Another point that arises in interpreting the Will is: Did not Alvythele, Essex (now Aveley, near Purfleet), give Yevele his name? In the index of the Patent Rolls, it is equated with Yeovil. In the *D.N.B.*, Yeaveley in Derbyshire is suggested, and it is said that there was also a manor of Yevele in Surrey (?) But may not the Essex place, where the Master had property, and his own name have both been pronounced Yaverley?"

Bro. Williams gives the names of the resorts patronized by the Grand Lodge of England in the early days of its existence. Amongst them is The Queen's Head in Great Queen Street. Grand Lodge apparently met there for the first time on 26th November, 1728, and it is, I think, of some sentimental interest to note that Great Queen Street has been associated with the government of the Craft for over 200 years. Another resort was The Devil Tavern

within Temple Bar. This tavern must have had a very commodious room, for at the meeting of Grand Lodge held there on 31st January, 1739, I calculate the number present to have been 295.

The Appendix given by Bro. Williams concerning the Apple Tree Tavern contains the evidence relating to 'John Swift' to which Bro. Williams referred in his Paper upon "Alexander Pope and Freemasonry." There is, I think, a greater probability that this John Swift was the member of the Lodge at The Goat at the foot of the Haymarket, than that the member was the famous Doctor and Dean.

These few random comments are offered, not by way of criticism, but rather to enable me to express my delight with the Paper and indicate how such a paper as Bro. Williams has given us induces one to browse amongst one's Masonic literature. I hardly know which to admire the more: the pleasing manner in which the diverse materials have been grouped together and welded into a whole, or the industry displayed in unearthing from oblivion so many items of value to the Masonic Student. All of the facts quoted are useful, and one never knows when some isolated fact may fall into its proper place and make something clear which before was uncertain or obscure.

Bro. GEO. ELKINGTON writes:—

It does not appear clear whether William Suthes, described as (1) Master Mason of Windsor Castle and (2) a Member of the Court of Assistants of the Goldsmiths Company, was a member of the Masons' Company.

If he were not, there would be nothing unusual in that he belonged to a Guild not connected with his actual trade or business.

Admission by patrimony produced many such cases, for sons did not always follow their fathers' business. In others, citizens followed more than one trade or changed their line of business.

If William Suthes were a member of the Masons' Company his case seems remarkable, because as far back as 1416, in consequence of a (then) new ordinance that no one should belong to more than one Fraternity, a certain Alderman Richard Merlaw had to elect as between the two trades of Ironmongery and Fishmongery (having taken up the livery of both crafts)—and chose to be a Fishmonger.

With reference to the very interesting statements (in Part II.) as to Henry Yevele and his several appointment to take Masons and to put them on the King's works, &c., which Bro. Williams describes as press-ganging, it seems difficult to believe that even in those times skilled workmen had no individual liberty of choice as to their work. Even if impressed, however, these craftsmen were probably known to, and selected by, their head, and it may perhaps be that they were formed into travelling and moveable operative lodges. It has been often claimed that operative lodges were concerned in the erecting of cathedrals and other public buildings, and the examples quoted may furnish a little more presumptive evidence in support of that view.

The parent code of bye-laws for the Masons' was apparently granted in 1356 and shows that the workmen then were divided into two classes, "Hewers" and "Light Masons or Setters." It would seem that the latter were the "Cementarios" as suggested by Bro. Williams.

Supplementing the references to the Masons' Company it may be noted that in the returns or *Letter Book* of 1376 the Masons are said to be entitled to four representatives and the Freemasons to two, as if they were independent Societies. As a further instance of the use of the term "Free Mason" in relation to operative masonry in the "Book in Metre of the Rich Merchant Man called Dives Pragmaticus," 1563, wherein all the trades of London are enumerated, the Author, Thomas Newbery, refers to the Craft as "free masons."

Bro. C. F. SYKES said:—

I welcome Bro. Williams' paper as a contribution towards the greater story—yet to be written—of the association of London and Freemasonry. Some years ago Bro. Simpson dealt with one phase of the subject in his papers on the Old Inns which had been the meeting places of Lodges. The present paper deals almost entirely with another phase, and equally with its predecessors is full of interest.

What an engrossing story a Masonic Survey of London would produce!

Where so much material was available it would be ungenerous to cavil at omissions, for the difficulty which Bro. Williams had was probably not what to include, but what to omit. One or two points which strike me, however, may not be without interest to readers of the paper.

Inigo Jones, Wren's great predecessor, was buried in the church of St. Benet, Paul's Wharf. He was interred close to the Communion Table where his father and mother also lie. He left £100 to be used to erect a memorial

“in memorie of mee, to be made of white marbele and set up in the church aforesaid.”

The memorial subsequently erected by his pupil and heir, John Webb, was destroyed with the church in the Great Fire of 1666. Lieut.-Col. Inigo Jones, a descendant of the great architect, caused the original inscription to be again recorded on a tablet in the present church:—

IGNATIVS JONES ARM.
ARCHITECTVS REG. MAG. BRIT. CELEBERRIMVS
HIC JACET
AVL. ALB. REG. ÆDIFICAVIT
TEMPLVM D. PAVLI RESTAVRAVIT:
NATVS ID. JVLII. M.DLXXII.
OBIIT XI. CAL. JVNII. M.DCLI
VIXIT ANN. LXXIX. D^{ca}. XXX. IIX

VXORIS PATRVO AMANTISSIMO
PRÆCEPTORI SVO MERITISSIMO
HÆRES ET DISCIPVLVS
POSVIT MÆRENS JOHAN. WEBB

On the original monument, the porticoes of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, and of St. Paul's Cathedral were carved. Inigo Jones was born in Smithfield and his baptism is recorded in the register of the Parish of St. Bartholomew the Less:—

“Enigo Jones the sonne of Enigo Jones was christened the XIX. day of July 1573.”

Bro. Williams clearly indicates the important works carried out by that great mediæval craftsman, Henry Yevele.

Only a short distance to the East of St. Magnus is St. Dunstan in the East. There is in existence a deed concerning the church which stood on this site before the Great Fire. This shows that in 1381 Nicholas Typerton a mason contracted to carry out works at the church after the design of Master Henry Ivelegh.

The deed runs as follows:—

Endentre Nichole
Typertone del Eglise
Seynt Donston en
Toustrete en Loundres.

Ceste endentre faite perentre Mons. John de Cobeham Sr. de Cobeham dune parte et Nichole Typerton, masoun dautre parte tesmoigne que le dit Nichole perferra

la foundement de Southale de Seint Dunstone en Toustrete de loundres du longueur dil esglise bon et suffisaunt oue le foundement dune porche solom la devyse mēstre Henry Ivelegh et taunt de foundement des boteras et oue dune watertable bon et suffisaunt de durre pere solom la devyse le dit mēstre Henry et avera pour fower le dit foundement et trover piere craye lyme et sabloun et tablement cariage et toutes choses que apertent al dit overayne vintz et cynque marcs come il ferra soun overayne cynque marcs al comensement les queux le dit Nichole ad receus del avaunt dit Mons' Johan et ensy de temps en temps cynque marcs; tanque les dits xxv. marcs soyount perpaies. Et la dit overayne serra perfourmy bien et suffisaument perentre la fesaunce dycestes et le moys prochain apres la feste de Pasque solom devyse lavaundit mēstre Henry a quele chose bien et loialment perfourmer lavaundit Nichole se oblige per cestes presentes. En temoignance de quele chose les parties suisdits ount entrechangeablement mys lour sealx a ycestes. Done a loundres laveille de Nowel anno regni Regis Ricardi secundi post conquestum quinto.

The East window of Battersea Parish Church was designed and erected by Ivelegh. When the church was rebuilt and enlarged, the old window was taken down, stone by stone, and re-erected in the present church.

Brother Williams' contention that Yevele=Yeovil, receives confirmation from the name of the place as given in the Doomsday record, where it is spelt, Givele, Ivle.

The old church of the Hospital of St. Katherine by the Tower afforded an example of a seventeenth century speculative Freemason. There was buried in 1683 Robert Beadles, described as a Freemason, one of His Majesty's Gunners at the Tower.

Battersea Churchwardens' Accounts for 1657 show a seventeenth century operative Freemason:—

“Pd. to Thos. Goodridge freemason for making the stepps at the Church both for stone and workmanship 16s. 7d.”

Bro. W. J. WILLIAMS writes, in reply:—

The pleasure I had in preparing and presenting my paper is enhanced by the very cordial reception given to it by my Brethren. I am hopeful that when it comes before our Correspondence Circle in the printed *Transactions* they will find in it much to interest them, and to incite them, especially our Brethren in the Provinces and in other lands, to collect and communicate to their Fellows similar information as to the Masonic monuments, records and bric-a-brac in their own localities. By such means we may speedily hope to achieve a comprehensive Masonic survey which will afford materials for future histories of the Craft.

There is no need to assume that nothing remains to be done in this way. On the contrary, within the last year or so, it has been left to the Brethren in London to disinter most important documents relating to the Craft at Exeter, at Oxford, and at Lincoln.

Such matters would long since have been brought to light if the local Brethren had taken a greater and a continuous interest in their own Masonic history.

My sincere thanks are here accorded to all the Brethren and especially to those who have added lustre to the subject by their own lucubrations.

As to Bro. Gordon Hills' observations. It is gratifying to any writer to find that he has found a subject which has aroused interest and elicited additional items and particulars.

As to whether Lord Nelson was a Mason, it should be remembered that the existence of the “Nelsonic Crimson Oakes” medal is not the only fact which indicates an answer to the question.

In my paper I only supplied materials for consideration, and I still, as then, leave the matter for the Brethren to form their own conclusions.

If the Brethren are prompted to visit St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, they will be interested to see a Wall Tablet near the pulpit.

At the head of it is the Volume of the Sacred Law irradiated. Then comes this inscription:—

This Tablet was erected by
A Few Masonic Friends to the Memory of
The Rev. John Edmund Cox D.D.
of All Souls College, Oxford, who for
24 years was Vicar and subsequently
for 14 years Vicar-in-Charge of this
Parish and for 10 years Grand Chaplain
of the Freemasons of England
Born October 9th 1812
Died October 27th 1890

Bro. Gordon Hills makes reference to a work of this departed Brother.

As to Brother Belzoni. The reference made by me to the *Freemason's Magazine* was on the authority of a note there quoted over the signature of W. Sadler K.T. 18°, who states: "He and I were both made Knights Templar in 1828 in the Encampment at Norwich the well known Sir Knight 'Daddy Coke' afterwards Earl of Leicester being Prov.G.M. No one who once saw Belzoni could forget him, he stood 7 feet 10 ins. in height."

Having regard to the record in the Alien Office that Belzoni was registered as 6 feet 6 inches in height and that the *Dictionary of National Biography* gives it as 6 feet 7 ins., I fear the natural desire of Bro. W. Sadler to emphasize the fact of the unusual stature of Belzoni has led to an addition of 15 inches. There seems hardly room to suppose that Belzoni achieved so much further height after the Registered measurement.

In the British Museum Library is a Book of coloured sketches by Belzoni illustrating numerous articles and paintings in Egyptian Tombs. This book was given by Belzoni to the Duke of Sussex, but afterwards came into the market and was bought for the Museum.

A Royal Arch Jewel believed to have been worn by Belzoni is in the possession of the Chapter of St. James No. 2.

The additional facts, suggestions, and queries contained in Bro. Daynes's contribution form further evidence of the value of the welcome given by the Lodge to the comments of the Brethren. I refrain from dealing with the various points raised lest I should unduly exceed the space limit.

Bro. Elkington's notes are also helpful.

As regards the impressment of Masons, it is to be remembered that, in consequence of the ravages of the Black Death in 1348-1349, there was a great scarcity of workmen and a tendency always inherent in the human race, to increase their demands for remuneration consequent on the lack of competition. The crux of the matter may well be that the Masons so commandeered were "to work at the Kings Wages."

I venture to suggest that Bro. Elkington has mis-read the entry dated 1376 in the City of London Letter Book H. It does not say that the Masons were entitled to four representatives and the Freemasons to two. A photograph of the entry is in *A.Q.C.* xli., 136. It shows that the same two men who had at first been entered as "Fremasons" were included under the subsequent heading "Masons," making a total of four Masons and showing they were all of one misterie, and not members of independent Societies.

The contribution of Bro. Sykes is very welcome and adds valuable information which for the most part has not yet been enshrined in these *Transactions*.


Concerning my correction as to the age at death of Edward Marshall, it is but fair to state that our Brother Conder was incorrectly informed by the *Dictionary of National Biography*. The Monument in St. Dunstan's, Fleet

Street, clearly shows the age as 77, and the inscription is correctly given in Hatton's *New View of London*.

A photograph of the Marshall Monument illustrates my paper, but I fear the inscription cannot be very clearly reproduced. The photograph is the copyright of H.M. Stationery Office and is reproduced by their permission. It was taken on behalf of the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England). The distortion is in the original photograph and was practically unavoidable.


I venture to round off these observations by referring to a masterpiece of operative Masonry linking the Craft with the very ancient Master Masons of Egypt.

I refer to Cleopatra's Needle now erected on the Thames Embankment. On this the eyes of Moses, who has been styled "the General Master Mason," must many times have rested. It dates back to 1450 B.C., and is the largest quarried stone in England. The largest of the Stonehenge blocks weighs about 18 tons. This weighs 186 tons. The Obelisk itself is in some measure allegorical and bears incised illustrations of symbols.



REVIEWS.

THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE LODGE OF RESEARCH No. 200 I.C. FOR THE YEAR 1923. (Dublin, 1929.)



As a Founder and P.M. of the Lodge of Research I.C., I should feel some diffidence in reviewing its *Transactions* for the year 1923, which have just been published, did I not feel strongly that the volume in question calls for careful examination and discussion, and that perhaps I may be fitted to approach this task with more sympathy and understanding than many others; and these reflections only have induced me to undertake it.

The *Transactions* make a portly book of 475 pages, 360 of which are filled by Brother Philip Crosslé's "Historical Sketch of St. Brendan's Masonic Lodge No. 163, Birr, King's County." The other papers printed comprise: "Freemasonry in the Midland Counties Province," by V.W. Bro. John M. Lewis (W.M. of the Lodge in 1923), which is supplemented by a valuable list of Lodges; "The old records of the Longford Masonic Lodge (1743-1835)," by W. Bro. Walter Sargaison; and "Springett Penn's connexion with the Grand Lodge of Munster, 1726-30," by W. Bro. Bernard Springett, who is of the same family as the famous Munster and London Freemason. In Appendices (which we also owe to Bro. Crosslé) are given a complete reprint of the Minutes of the Grand Lodge of Munster (and First Lodge of Ireland, the present No. One Cork) 1726-49; and also an identification of the members of the London Lodge "The Ship behind the Royal Exchange" who were registered with the Grand Lodge of England in 1723. Brother Crosslé shows that nearly all these Freemasons were Irishmen, many of them with landed estates in Ireland; and this notable piece of research work not only suggests why a Grand Lodge of Ireland came to be established *circa* 1723, but also is additional and convincing proof that the English and Irish Masonic ceremonies must have been identical at this date—of course, this has been generally accepted as a fact by Masonic scholars of late years, but it has remained for Brother Crosslé to put the matter beyond all reasonable shadow of doubt; so I should like to congratulate him on a striking addition to our knowledge that, I venture to say, no living Mason but himself could have furnished.

Having commended all the aforementioned papers to the serious attention of Masonic students, I shall now proceed to deal with the "History of Lodge 163," with its interpolated chapter, "The Irish Rite," which is an amplified version of an address delivered by the author to the Manchester Association for Masonic Research in the year 1927.

Lodge 163 was warranted for Birr (otherwise known as Parsonstown) in 1747, and is still current after having passed through some hard times. The Minute Books examined run from 1775 to 1872, and the history of the Lodge falls into three epochs, 1775-97; 1800-27, and 1836-67, with periods of dormancy between each.

Let me say at once that these Minutes are full of matters as interesting as noteworthy; but I shall not attempt to skim off the cream in any way, for every serious student will do well to acquire the book. Let me, however, give a whet: here among other surprises you will find an instance of a Lodge that

practically constituted another by giving the new body a copy of its Warrant (just as happened in the case of No. 74 I.C. in 1759 at Albany N.Y.)¹ you will covet the book too for its fascinating illustrations, including one of a magnificent fireplace, dated 1635, which represents the rebuilding of the Temple, the masons with sword in one hand and trowel in the other; and, finally, it contains a list, as complete as care can make it, of every member of and visitor to No. 163 since 1747, compiled and printed at the author's own expense. For these and many other features in the book we shall have to give our Brother Crosslé very hearty thanks.

In my opinion then, as a record of Masonic days that have passed away for ever this history is highly praiseworthy; but it is equally my opinion that as an attempt to prove the preconceived theory with which Brother Crosslé sets out on his pilgrimage we must regard it as a deplorable failure.

The more deplorable because loose reasoning and jumping at conclusions and positive statement in lieu of proof have too often been accepted (even since 1886) as gospel by those credulous Brethren who believe anything they see in print; and if this book suffers from these defects, as it seems to me to suffer, it may sooner serve to spread error among the uninstructed than promote discussion among the erudite of our Order; though I have no doubt the latter was the author's true object in putting it forth.

The theory on which the book is based appears to be as follows: the Irish Royal Arch degree (with the J. Legend) originally included the degrees that are now known in Ireland as the Knight of the Sword, Knight of the East, and Knight of the East and West, which degrees approximate in Legend, etc., to the one known to us in England as the Red Cross of Babylon, and figure in one old French ritual of the Ancient and Accepted Rite in Q.C. Library as the 15th and 16th of that system.

If Brother Crosslé's theory is correct, its implication is to confer added dignity on the recently formed (1923) Grand Council which now governs these degrees (Kt. of the East, etc.) in Ireland. They used to be conferred as side degrees in some of the Irish Preceptories, notably Sharavogue Preceptory, Birr, and North Down Preceptory, in which latter I personally received them over twenty years ago. It appears that the Grand Council also confers nowadays the degrees of Babylonian Pass, Jordan Pass, and Royal Order or Prussian Blue, for which, if I have followed him correctly, Brother Crosslé would claim an antiquity coeval with that of the other Red Cross degrees, as he terms all those comprised in this group. It is obvious, therefore, that a further implication attends the acceptance of the theory, and that is this: the Irish Royal Arch in its palmy days must have been a very lengthy ceremony, to wit: the existing Irish Royal Arch degree and all it contains in passing the veils and exemplification of the J. Legend, plus the Z. Legend as divided now into three degrees in Ireland, further plus the three other degrees mentioned above, of which I personally have no knowledge, for there was no knowledge of them existing in Irish Masonry in all the degrees I took there up to and including that of Prince Mason; so they presumably have been revived since 1914.

(This will be a convenient place to give the warning that the J. Legend was not, in my opinion, in undisputed possession of the Royal Arch field in Ireland. Some of the R.A. seals illustrated in this book are sufficient proof to the contrary, were any needed, which is not the case.)

Having adopted his theory for better or worse, Brother Crosslé sets out to attempt to prove it by citing a multitude of documents, which, however interesting and valuable in themselves, and they usually are so, bear better testimony to the wideness of his reading than to his success in either stating a case clearly or in drawing an obvious conclusion. When evidences clash with theory, as they are continually doing throughout, we are offered another theory to explain away the staggering inconsistency; and thus the airy fabric rises, improbability piled upon improbability, and cemented with ever-ready assertion in lieu of proof or logic.

¹ *Vide A.Q.C. v., 242.*

We are told first of all that the three degrees mentioned by Pennell (1730), viz. (1) E.A., (2) F.C., and (3) M.M., are not what we understand by the names now: that (1) included our present E.A. and F.C.; (2) our present M.M.; (3) our present Installed Master's degree, Royal Arch (Irish J. Legend) and the group of Red Cross degrees (for which see above). We are further told that at an indefinite period, but *circa* 1750, a conversion to what Brother Crosslé calls "Royal Archism" took place in the Irish metropolis, since when pure unadulterated Irish Freemasonry has only been found sporadically preserved in isolated instances in remote country Lodges. I fear our Brother has left this very peculiar term of his own invention lying about too carelessly and that some will trip over it. After reading his definition of it at page 144. "that blessed word Mesopotamia" itself has more comfort, for me at all events. Yet, since I may be dense or unfair, I hasten to copy his words in full:—

" 'Royal Archism' is a phrase of my own coining. It falls into the same category with 'Ritualism,' defined *inter alia*: 'excessive observance of forms in divine worship'."

But, if I have followed our Brother correctly, "Royal Archism" was rather an excessive lack of observance of forms, such a lack that its exponents failed to observe or preserve integral forms of the Irish Royal Arch degree, the existing Red Cross degrees. Thus the theory leads to a point where we must either fall into the jaws of a paradox or remain bogged in the slough of an inadequate definition.

Here I had better state my own personal opinion, which was elaborated in a paper for the Lodge of Research as long ago as 1915: that our original English and Irish E.A. (the forms being similar in the period 1723-30) did comprise our existing E.A. and F.C.; and that our existing M.M. degree was originally known as the F.C. It is quite unnecessary to quote the names of famous Masonic scholars who have held or still hold similar views. So far then, Brother Crosslé and I see eye to eye; and I will go even farther, and declare that to the best of my knowledge and belief an essential part of our existing Royal Arch degree (common to both the English and Irish varieties) was known to the Dublin Masons of 1725: but I am unable to go with him in asserting that the original M.M. degree contained the clamjamphrie of ritual that he claims for it, or that the transposition of names took place as late in the eighteenth century as he thinks.

I had imagined that one salient fact was beyond dispute between Brother Crosslé and myself, yet apparently we have to join issue on it now: the evidence of Laurence Dermott, if his evidence is worth anything, shows that the degree of Installed Master was firmly established in the Irish metropolis by the year 1746, and was then looked upon as an essential preliminary to the Royal Arch degree, which was known by this latter name, and *not* by that of Master Mason. If Dermott was speaking the truth, and I hold that he usually did about matters that came within his own knowledge, then his word, supported as it is by the words of contemporary worthies, sweeps away a good many of Brother Crosslé's arguments. It will be enough here to remind Brethren that we have the testimony of the Installing Officer himself that Dermott was installed as W.M. in Dublin in the year 1746, and his own testimony that he was exalted R.A. in the same year. On these and on other grounds (which will be patent to everyone as soon as Brother Songhurst has completed his labours on the Minutes of the Grand Lodge of England) I cannot accept the theory that the Royal Arch degree was part and parcel of the Irish Installed Master's degree in 1746 or later.

Passing from the theory to the details of its construction, it has been extremely difficult to single out the main pillars on which our Brother bases his beliefs, because in looking for them you have to turn over page after page full of matter quite irrelevant to the main issue, though full of interest always, and often of value. I trust I am not doing the author any injustice in giving the following as the main points in his creed:—

A. The occurrence of a "Deputy Master" as an officer in any Irish Lodge shows that the Lodge was at that period working the old M.M. degree, viz., Installed Master + Royal Arch (J. Legend) + Red Cross degrees (Knight of the East, etc.). The appearance of a sword and trowel in a Lodge floor-cloth is also a sign bearing the same esoteric significance.

B. When the words Royal Arch occur in any old Irish connexion, they do not mean what we mean by Royal Arch, but something quite different. Thus the famous reference to the Royal Arch carried in procession at Youghal in December, 1743, "cannot be read to mean a degree bearing that name was conferred at Youghal in 1743." Similarly, Dassigny's equally famous reference (1744) "does not suggest that the Royal Arch Masons of York were anything more than M.Ms. under another name." About Dassigny's further statement: "it is an organised body of men *who have passed the chair*" (my italics) our Brother says: "This is an early reference to the expression 'passed the chair,' used here in a colloquial sense; because no available evidence justifies the assertion that a separate degree, under that specific name, was conferred in Ireland before *circa* 1790."

Let me here refer Brother Crosslé to the entry in Kilwinning Lodge (Dublin) Minutes of 1st January, 1781 (I reconstruct the date, for the entry is torn) when a Lodge of emergency opened with Brother Wogan in the Chair and "proceeded to instal our (Worsh)ipful Bror Alley in due form with () honours." At the previous meeting on St. John's Day in Winter, 1780, Brother Wogan had been installed as proxy for Bro. Lewis Alley Master Elect, who had not attended—if no esoteric ceremony was attached, why repeat the performance?

C. The practice upheld by Laurence Dermott in England of conferring the Royal Arch upon only Installed Masters is not to be taken as indicating the Irish practice in 1746, when he received the degree in Dublin in Lodge 26.

D. It cannot be too strongly insisted that the Installed Master as a separate degree did not come into vogue in Ireland till *circa* 1790.

(From which it follows, as natural corollaries, though Brother Crosslé does not pursue his argument so far, (1) that the Antients in England were unjustified in claiming Installation as one of the landmarks from which the Moderns had retroceded: and (2) that the Lodges of Promulgation and Reconciliation were both bamboozled into adopting this feature as an essential of old British working.)

E. That Chetwode Crawley and subsequent scholars have been quite wrong in accepting in the ordinary sense of the words that Irish Grand Lodge Minute of 1786 which runs:—

"Resolv'd that it is highly improper for a Master Mason's Lodge as such to enter upon their Books any transactions relative to the Royal Arch."

Since the Master Mason's degree at this date contained the Royal Arch, the words must bear some other meaning than that of prohibiting the record of Arch transactions in Craft Minute Books.

What that other meaning may be, Brother Crosslé does not make clear.

F. The original name of the Knight of the East and West degree was "The Royal Order."

With none of the foregoing statements do I find myself able to agree: because they are either contradicted by positive evidence long known to Masonic scholars or unsupported by any fresh evidence produced by Brother Crosslé in this book.

Having formulated his theory, however, which he had every right to do, and stated it with a courage for which I have every admiration, he proceeds to apply it to the earliest Minutes (1775-97) of Lodge 163 in a way that I consider

can neither be justified nor admired in a serious historian. My readers will kindly not take my opinion as being worth a straw in this case, but go to the book itself, read the original Minutes of Lodge 163, and form their own judgment of their meaning. They will find typical Irish country Lodge records, set down by rather unlettered secretaries (no disgrace that, but the fact must be taken into the balance), who occasionally vary their phraseology for no real reason, as I venture to say happens to this very day. The plain ordinary English sense of these Minutes, which mention our three Craft degrees, with an occasional reference to the Royal Arch, is explained away by Brother Crosslé to mean something quite different from what plain English usually means. Where the impossibility becomes too glaring, as when the Royal Arch is mentioned by name (though it had been dinned into us previously that the Birr Freemasons knew it as the Master Mason's degree), then a harmless Brother who had visited the Kilwinning Lodge in Dublin is made the villain of the piece and accused of attempting to pervert the Masons of Birr to "Royal Archism." Often, moreover, for no apparent cause, the more improbable signification of an entry is adopted peremptorily, *e.g.*, when a certain Minute of Lodge 794 Newbliss mentions the conferring of the degree of the Knight of the Red Cross, Brother Crosslé decides that this was not the degree commonly known by that name in Ireland, but the Red Cross of Constantine—goodness knows why.

And all this torturing of language and straining of imagination to demonstrate a fact that he has not succeeded in demonstrating (but rather the reverse), that the Red Cross degrees have been known in Birr from the time of the eighteenth century.

I hold no brief against the honour and dignity of the Red Cross degrees, which were probably not much later in coming to Ireland than the Rose Croix (Prince Mason) in 1782, and were certainly in vogue there long prior to many other Masonic degrees now held in the highest estimation: but in fixing their real antiquity in that country we shall do better to rely on such documents as the one Brother Crosslé has reproduced in *facsimile* at page 256, which refers to the degree by name in 1790. The contrary method of twisting words to thatch a non-weatherproof theory, while apt to make the uninitiated smile, cannot but make the judicious grieve.

The earliest reference to the Red Cross degrees in an Irish Lodge which I can find in my index was given me by Brother Crosslé himself some years ago. In the *Freemason* of 1871, page 71, will be found notes of demits granted by No. 535 I.C. in the 30th Foot to Isaac Reed at Long Island, N.Y. On the 20th July, 1783, he was made a Royal Arch Super-excellent Mason. On the 25th August, 1783, he was dubbed a Knight of the Red Cross. Thus they were two separate degrees at this date. I cannot believe that they ever were one united degree.

Yet, having expressed my disagreement with many of the assumptions and conclusions contained in this book, it would be unjust and unbrotherly to lay it aside without a heart-felt compliment to the author for all the work that has gone into its making, for all the time that has been spent in collecting the many striking documents it comprises. Those of us who know Brother Crosslé know with what unselfish energy he has laboured for the good of the Irish Craft in general and of the Lodge of Research in particular: we acknowledge that his was the first idea of worthily celebrating our Bicentenary by producing a book which will connect his name for ever with that of the Grand Lodge itself; we are indebted, and none more so than myself, to his zeal for which no trouble is too great and no compilation too lengthy when information is wanted from any of the documents under his care—and when we can truthfully bestow such praise on a Brother, surely we may pardon the excessive enthusiasm for a theory that has carried him much farther than we are prepared to go in his company. I will personally vouch that his theories, unstable as they seem to me, are presented in all sincerity, for our Brother is incapable of acting in any other way: and if I have tried to dissipate this insubstantial pageant with a few

vigorous blasts of common sense, it is done without the least desire to give pain to one whom I am proud to call friend as well as Brother.

March, 1930.

JOHN HERON LEPPER.

FREEMASONRY IN THE THIRTEEN COLONIES.

By J. Hugo Tatsch.

(Macoy Publishing and Masonic Supply Co.: New York 1929).

To write that one has enjoyed a book is much: to write that one has admired it is more: but to write that it has brought one added knowledge and wisdom is surely the greatest praise of all: and the present reviewer can in all sincerity thank our Brother J. Hugo Tatsch, the well-known American Masonic scholar, for having given him all these sensations with his latest work. "Freemasonry in the Thirteen Colonies."

Technically, to the eye of either editor or historian, the plan of the book together with its execution is well-nigh perfect. In the space of 245 pages of good print we are given all the main features of the history of the thirteen oldest American Masonic Constitutions up to the times of establishment of independent Grand Lodges in each: nor has one of the more notable details in the story of any of them been omitted; while for the reader in search of more minutiae an excellent bibliography appended to every chapter will set his feet on the right paths. The succinct yet complete narrative is presented with scholarly precision and critical broad-mindedness. Brother Tatsch is neither an iconoclast nor a *fidei defensor* where old American Masonic traditions are concerned; some he dismisses as improbable, others as coming from untrustworthy sources, but with yet others has indicated ways and means by which requisite proof might be yet obtainable.

These are some of the reasons why I admire this book.

When and where Freemasonry began in what is now the United States Brother Tatsch does not offer a dogmatic opinion, and in all probability we shall never know definitely, because it seems undoubted that our Craft took its course westward long before definite adherence to one of the Mother Constitutions in the British Isles had become the shibboleth of regularity. What can be more certain than that where a few Freemasons were gathered together in New England they should form themselves into a Lodge according to ancient custom? Who are we to dub these non-regular, or even clandestine meetings? It is essential that we should cast off our present-day conceptions of Masonic jurisprudence, if we are going to look upon the colonial Freemasonry of two centuries ago with any clearness of vision or judgment.

There is yet another point that we should bear in mind when estimating the probable or possible antiquity of some of the old American Lodges. The Warrant as we know it to-day did not exist in the Grand Lodge of England till the sixth decade of the eighteenth century. Therefore all English Lodges regularly constituted, either at home or in the colonies, before this date would come into being by virtue of a "Deputation," an authority to some person or persons to instal a new Masonic body under the aegis of the Grand Lodge in London. This document might or might not be preserved by the new Lodge: in the vast majority of cases it was not preserved, and its actual preservation was unnecessary as a certificate of regularity. There is, therefore, more of certainty than conjecture in suggesting that a great many early American Lodges found themselves without any written evidence of regularity that they could produce, when asked to account for their antiquity and good standing later in the eighteenth century, when a Warrant of some sort had become a hall-mark in the Craft. So, to my mind, there is more than a little to be said before

rejecting such early traditional dates as attach to some of the old American Lodges, for example, to the Lodge at Norfolk in Virginia.

The Provincial Grand Masters in America were appointed in a haphazard way; I have no doubt many of them executed their functions in a way just as haphazard; it speaks well for the reverence paid to the Craft in America that we possess as many evidences of their activities there as we do.

The most casual reading of this book will show what a hard task American Masonic historians have had. A minute study has been essential not only of manifestations of Freemasonry in their own States, but also of the course of events in the three Home Constitutions of England, Ireland, and Scotland, to mention but the three most important. What wonder then if some of the older school of historians must now be considered unreliable, as one of them certainly must in anything connected with the phenomenon of Antient Masonry in England. After all, Masonic history, like to Freemasonry itself, is a progressive science. Every honest piece of work adds to our potential knowledge. We cannot know everything, but we all have the desire to learn: and I do believe that there is not one of us but must learn more about his own particular corner of research by making his general reading as wide as opportunity gives him scope. None of us can afford to remain completely ignorant of the origins of those stupendous Masonic Constitutions across the Atlantic.

An ounce of example is worth a pound of precept. While this book was lying on my desk waiting for review, I received a letter from a fine Masonic scholar, saying: "I want to learn something about American Masonry, what books shall I read?" I have replied: "Read 'Freemasonry in the Thirteen Colonies' by J. Hugo Tatsch. He has done for America what Vibert and Daynes have done for England."

March, 1930.

JOHN HERON LEPPER.

*TWO HUNDRED YEARS OF FREEMASONRY: A HISTORY OF THE
BRITANNIC LODGE No. 33.*

By William Sanderson.

London: George Kenning & Son.

[Cloth, 10s. 6d., Library Edition, 25s.]

"This Book is not an ordinary Lodge History" is the publishers' official description; and when we learn that the Records of the Lodge are missing for the first one hundred and three years of its existence, we can sympathize with the brother who found himself called upon to write a History of Two Hundred years with such scanty material, even though we may differ from him in regard to the utility—and indeed the accuracy—of some of the information with which he has expanded the Volume.

No doubt it was wise, when endeavouring to piece together the fragments of fact which go to make up the History, to create an 'atmosphere,' but as it seems to me this 'atmosphere' so far as Masonry is concerned, and that is really all that matters, is based mainly upon Anderson, without an attempt to consult any of the critical commentaries which have appeared on that brother's work. In some respects our Author has even out-distanced Anderson, for while the latter only claims that Adam was the first Mason or Geometrician, we read here that:

Masonry actually began before man existed on this planet, commencing it is believed in the love dances of birds, whose revolutions danced the grass into a circular nest. This nest became their home, and its architecture was long afterwards imitated by the men who made their first dwellings in the trees.

I am sorry that I cannot see the point of this joke, but it enables me to understand the force of the publishers' description of the book.

Anderson's work was a private venture, and received but a grudging approval by Grand Lodge. There is no reason to believe that he had any part in the proceedings of 1716-17, and he himself states that the General Regulations were first compiled by George Payne in 1720. Furthermore we need not now repeat the tale—I think it was started by Oliver—that Desaguliers and Anderson had any share in the compilation of the Ritual, nor assume that an early Eighteenth Century Ritual could bear more than a superficial resemblance to one of the early Twentieth Century.

The statements that Inigo Jones patronized the Lodges and Wren neglected them, are pure Anderson, without any evidence whatever to support them. Our Author admits that there is a doubt about their initiation, and yet he says that they were "the two great leaders of speculative masonry." The claim that "we find several lodges of speculative masons working in England in the reign of Queen Anne" is not in Anderson. It would have been useful if we had been furnished with particulars of these Lodges—if indeed they ever existed.

Other statements made by our Author are equally difficult to follow. For example, he says, "there is plenty of evidence that this Company [the Masons' Company of London] practised speculative masonry, as well as operative, after the Civil War," and he puts forward the hypothesis that at some later period not clearly defined but apparently early in the Eighteenth Century, "speculative masonry was so old that it was decaying." My own suggestion is that he might well re-consider his definition of the word 'speculation'. It may be quite true that in the present day speculation can be defined as "the mental process of contemplating anything and viewing it in its different aspects and relations to other objects," but this definition would not hold good when associated with "medieval organizations." The oldest known use of the word in connection with the Mason's Craft is in the *Cooke MS.* (written c. 1420, but from a much earlier original), and there it is quite clear that it meant *theory* as opposed to *practice*, in other words, *design* as against actual *construction*. We must not assume that in medieval times speculation meant *philosophy*. 'Atmosphere' of this kind is apt to degenerate into Fog.

We are told that as compared with men of other trades "the masons alone had liberty of movement, and so were called Freemasons to distinguish them from the tied masons of the monasteries." If, as seems to be implied, this means that the "liberty of movement" was granted by Statute or Charter, the statement needs some corroboration, although we know that Masons did travel, especially when engaged on the King's work. And the periods during which Masons were styled Freemasons would perhaps upset the theory as to the meaning of the prefix *Free*.

I cannot even guess the authority for the statements about the Antients and the Moderns. Their differences *were* on matters of Ritual, and had nothing whatever to do with politics or religion. The Moderns admitted that they had departed from the Landmarks, and not until they reverted to the original form was a Union possible. The theories about William Smith and his *Pocket Companion* are quite untenable.

The actual History of the Lodge contains many points of great interest, though confusion has been caused by treating various important periods of the Lodge's existence out of their chronological order, the earliest History from 1730 being dealt with after that of about 1773 and onwards. It will be useful to take these in their proper sequence.

The Lodge was certainly formed in 1730, and our Author assumes that a Charter or Warrant was issued, and signed on 17th July of that year, by the Duke of Norfolk, Grand Master. We may acquit a later Secretary of the charge (made by the Author) of losing a document that never existed, for Warrants were unknown in this country for many years after 1730. There may perhaps have been a Deputation to constitute, but the actual Constitution and Registration were considered quite sufficient to make a Lodge regular.

The Lodge first met at the Rainbow Coffee House, York Buildings, in the Strand, and mention might have been made of a small but interesting incident in connection with that House. In the Minutes of Grand Lodge (*Q.C.A.* x., 128, 137) for 28th August, 1730, we find that a complaint was lodged against Mr. Lily, the Landlord, "with having made it his business to ridicule Masonry publickly notwithstanding he lately received the honour of having a Lodge constituted at his house and he being a Mason." At the next meeting the parties attended in response to a summons and "after a full hearing on both sides and witnesses" it was found that "the Accuser and Accused had both evidenced their Affection and Zeal for Masonry" and they were directed to salute each other "which was done accordingly." The Lodge continued to meet at the Rainbow for nine years.

The Lodge is fortunate in being included (with over eighty names) in the List of Lodges and their members "as they were returned in the year 1730. The R^t. Hon^{ble}. Thomas Lord Lovell being then Grand Master." This description makes it clear that the List was commenced in March, 1730-1, although for convenience it is called the "MS. List of 1730." It is very uncertain when the last entries were made in the List, but it was certainly in use down to September, 1732. It is unsafe to assume that the Lodge at the Rainbow started with sixty-two members. The List furnishes practically all that is known of the Lodge during what the Author calls its "Huguenot period," because some of the members had French names. I am inclined to think that the List could well have borne a closer scrutiny, as some of the members are certainly recognizable, and one—Henry Price—has long since been identified as the brother appointed in 1733 as Provincial Grand Master for New England. It may be merely a coincidence that in a later list of members we find a George Harrison, a brother of that name having been appointed Provincial Grand Master for New York by Lord Carysfort.

In 1739 the Lodge moved to the Gun (otherwise Cannon), Charing Cross, and I believe that this is the same house as the Gun (or Cannon), Suffolk Street, Haymarket, where the Lodge remained until 1746. In that year it went to Putney, meeting first at the Bowling Green, and subsequently at the Castle, and the White Lion, where it is said to have remained until 1774, but in my opinion this is very much open to doubt, though the tangle which is presented is not easy to unravel.

It would have been useful if we had been furnished with a statement showing attendances at Grand Lodge. I have made a rough search and find that while the Lodge met in Town the representatives attended with considerable regularity—about twenty-three times between 1730 and 1746. After the removal to Putney there were about twelve attendances from the Bowling Green in as many years (1746-1758), and six from the Castle from 1758 to 1764. Then from the White Lion we have attendances in 1766, 1769, and 1771. In February, 1772, there is the first mention of the name 'Britannick,' and this seems to upset our Author's theories based upon the adoption of the name in 1774. By November, 1774, No. 33 was again meeting in Town, at the Thatched House Tavern, and then there is a very regular attendance with £6 6s. for Charity at practically each meeting. Their admission fees and annual subscriptions were high, and they charged £5. 5s. for Visitors!

It will be noticed that the attendances tailed off considerably while the Lodge was at Putney, but our Author says that "the Lodge must have been a going concern in 1770 when it was re-numbered 33." I do not agree with this opinion. The re-numbering only shows that the Lodge had not been erased, as actually happened in 1773. In February of that year the Grand Secretary was directed to write to those Lodges which had not recently attended Grand Lodge or contributed to the Charity Fund, and request them to show cause why they should not be erased. In April following, seven Lodges were ordered to be erased as they had not "contributed anything to the Fund of Charity for some years past nor transmitted any satisfactory excuse for their omission." Amongst these Lodges was the White Lion at Putney. There was nothing

unusual in this procedure. It was the ordinary method of cleaning the List. Two years later eighteen Lodges were similarly erased.

But what then of the very flourishing Lodge with the same Number which we find meeting at the Thatched House Tavern in 1774 with Royal Princes as members? The imagined conversation between the Secretary of the Lodge and the Grand Secretary does not impress me. Was not Heseltine more likely to have taken hold of the derelict No. 33 and worked it up as a strong and exclusive Lodge in London? I fancy that such a course would not have been without a precedent. It might have been useful to study the History of the New (Royal) Lodge which had been meeting at the Thatched House Tavern from 1767. In that Lodge and in that year the Duke of Cumberland was initiated, and he later became the "perpetual Master" of the Britannic.

We now come to a very interesting Book which is preserved in the Library of Grand Lodge, and gives useful information concerning a period of which no other records are known to exist. It contains a set of By-Laws (undated) of the Britannick Lodge No. 33 meeting at the Thatched House Tavern. This is followed by a second set of By-Laws of 1790, and each set has been signed in the usual manner by the members as they were admitted. There are also some notes of meetings, the latest of which is of 17th June, 1817. The Secretary during the later period was George Blackman, who afterwards became Sir George Harnage, and who died in 1836. The Book then came into the hands of his son, also George Harnage, and he in 1837 went through it and annotated it, principally identifying the members of the Royal family and of his own family, who had been members also of the Lodge.

I have said that the first set of By-Laws is undated. But a date *does* appear. In the preamble the Scribe wrote "The Britannick Lodge No. 33 Constituted" and then left a blank which was filled in another handwriting by "22nd day of May 1773." In 1790 there is no mention of the date when the Lodge was constituted, but the date—22nd May 1773—is taken as that on which the earlier By-Laws were "first formed and concluded." But where did the date come from? It is within a month of the erasure of the Lodge, and I think it bears out my view that a new Lodge was put into the vacant place in the Register.

This MS. Book covers what the Author designates the "Royal Period," and he deals fully with the Royal Princes who were members, as well as with a few other Brethren of note, but curiously he omits particular reference to the Duke of Manchester, Grand Master 1777-1782; the Earl of Effingham, Acting Grand Master (1782-1797) under the Duke of Cumberland; Thomas Sandby, the Architect of our present Freemasons' Hall; John Allen, Provincial Grand Master for Lancashire; the Rev. William Peters, Grand Portrait Painter; and others who were equally prominent in Masonry in their day. He identifies James Willis as a member, on the strength of his signature to an Inventory of Lodge property in 1809. But surely Willis, the proprietor of Willis's Rooms where the Lodge was meeting, only signed the document in compliance with the 13th By-Law of 1790.

This particular Inventory is useful as it tells somewhat of the history of the valuable furniture which is still in use to-day. On three Candlesticks are to be found the letters G.B. which our Author suggests mean *George* (Prince of Wales) and *Britannic*. May it not be that the Candlesticks had been in the possession of the Secretary, George Blackman, and so bear the initials of his name?

Two annotations in the MS. Book are treated differently by the Author. One he is satisfied is correct, but the other he declines to accept. The first is to the effect that Prince William Henry, afterwards King William IV., was a member, although he did not sign the By-Laws. This is quite possibly true, for the Prince had been initiated in a Lodge at Plymouth in 1786, and was Master of the Prince of Wales' Lodge in London for some years down to 1830. The second note states that the Lodge did not meet after 17th June, 1817. It is suggested that the annotator was not a Mason, and there seems no

Part III. deals with the private Lodge, its formation, its officers and so on, in the same way. As evincing the sort of misunderstanding that does exist, I was only recently asked quite seriously whether a paper could be read in Lodge during an ordinary meeting: the worthy P.M. who put the question really believed that nothing except routine business and ceremonies could be done at a meeting without calling off. The fact that a Lodge cannot to-day make a By-Law allowing subscriptions to be commuted for life-membership is one that might well escape Founders when drafting their By-Laws, as it is not to be found in the B. of C. Apparently there never has been a categorical decision on the subject, but in the Appendix (p. 202) we find a reference to an expression of opinion by Grand Lodge, and that is all. On the same footing are the restrictions in force to-day with regard to the name of a new Lodge. The section on Lodge By-Laws is particularly helpful, and there are valuable hints on conducting the discussions and dealing with amendments.

Bro. Edwards discusses the point whether a visitor may require to see the Lodge Warrant, and says that this may be, but that the discourtesy of such a proceeding is apparent. I would suggest that the brother, by his very act of proffering himself as a visitor, is, in legal phrase, estopped from querying the right of the Lodge to meet since he has by implication conceded it. It would be another matter if he had come down armed with authority to enquire into the legality of the Lodge's proceedings. The point should be academic, but the incident actually occurred once within my knowledge. Two strange brethren visiting a Lodge in a certain District thought that they had been tested with unnecessary particularity, and retaliated by requiring the Warrant to be brought out for their inspection. As it was framed and fastened to the wall of the Lodge room, the compliance with their request caused no small disturbance, and it was some time before harmony was restored.

With regard to the returns stated to be due to the Clerk of the Peace under the Unlawful Societies Act of 1799, a quite recent pronouncement in Grand Lodge has altered the state of affairs, and Bro. Edward's analysis of the position has now to be read with that pronouncement in mind.

The table of payments to G.L. on p. 103 omits one small amount that a new Lodge has to pay, which is the 4/6 required by G.L. for the book of candidate declaration forms under Rule 187. The quotation from the Book of Ecclesiasticus that is given in the section on the banquet is one that might with advantage be read occasionally, say immediately after the toast of the King. This would be a pleasing innovation for some Master with much force of character to introduce. The remarks on the introduction of a cigarette with the *sorbet*, which one occasionally sees, seem to make rather too much of this old addition to our table customs. If the cigarette is treated as part of the course, the toast list need not be disturbed, since it can plausibly be maintained that no one is smoking, in the true acceptance of that term, that is to say, taking tobacco after having finished their dinner.

Bro. Edwards considers the formation of what he calls rehearsal clubs to be an evasion of the provisions of the B. of C. relating to Lodges of Instruction. The rules contemplate that these Lodges should be formally sanctioned, and their times and places of meeting regularly notified to the authorities. But there is nothing to prevent the W.M. allowing the brethren to meet, with all due precautions, for any purpose he pleases without the occasion being treated as a meeting of the Lodge. There is no doubt it is constantly done and indeed one often sees the time and place of the rehearsal notified on the summons itself. The Lodges of Instruction contemplated by the B. of C. are not bodies meeting merely to rehearse ceremonies, but they are supposed to work the Lectures, and would almost appear to have originally been formed for that purpose only. The rules as to Lodges of Instruction first make their appearance in 1819, having been inserted as amendments to the *Constitutions* as printed for discussion in 1815. By a resolution of 9 Sep. 1818, G.L. approved a list of

amendments to the B. of C. which included: "That no general Lodge of Instruction shall be holden but under the Sanction of a Regular Warranted Lodge [etc.]." Just what is implied by *general* does not appear.

In Part IV., which deals with Provincial and District Grand Lodges, Bro. Edwards draws attention to one of the minor anomalies of the B. of C., which is that whereas Deputy Provincial or District Grand Masters must have previously served the office of Master in a regular Lodge, this is nowhere laid down as a qualification for the Assistant Provincial or District Grand Master. (On p. 132, line 17, the word "Assistant" has dropped out of the text.)

With regard to the constitution of Grand Lodge, Bro. Edwards asks in what capacity Past Masters of private Lodges attend, and, as I think correctly, he comes to the conclusion that they are there in virtue of their own qualifications. We are liable to lose sight of the fact that G.L. is not like Parliament, with the Lodges in the position of constituencies sending up Members elected for that purpose. G.L. is essentially the whole body of Masters of Lodges, with their Wardens. The Moderns allowed the Grand Secretary and Treasurer and Past Grand Officers to rank as members of Grand Lodge. The Antients went further and all Past Masters of Lodges were allowed to be on the same footing. (*Ahiman Rezon*, 1807, p. 69, footnote.) At the Union this principle was carried on into the United Grand Lodge. It seems to be clear therefore that Grand Lodge to-day consists, as it did in 1723, of the body of Masters of all the private Lodges with their Wardens, but that to these are added Past Grand Officers, Past Masters and certain officials, in an advisory capacity, and by virtue of their personal qualifications. The *Constitutions* of 1723 say clearly that the Lodges may instruct their Masters, who are their representatives, how to vote. The first two editions after the Union laid it down that the Master and Wardens could, by a formal document, appoint other brethren to represent them. But the Past Masters are apparently under no obligation to consult their Lodges: they are neither representatives nor delegates. In 1822, at the meeting of June 5th, the Board of G.P. reported that they had maturely considered the question of the right of P.M.'s to sit in the G.L. and had come to the conclusion that the right is a personal one. The *Constitutions* of 1815 provided for one Past Master only from each Lodge being a member of G.L., but as amended in 1819, they made all P.M.'s members, and that is the rule to-day.

Clearly a Lodge would be perfectly in order in sending up a body of Past Masters to G.L. to vote in a special manner on any particular occasion, and the incident has actually occurred.

Bro. Edwards observes, no doubt with perfect correctness, that there may, as a matter of history, be a right in Grand Lodge to confer degrees on candidates, but that the right is, at least, in abeyance. It would certainly introduce a situation of some difficulty in respect of the candidate's position in the Order, if the practice were to be revived to-day. But the point is academic.


The position of the Assistant Grand Secretary is not very clearly defined on p. 165, even with the help of the Corrigendum. Actually this officer, when appointed, is an Officer of Grand Lodge with a specified position in the order of precedence.

The conclusion of the whole work is a well written analysis of our peculiar system in which the written law, ever tending to get more complex, is yet wholly controlled by the unwritten spirit which lies behind it and keeps the Craft alive. In printing his selection of decisions of G.L. which forms the first Appendix, the Author is careful to warn us that these must be taken solely as decisions in particular cases, and are not to be erected into general principles or even to be regarded as precedents binding upon the Order. Some indeed are actually superseded by recent emendations of the B. of C. as Bro. Edwards is careful to point out. In a second Appendix he gives the full text of certain recent changes in the B. of C. itself.

The work is not free from printers' errors which at times make the Author appear to be responsible for definitely erroneous statements. On p. 59 the text of Art. 120 of the B. of C. has been much distorted and the omission of the word "Grand" before "Officers" in line eight seriously alters the sense. On p. 56 the statement is made that the petition for a new Lodge must be signed by seven Master Masons regularly *installed*; it should, of course, read *registered*. There are other small errors, some of which are dealt with by a Corrigenda slip pasted in, but in what is in effect a legal text-book, it is of more than ordinary importance that the text should be immaculate. But apart from this, the book is a most useful piece of work, and should go far to support the W.M. who finds, not for the first time, that the description that was given him of the Book of Constitutions on Installation Night belongs rather to the domain of ritual than that of actuality and was only intended symbolically. It will go far to provide Masters and those generally who have to determine questions of Masonic jurisprudence in the Lodges with a really useful manual, of which it can be said with some confidence that scarcely a difficulty will occur in the Lodge but this work will set it right.

January, 1930.

LIONEL VIBERT.



NOTES AND QUERIES.



ATHEW BIRKHEAD, AUTHOR OF THE APPRENTICE'S SONG.—In the Calendar of Wills for the Archdeanery of Middlesex the following entry occurs:—

Birkhead, Mathew
gentleman
St. Clement Danes. Regr. 3. 1133.
11 March 1722/3. W. 11—126.

The Register contains a copy of the Will, but spells the Testator's name as "Brickhead."

I have seen the original Will and extracted the following:—

The Will begins:—

"In the name of God, Amen. I Mathew Birkhead of the Parish of St. Clement Danes in the County of Middlesex Gent. being sick in body but of good and perfect memory thanks be to Almighty God do make this my last Will and Testament (that is to say) First of all I recommend my Soul to Almighty God my Creator hoping thro' the meritts of our blessed Redeemer Jesus Christ to obtain Everlasting life And I do dispose of all my personall Estate as follows (that is to say) I will and desire that all my debts and funerall expenses shall be well and truly paid and satisfied."

He then gives to his dear and loving Mother Sarah Watson alias Birkhead £10 to be paid within three months after his decease, and gives unto his dear and good wife Sarah Birkhead all his right benefit and advantage in or belonging to the Lease tenement House and Garden he had at Brumpton in the Parish of Kensington in Middlesex during her naturall life, and after her decease he gives the same to his said dear Mother. He bequeaths the residue of his estate unto his said wife and appoints her to be Executrix. In witness whereof he set his hand and seal the 14th day of December 1719.

The signature is M. Birkhead.

The witnesses to the Will were Hen. Ordway and John Gatrell.

Probate was granted on 11th March 1722 to Sara Birkhead the Widow and Executrix.

The Testator was buried at St. Clement Danes Church and a record of the funeral appeared in a contemporary newspaper.

The Seal on the Will is interesting. It shows on a shield three garbs or wheat sheaves without any chevron or bar. The crest is a Stag's head with antlers. As regards the Arms shown on the Seal it would have been indiscreet to assume that they belonged to the Testator. For a long period it has been a custom to utilize any seal that may be handy; more often than not the seal of the Lawyer who prepared the Will or other document. In this case, however, the Arms were evidently those claimed by Mathew Birkhead himself.

The evidence is to be found in the *Transactions* of the London & Middlesex Archæological Association, vol. 1, pages 278 *seqq.*, in an article on Sepulchral Brasses at Harrow (Middlesex).

An account is there given of the important Monumental Brass in Harrow Church of John Byrkhede a priest (of which an etching by J. P. Malcolm, dated January 1st, 1799, is published in that artist's "Illustration's to Lyson's

Environs of London"):—"The terminations of some of the lines of the inscription are marked by garbs or wheatsheafs. These were derived from the armorial bearings of the deceased, whose entire coat, three garbs, is at the lower left hand corner."

The true date of this memorial is apparently 1468, though other dates have been erroneously assigned.

This John Byrkhede was Rector of Harrow and one of the Executors of Abp. Chicheley, the founder of All Souls' College, Oxford. Other particulars are given showing that John Byrkhede was highly esteemed. He had other ecclesiastical preferments at Wigan and at Hawkhurst.

It would be improper to suggest that our Brother was a *descendant* of this priest, but he may easily have been collaterally related to him.

Continuing from the said *Transactions* at p. 282:—"It is remarkable that the college of All Souls possessed at a later period, a fellow of the same name (or nearly so) who was a person of considerable eminence. This was John Birkenhead, sometime amanuensis to Archbishop Laud, and afterwards writer of the *Mercurius Aulicus*. He was expelled from the college as a royalist in 1648, and was subsequently knighted by Charles the Second. He died in 1679. Sir John was the son of Randall Birkenhead, saddler, of Northwich in Cheshire; in which county the family had long flourished, deriving its name from a place opposite Liverpool, which in later years has arisen into world-wide reputation. Dr. Ormerod, in his history of Cheshire, vol. ii., p. 199, gives a pedigree of Birkenhead of Bachford in that county, whose arms were: Sable, three garbs or, within a bordure argent, and derives them conjecturally from John de Birkenhead, who bore three garbs on his seal temp. Edward III. The Historian remarks that this was one of the numerous Cheshire bearings which are what the old heralds call arms of affection, and were adopted with reference to the coat of the local sovereigns of the Palatinate."

W.J.W.

Oddfellows.—In connection with the Paper on Oddfellowship by Bro. Rickard, recently reprinted in our *Transactions*, it may be of interest to note that Mutual Benefit Societies were first recognized by Law when the Statute 33 Geo. III. c. 54 was passed in 1793. Under this Statute the legal status of these Mutual Benefit Societies depended upon the enrolment of their Rules with the Clerk of the Peace, and the confirmation thereof by the local Justices. A vast number of Societies speedily enrolled their Rules under this Act, familiarly known as Rose's Act, thus showing that the Act met a real public need. For instance, within a very few years after the passing of the Act nearly 1,000 Societies were enrolled in Middlesex, and in some of the other English Counties the number was almost as great. In the Archives of the Norwich Corporation there are the Rules of over a hundred of these Mutual Benefit Societies, but unfortunately none relating to Oddfellow Clubs. A search in the Archives of other Municipal Authorities throughout England might, however, produce some positive result.

The Rule in the Loyal Aristarcus Lodge of Oddfellows, as to no tipstaff, bailiff, &c., being eligible for admission, finds its counterpart in the Constitutions of the Grand Lodge of Ireland at the present day. By Rule 135 it is provided:—

"No Lodge shall initiate any person who shall not be able to read and write, or who shall be a Sheriff's, Coroner's or Marshal's bailiff, or a domestic livery servant."

The same Rule further provides:—

"Any Brother filling any of the before-mentioned positions, after he has been admitted a Member of the Craft, shall forfeit all his rights as a Freemason as long as he shall continue to fill such position, and

any Lodge which shall knowingly receive or admit among them any Brother filling any of the before-mentioned positions shall be punished as the Grand Lodge shall direct."

In the *Norfolk and Norwich Remembrancer*, 1701-1821, there is at page 120, under the date November, 1811, the following paragraph:—

"As a Club of Odd Fellows were performing their mystic rites, in an upper room at the Three Tuns Tavern, St. Andrew's, Norwich, the floor gave way, and precipitated the fraternity to the ground: none of them were much hurt."

No Lodge of Freemasons was meeting at the Three Tuns Tavern, St. Andrew's, at the period mentioned, and I can find no further particulars as to this Lodge of Oddfellows.

Lastly, no mention was made in the Paper, or the discussion which followed, of the account of Oddfellows and their ceremonies, given in a letter printed by Richard Carlile in *The Republican*, vol. 12, No. 16, for 21st October, 1825, pp. 497-501. The account is a full one, and therefore too long to quote here, but should be considered by anyone studying Oddfellowship.

GILBERT W. DAYNES.

Engravings of the Portrait of Anthony Sayer.—I have now, through the courtesy of the Lahore authorities, been enabled to see the original engraving in their possession, which they have been kind enough to send over here, and it is undoubtedly a first state of the engraving, before letters, and before being cleaned for engraving the lettering. On the lower part of the paper, but inside the plate mark, someone at a later date has written: *Anthony Sayer, G.M. 1717*, and outside the plate mark *Highmore pinxt. Faber fecit*. From the photograph alone it could not be determined how much below the actual engraved area was mount and how much was blank area within a plate mark.

Bro. A. F. Calvert has also gone into the questions of the plate in its various states and of the reproduction that the late Bro. Sadler had made, and he has been able to establish the fact that Bro. Sadler, when making his reproduction, took the very unusual course of changing the lettering. He had the original lettering removed and replaced by a copy which was not an exact reproduction. He therefore gave us what one would naturally take to be a reproduction of a different plate, if its true history had not now been ascertained. Accordingly the alteration in the lettering does not support the inference that the original plate was redrawn by Richardson in 1790, and in Bro. Calvert's opinion the plate was the same throughout.

All this does not affect the Lahore engraving, the one which omits the apron, and this still remains unique, but apparently the original plate was not at any time redrawn as I had been led to conclude, and the minute differences must be explained as due to wear or to the process of reproduction.

L.V.

A Possible Identification of Warrant No. 45 I.C.—Warrant No. 45 is blank in the earliest register of the G.L. Ireland, compiled *circa* 1761. It was issued probably in the latter half of 1735, but not later than April 1736. This note is intended as a suggestion more than a definite identification of its original destination.

In the Minutes of St. John's Old Kilwinning Inverness, 14th December 1744, we read:—

"David Holland present Master of the Lodge of Free Masons in the Honble Brigadier Guise's Regt now lying at Inverness, Fort George,

visited us this day, and had his proper place assigned to him in our procession; he appears to be No. 45 Mrs of this Lodge."

Brigadier Guise's Regiment was later known as the Sixth Foot, the present Warwick Regiment.

The "Mrs" in above entry is a bit of a crux. Has the Minute been transcribed correctly? Might it be "Wrt"?

The 45 looks to me like the number of the Lodge; and since Scots Lodges were not numbered at this date, and there were no English Military Lodges yet, we have to fall back on the Irish Constitution for a parent.

The Sixth Foot was in Ireland from 1720 to 1739, within which period the original No. 45 was issued.

In the winter of 1753, after service in Scotland, the Sixth Foot proceeded to Gibraltar. It may well have gone by way of Ireland.

At any rate, No. 45 crops up again in *Faulkner's Dublin Journal* for March 1753:—

"On Wednesday last the Printer hereof received One Pound Four Shillings from the Gentlemen of Lodge No. 45 of FREE and ACCEPTED MASONS in Barrack street, for the Gentleman, the son of a Clergyman etc."

Barrack Street was a usual place of meeting for military Lodges in garrison in Dublin. It was not, so far as we know, a fixed Dublin Lodge. I take it that this advertisement carries us a step farther in fixing No. 45 as a military Warrant.

Very little additional outside evidence is needed either to disprove or confirm above, which I print with the object of securing such evidence.

J.H.L.

Provincial Warrants.—In the Appendix to Part I. of his paper, Bro. Carter, at p. 94 of *A.Q.C.*, vol. xli., showed Lodge Unanimity, Norwich, constituted in 1758, as having lapsed in 1797. Nevertheless he *also* gave its present number, which is 102. This apparent contradiction reflects an interesting piece of Lodge history to which Bro. Sorrell of Lowestoft has drawn my attention. Bro. Carter himself would have dealt with it had he lived; the papers were with him at the time of his death.

The history of the Lodge will be found at pp. 118-132 of Bro. Hamon le Strange's *History of Freemasonry in Norfolk*, and further details can be gathered from the correspondence in the files in Grand Lodge. It was founded in 1758, to meet at Norwich, but the only authorities for the meeting-places until 1787 are the Engraved Lists, and the Warrant of Confirmation granted in 1811, as for the period before 1787 there are no records, but the Lodge contributed to the Hall Fund previous to 1781.

The first entry in the Minute Book, the date of which is 4 April, 1787, shows very clearly that a certain Bro. Chapman Ives acquired the "Constitution" and opened a new Lodge at Coltishall, a village seven miles N. of Norwich. This Brother had been initiated in the Maid's Head Lodge in 1784. (*A.Q.C.* xxxviii., 267.) He was a brewer at Coltishall, and the proceedings at this first meeting consisted of admitting him and 13 other brethren as joining members, and initiating a candidate. In the G.L. Register these admissions are preceded by seventeen names as to which no information whatever is given. Most of the individuals can be found as members of other Lodges in Norwich and the neighbourhood, and the names probably represent the membership of the Lodge before it became inactive in Norwich itself; seven can be traced to Union Lodge, and the names of others occur in the Maid's Head Lists in *A.Q.C.* xxxviii. The Lodge met at Coltishall and Norwich and also at Wroxham. After the meeting of 4 September, 1797, there was a break and the Lodge did not meet again until

10 December, 1804, when it made a fresh start at the King's Head, Hoveton St. John. But this and Wroxham are adjacent parishes, and the extent of the migration was no more than half-a-mile, from one inn to the next. The same Brother presided on both occasions, and the same Brethren were members. (*Vide* a letter to Bro. John Lane from the Prov.G.Sec. of Norfolk, of 17 Feb., 1891, in the file at G.L.) It is this break that Lane takes as a lapse of one Lodge and the formation of a new one, for which he gives the date 10 December, 1804, as the date of the Warrant of Constitution. There is no such document recorded, nor does it appear that any Warrant was surrendered by the Coltishall Lodge.

In 1811 the Lodge got a Warrant of Confirmation, as it appeared that its original Warrant was lost or destroyed. In 1814 it moved to Bungay in Suffolk. Once more Lane calls this a new Lodge, with its own Warrant. But in fact the letter from the Lodge Secretary of 28 February, 1814, is still extant, in which he hands the Grand Secretary £2 "from which you will be pleased to deduct the usual fee for transferring the Constitution and inserting the same on the engraved list and appropriate"—the balance to Charity. And Bro. Daynes has looked into the matter and finds that in fact only 2/6 was taken as the fee. It is clear that the proceedings were treated simply as a change of meeting place without any break in continuity. Although its subsequent history is not free from periods of quiescence, yet the Lodge was granted a Centenary Warrant in 1877 and is No. 102 to-day.


It was perhaps fortunate that in 1877 claims to Centenary Warrants were not examined meticulously. But be that as it may, the Lodge, from 1787 at all events, may fairly claim to have a continuous existence. And the transactions by which, in that year, the Lodge at Coltishall took over the "Constitution" and the number of the Lodge founded thirty years previously at Norwich was, at that period, not looked upon as in any way irregular.

I am indebted to Bro. A. E. Richmond, of Great Yarmouth, for an interesting fact connected with Lodge Friendship, No. 100, which is that it possesses two Warrants. The original was lost, and a Warrant of Confirmation issued to replace it. Subsequently it was found among other records at Grand Lodge, by Bro. Sadler, and Bro. Hamon le Strange, who was then the Prov. G. Master, had it restored to its original owners. But in view of the fact that the Warrant of Confirmation had, since it was issued in 1823, been endorsed with the signatures of the Masters, and so had a special interest for the Lodge, they were allowed to keep it, and both documents are now in the custody of the Lodge at Great Yarmouth, although the Warrant of Confirmation is, of course, technically cancelled.

Lodge of Harmony, Faversham, Kent, No. 133. is another Lodge that to-day possesses two Warrants, but the circumstances are different. This was originally an Antient Lodge, warranted in 1763 as No. 114. (Lane, 1895, p. 106.) This Warrant was never returned, but the Lodge in the next year applied to the Moderns for a Warrant and they were issued one with the number 319. under which they are working to-day. The Lodge will be found at p. 136 of Lane. But the Minutes are in the same book, and without break, the same names appear, and the original J.W. is the first Master under the Modern Warrant. The Antients seem to have completely lost sight of their Lodge. (*Vide* an article in *The Freemason* of 3 January, 1891, by Bro. Speth.) At the Union the Lodge took rank as a Modern Lodge, with a consequent loss of seniority.

LIONEL VIBERT.

OBITUARY.



It is with much regret that we have to record the death of the following Brethren:—

Barten Herbert Beaumont Allen, of Cape Province, in 1928. Our Brother was a member of Lodge Anchor of Hope No. 1093. and a Life Member of our Correspondence Circle which he joined in June, 1922.

Edward Armitage, M.A., of Farnham, Surrey, on 12th March, 1929. Bro. Armitage had attained the rank of Past Grand Deacon in the Craft and Past Grand Sojourner in the R.A. He was Treasurer and Past Master of the Lodge which he joined in October, 1898. He was elected to membership of the Correspondence Circle in October, 1888.

James Owen Baildon, of Rockhampton, Queensland, on 31st December, 1928. Our Brother held the rank of P.G.Stew., and was P.M. of Lodge No. 35. He became a member of our Correspondence Circle in November, 1900.

Henry Barrow, F.R.S., of Westcliff-on-Sea, on 23rd March, 1929, in his 81st year. Bro. Barrow had attained the rank of Past Grand Standard Bearer in the Craft and Past Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies in the R.A. He had been a member of our Correspondence Circle since October, 1909.

William Brooking, of Northlew, Devon., in February, 1929. Our Brother was a member of Franklin Lodge No. 2486, and was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in October, 1895.

Thomas Burfield, M.A., M.D., B.C., of Heathfield, Sussex, on 15th March, 1929. Bro. Burfield was P.M. of Tilsmore Lodge No. 4499, and a member of Hartington Chapter No. 916. He joined our Correspondence Circle in 1925.

Lionel Cottingham Burrell, M.A., M.B., B.C., of Peterborough, suddenly on 24th February, 1929. Our Brother had been appointed to L.R., and was P.M. of Royal Kew Lodge No. 3012. He became a member of our Correspondence Circle in January, 1908.

Guy Marshall Campbell, of London, S.E., on 2nd February, 1929. Bro. Campbell held the rank of Past Grand Standard Bearer in the Craft and Past Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies in R.A. He was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in October, 1915.

Harold Arthur Caslon, of London, N., on 9th February, 1929. He had attained the rank of Past Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies in the Craft and Past Grand Standard Bearer in R.A. Bro. Caslon was a Life Member of our Correspondence Circle which he joined in June, 1906.

Frederick George Cockey, of Surbiton, on 18th November, 1928. Our Brother was W.M. of the Evening Star Lodge No. 1719. He joined our Correspondence Circle in 1928.

Dr. **Richard Watson Councill**, of London, S.E., in 1929. He was a member of St. Barnabas Lodge No. 3771 and of Kennington Chapter No. 1381. Bro. Councill became a member of our Correspondence Circle in October, 1920.

Andrew Edward Dobson, of Queenstown, Tasmania, on 29th March, 1929. Bro. Dobson was P.M. of Lodge No. 25 (T.C.), and a member of Chapter No. 179 (S.C.). He was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in October, 1911.

Charles James Drummond, M.B.E., J.P., of London, S.E., on 10th February, 1929. Our Brother had attained the rank of Past Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies in the Craft and R.A., and had been a member of our Correspondence Circle since January, 1899.

David Lythall Hewitt, J.P., of Chester, on 19th December, 1928, in his 72nd year. Bro. Hewitt was Past Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies in the Craft and Past Grand Standard Bearer in R.A. He joined our Correspondence Circle in March, 1905.

Charles James Higgs, of Hove, on 14th December, 1928. Our Brother held the office of Dep.Dis.G.M. and P.Dis.G.J. for Madras, and held the rank of Past Grand Deacon. He was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in October, 1893.

Joseph Walter Hobbs, of London, S.W., on 25th February, 1929. Bro. Hobbs was honoured with appointment in Grand Lodge as Past Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies and Past Grand Standard Bearer in R.A. He joined our Correspondence Circle in March, 1907, and was S.D. of the Lodge of which he became a member in November, 1926.

J. F. Glenfield Martin, M.D., of Littleport, Cambs., in February, 1929. Our Brother had attained the rank of P.Pr.G.O., and became a member of our Correspondence Circle in March, 1919.

Henry A. Matheson, L.D.S., of London, S.W., on 3rd December, 1928. Bro. Matheson was a P.M. of Knightsbridge Lodge No. 2978, and was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in November, 1920.

George Thomas Mawson, C.E., F.R.S.A., of Bombay, on 9th October, 1928. Our Brother was a member of Lodge Orion in the West and of the Chapter attached thereto. He was a Life Member of our Correspondence Circle which he joined in May, 1923.

H. J. Osborne, of Ryde, I.W., in December, 1928. Bro. Osborne held the rank of P.Pr.G.D. and P.Pr.G.Sc.N. He had been a member of our Correspondence Circle since October, 1907.

Thomas Ryan, of Melbourne, in 1928. He was a Life Member of our Correspondence Circle which he joined in March, 1919.

Thomas Edward Scott, of London, E., on 6th December, 1928. Our Brother had attained the rank of Past Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies in the Craft and Past Grand Standard Bearer in R.A. He was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in May, 1926.

William George Simpson, of Belfast, on 31st January, 1929. Our Brother held the rank of P.Pr.G.I.G., and P.D.G.C.S.V., Armagh. He joined our Correspondence Circle in May, 1927.

Joseph Collett Smith, of London, W., on 18th March, 1929. Bro. Smith held the rank of P.Pr.G.D., Kent, and P.Pr.G.Reg., Middlesex. He had been a member of our Correspondence Circle since May, 1898.

John Swannack, of Retford, Notts., on 30th January, 1929. Our Brother was a P.M. of Vernon Lodge No. 1802. He was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in March, 1926.

George Sutherland, of London, S.W., on 21st January, 1929. Bro. Sutherland had been appointed to L.R., was P.M. of Eastes Lodge No. 1965 and P.Z. of Sir Edward Clarke Chapter No. 3601. He joined our Correspondence Circle in March, 1913.

Charles E. Turnbull, of Surbiton, on 1st December, 1928. Our Brother held L.R., and was P.M. of Oak Lodge No. 190. He had been a member of our Correspondence Circle since May, 1907.

Arthur Christopher Walter, of Walton-on-Thames, on 2nd November, 1928. Bro. Walter was a P.M. of Molesey Lodge No. 2473, and P.Sc. of Chertsey Abbey Chapter No. 2120. He was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in January, 1910.

Frederick William Arthur John Wienand, of Bloemfontein, on 17th March, 1929. Our Brother was a member of Rising Star Lodge No. 1022. He joined our Correspondence Circle in January, 1927.

Captain **Edmund Wildy**, R.N.V.R., O.B.E., of London, N.W., on 29th January, 1929. Bro. Wildy had attained the rank of Past Deputy Grand Sword Bearer in the Craft and Past Grand Sword Bearer in R.A. He had been a member of our Correspondence Circle since January, 1909.

Quatuor Coronati Lodge, No. 2076, London.

PUBLICATIONS.

ARS QUATUOR CORONATORUM.

COMPLETE SETS OF THE *TRANSACTIONS*.—Very few complete Sets of *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, Vols. i. to xli., now remain unsold. Prices may be obtained on application to the Secretary. Each volume will be accompanied as far as possible, with the St. John's Card of the corresponding year.

ODD VOLUMES.—Such copies of Volumes as remain over after completing sets, are on sale to members.

MASONIC REPRINTS.

QUATUOR CORONATORUM ANTIGRAPHA.

COMPLETE SETS OF *MASONIC REPRINTS*.—A few complete Sets of *Quatuor Coronatorum Antigraha*, Vols. i. to x., consisting mainly of exquisite facsimiles, can be supplied. Prices may be obtained on application to the Secretary.

ODD VOLUMES.—Vols. vi., vii., ix., and x. are on sale to members, price 30/- per volume.

FACSIMILES OF THE OLD CHARGES.—Four Rolls, viz., Grand Lodge Nos. 1 and 2 MS., Scarborough MS., and the Buchanan MS. Lithographed on vegetable vellum, in the original Roll form. Price, One Guinea each.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS.

	£	s.	d.
The Masonic Genius of Robert Burns, by <i>Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson</i> , Drawing-room edition, extra illustrations		5	0
Facsimile of the Regius MS., circa 1390	1	1	0
Caementaria Hibernica, by <i>Dr. W. J. Chetwode Crawley</i> , Fasciculus I., Fasciculus II., and Fasciculus III. One or two complete sets only for sale. Prices may be obtained on application to the Secretary.			
Caementaria Hibernica, Fasciculus III., a few copies available	1	1	0
The Orientation of Temples, by <i>Bro. W. Simpson</i> , uniform in size to bind with the <i>Transactions</i>	2	6	
British Masonic Medals, with twelve plates of illustrations	1	1	0

BINDING.

Members returning their parts of the *Transactions*, to the Secretary, can have them bound in dark blue Canvas, lettered gold, for 6/- per volume. Cases can be supplied at 3/- per volume, date or number of volume should be specified.

MEMBERSHIP MEDAL.

Brethren of the Correspondence Circle are entitled to wear a membership Medal, to be procured of the Secretary only. In Silver Gilt with bar, pin and ribbon, as a breast jewel. 10/6 each.

Quatuor Coronati Lodge,

NO. 2076, LONDON.



SECRETARY:

LIONEL VIBERT, P.A.G.D.C.

OFFICE, LIBRARY AND READING ROOM:

27, GREAT QUEEN STREET, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.2.

42



→: Ars :←

Quatuor Coronatorum

BEING THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE
QUATUOR CORONATI LODGE NO. 2076, LONDON.



EDITED FOR THE COMMITTEE BY W. J. SONGHURST, P.G.D.,
AND LIONEL VIBERT, P.A.G.D.C.

VOLUME XLII. PART 2.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Proceedings, 3rd May, 1929	137	Proceedings, 24th June, 1929	186
Exhibits	138	Exhibits	187
Some Notes on the "Freemasons' Magazine or General and Complete Library"	140	The Transition. Some Reflections on Early Grand Lodge History	188
Summer Outing, 1929 Leeds	164	Notes and Queries	251
		Obituary	255

W J PARRETT, LTD., PRINTERS, MARGATE.
1930

THE QUATUOR CORONATI LODGE No. 2076, LONDON,

was warranted on the 28th November, 1884, in order

- 1.—To provide a centre and bond of union for Masonic Students.
- 2.—To attract intelligent Masons to its meetings, in order to imbue them with a love for Masonic research.
- 3.—To submit the discoveries or conclusions of students to the judgment and criticism of their fellows by means of papers read in Lodge.
- 4.—To submit these communications and the discussions arising therefrom to the general body of the Craft by publishing, at proper intervals, the Transactions of the Lodge in their entirety.
- 5.—To tabulate concisely, in the printed Transactions of the Lodge, the progress of the Craft throughout the World.
- 6.—To make the English-speaking Craft acquainted with the progress of Masonic study abroad, by translations (in whole or part) of foreign works.
- 7.—To reprint scarce and valuable works on Freemasonry, and to publish Manuscripts, &c.
- 8.—To form a Masonic Library and Museum.
- 9.—To acquire permanent London premises, and open a reading-room for the members.

The membership is limited to forty, in order to prevent the Lodge from becoming unwieldy.

No members are admitted without a high literary, artistic, or scientific qualification.

The annual subscription is one guinea, and the fees for initiation and joining are twenty guineas and five guineas respectively.

The funds are wholly devoted to Lodge and literary purposes, and no portion is spent in refreshment. The members usually dine together after the meetings, but at their own individual cost. Visitors, who are cordially welcome, enjoy the option of partaking—on the same terms—of a meal at the common table.

The stated meetings are the first Friday in January, March, May, and October, St. John's Day (in Harvest), and the 8th November (Feast of the Quatuor Coronati).

At every meeting an original paper is read, which is followed by a discussion.

The *Transactions* of the Lodge, *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, are published towards the end of April, July, and December in each year. They contain a summary of the business of the Lodge, the full text of the papers read in Lodge together with the discussions, many essays communicated by the brethren but for which no time can be found at the meetings, biographies, historical notes, reviews of Masonic publications, notes and queries, obituary, and other matter. They are profusely illustrated and handsomely printed.

The Antiquarian Reprints of the Lodge, *Quatuor Coronatorum Antigraha*, appear at undefined intervals, and consist of facsimiles of documents of Masonic interest with commentaries or introductions by brothers well informed on the subjects treated of.

The Library has now been arranged at No. 27, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, where Members of both Circles may consult the books on application to the Secretary.

To the Lodge is attached an outer or

CORRESPONDENCE CIRCLE.

This was inaugurated in January, 1887, and now numbers about 3500 members, comprising many of the most distinguished brethren of the Craft, such as Masonic Students and Writers, Grand Masters, Grand Secretaries, and nearly 300 Grand Lodges, Supreme Councils, Private Lodges, Libraries and other corporate bodies.

The members of our Correspondence Circle are placed on the following footing:—

1.—The summonses convoking the meeting are posted to them regularly. They are entitled to attend all the meetings of the Lodge whenever convenient to themselves, but, unlike the members of the Inner Circle, their attendance is not even morally obligatory. When present they are entitled to take part in the discussions on the papers read before the Lodge, and to introduce their personal friends. They are not visitors at our Lodge meetings, but rather associates of the Lodge.

2.—The printed *Transactions* of the Lodge are posted to them as issued.

3.—They are, equally with the full members, entitled to subscribe for the other publications of the Lodge, such as those mentioned under No. 7 above.

4.—Papers from Correspondence Members are gratefully accepted, and as far as possible, recorded in the *Transactions*.

5.—They are accorded free admittance to our Library and Reading Rooms.

A Candidate for Membership in the Correspondence Circle is subject to no literary, artistic, or scientific qualification. His election takes place at the Lodge-meeting following the receipt of his application.

Brethren elected to the Correspondence Circle pay a joining fee of twenty-one shillings, which includes the subscription to the following 30th November.

The annual subscription is only half-a-guinea (10s. 6d.), and is renewable each December for the following year. Brethren joining us late in the year suffer no disadvantage, as they receive all the *Transactions* previously issued in the same year.

It will thus be seen that for only half the annual subscription, the members of the Correspondence Circle enjoy all the advantages of the full members, except the right of voting in Lodge matters and holding office.

Members of both Circles are requested to favour the Secretary with communications to be read in Lodge and subsequently printed. Members of foreign jurisdictions will, we trust, keep us posted from time to time in the current Masonic history of their districts. Foreign members can render still further assistance by furnishing us at intervals with the names of new Masonic Works published abroad, together with any printed reviews of such publications.

Members should also bear in mind that every additional member increases our power of doing good by publishing matter of interest to them. Those, therefore, who have already experienced the advantage of association with us, are urged to advocate our cause to their personal friends, and to induce them to join us. Were each member annually to send us one new member, we should soon be in a position to offer them many more advantages than we already provide. Those who can help us in no other way, can do so in this.

Every Master Mason in good standing throughout the Universe, and all Lodges, Chapters, and Masonic Libraries or other corporate bodies are eligible as Members of the Correspondence Circle.

FRIDAY, 3rd MAY, 1929



THE Lodge met at Freemasons' Hall at 5 p.m. Present:—Bros. Rev. H. Poole, P.Pr.G.Ch., Westmorland & Cumberland, W.M.; George Norman, P.G.D., I.P.M.; H. C. de Lafontaine, P.G.D., S.W.; W. J. Williams, J.D., as J.W.; Lionel Vibert, P.A.G.D.C., P.M., Secretary; Gordon P. G. Hills, P.A.G.Sup.W., P.M., D.C.; Thos. M. Carter, P.Pr.G.St.B., Bristol, I.G.; Rev. W. W. Covey-Crump, P.M.; J. Heron Lepper, P.G.D., Ireland, P.M.; and W. J. Songhurst, P.G.D.

Also the following members of the Correspondence Circle:—Bros. Robt. Colsell, P.A.G.D.C., Arthur Heiron, Walter Dewes, J. M. Y. Trotter, J. C. Browne, N. S. H. Sitwell, W. St. A. St. John, W. T. Dillon, J. F. H. Gilbard, L. G. Wearing, E. Eyles, J. I. Moar, Geo. Elkington, P.A.G.Sup.Works, A. Saywell, A. H. Crouch, W. Young Hucks, F. K. Jewson, H. L. Attwater, Jas. Wallis, O. R. Daly, F. W. Golby, P.A.G.D.C., W. R. Makins, G. H. Kitchenner, E. A. Uttley, P.G.D., H. Johnson, G. Adams, A. Trevor Houghton, J. W. V. Mason, R. Hepburn, F. W. Le Tall, Herbert White, A. E. Jackson, G. W. South, Jas. S. Charters, E. W. Marson, Major Cecil Adams, P.Dep.G.Swd.B., W. T. J. Gun, J. F. Halls-Dally, Lewis Edwards, S. C. Keville, G. K. Barnes, R. H. Clerke, W. Brinkworth, R. Wheatley, and J. H. Clark.

Also the following Visitors:—Bros. G. S. Clegg, S.D., Panmure Lodge No. 720; G. A. Wratten, Temple Lodge No. 558; E. C. Harris, P.M., Hiram Lodge No. 2416; G. T. Allix, Bee Hive Lodge No. 2809; and Charles F. Glenny, P.G.Stew., P.M., Old King's Arms Lodge No. 28.

Letters of apology for non-attendance were reported from Bros. J. T. Thorp, P.G.D., P.M.; F. J. W. Crowe, P.A.G.D.C., P.M.; Cecil Powell, P.G.D., P.M.; John Stokes, P.G.D., Pr.A.G.M., West Yorks., P.M.; R. H. Baxter, P.A.G.D.C., P.M.; Gilbert W. Daynes, S.D.; and Sir Alfred Robbins, P.G.W., Pres.B.G.P., P.M.

The WORSHIPFUL MASTER read the following

IN MEMORIAM.

EDWARD ARMITAGE, M.A.

Bro. Edward Armitage was born in 1859 near Leeds, and went up to Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took up Natural Science, Anatomy and Physiology. But he was much handicapped in his early days by indifferent health. After taking his degree he travelled very widely, and on his return to England he took up research work in the Reading Room of the British Museum. He was a Director of the Farnley Iron Company, and had several other industrial interests.

He was initiated in the Isaac Newton Lodge at Cambridge in 1882, and three years later he was in the Chair of a Lodge at Kirkby Lonsdale. He joined the Correspondence Circle of our Lodge in October, 1888, very soon after its first formation, and he was elected to full membership in October, 1898. He became our Treasurer in 1922 and continued to hold the office till his death. With regard to his activities in other degrees a full list, as it then stood, forms part of the Toast of his health proposed by the late Bro. Edmund Dring when he was installed in the Chair of this Lodge in November, 1913. His most prominent association in Masonry was in connection with the Ancient and Accepted Rite, which he joined at Cambridge in 1882. He received the 33° in 1900 and in 1912 was Grand Marshal of the Supreme Council, being promoted to Lieutenant Grand Commander, which is the second Office in the Council, in 1924.

To our *Transactions* he contributed an important paper on Robert Samber in vol. xi., and in vol. xvii. his review of Craven's *Life and Writings of Dr. Robert Fludd* was more than a mere review, as it was itself a critical account of Fludd, the *Fama*, and other connected questions of the period. His Inaugural Address as W.M. was a masterly review of the work of the Lodge up to the time of his being put into the Chair.

Of late years his many other activities did not give him much leisure to write for our *Transactions*, but I may refer to one contribution, in vol. xxxv., to the discussion on Bro. W. J. Williams' paper on the *Nomenclature of Lodges*, when he gave the Lodge some interesting notes on the folk-lore of names and superstitions connected with them.

He died on 12th March, 1929, and a wreath was sent to the funeral on behalf of the Lodge.

Bro. William John Songhurst was unanimously elected Treasurer of the Lodge in the place of Bro. Ed. Armitage, and was invested with his collar by the Worshipful Master.

The Congratulations of the Lodge were offered to the following Members of the Lodge and Correspondence Circle, who had been honoured with appointments and promotions at the recent Festival of Grand Lodge:—Bros. Sir Kynaston Studd, Junior Grand Warden; A. J. Cross and F. R. Eaton, Junior Grand Deacons; C. H. Wilson, G. Norman, and E. G. Dru Drury, Past Junior Grand Deacons; Rev. W. W. Covey-Crump, Assistant Grand Chaplain; D. Campbell Lee, Assistant Grand Registrar; T. H. Thorpe, Past Assistant Grand Superintendent of Works; E. S. Beal, Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies; S. A. Knaggs, J. M. Maynard, E. B. Creasy, T. H. Andrew, C. Butler, Robert May, and John B. Wilson, Past Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies; Col. L. P. More, Past Deputy Grand Sword Bearer; Wallace E. Heaton, Grand Standard Bearer; A. T. Burgess, H. Le Forestier, H. Oubridge, and G. P. Simpson, Past Grand Standard Bearers; R. J. Sadleir, Assistant Grand Standard Bearer; and J. H. R. Cordell and W. E. Lincoln, Past Assistant Grand Standard Bearers.

Three Lodges, one Library, and ninety-nine Brethren were elected to membership of the Correspondence Circle.

The SECRETARY drew attention to the following

EXHIBITS:—

By the SECRETARY.

The Freemasons' Magazine, June 1793—Decr. 1798. Eleven volumes, from the Lodge Library.

By Bro. JENKINSON, of Armagh.

The (Irish) Sentimental and Masonic Magazine. Vol. for Jan.—June 1795.

The Masonic Visitor; the Journal of Irish Freemasonry, vol. ii., No. 7, July 15, 1895 (now defunct).

By Bro. CECIL POWELL.

PAMPHLET: A Genuine Account of the Behaviour, and Dying Words of William Dodd, LL.D. . . . By the Reverend John Villette, Ordinary of Newgate. London mdcclxxvii. *Presented.*

(Bro. J. E. S. Tuckett kindly furnished a biographical Note on Dr. William Dodd, which was also available for perusal by the Brethren, and is printed later on in this vol.)

By Bro. J. STOKES.

P.M.'s JEWEL: of an ordinary type, silver gilt, but with the inscription:—

Presented to E. B. Warner, W.M. 325. By Himself for Services rendered 1868-69.

(No. 325 St. John's Lodge: meeting then as now at Salford, Lancs.)

By Bro. Capt. N. S. H. SITWELL, of Paris.

CERTIFICATE in French and English. MS., hand-drawn and painted in water-colour.

The most enlightened East.

Where reign Silence. Union and Peace.

To all enlightened, entered, passed and exalted super excellent royal Arch masons

Under the can: of heaven, We the High Priest and officers of the Chap of Royal Arch Super-excellent masons held under the number 24, of the registry of Paris.

Send Greeting.

Do hereby certify declare and attest that the bearer our faithful, true and well-beloved brother Charles Lewis Nicholas Levavasseur Précourt, owner of lands, having proved by due examination to be qualified in all the three degrees of apprentice, fellow-craft and Master, besides, Red-Cross, and after having passed the chair in the said lodge was by us initiated into that subl. degree of royal-arch super-excellent mason, he having with due honor and justice to the royal community justly supported the amasing trials of skill and valour attending his admission and as such we recomēd him to all true and faithful brothers of our community.

Given under our hands and the seal of our chap. of Paris on the first of the second month of the year of our Lord 5807.

The signatures follow, and include those of Hacquet, Thory, Latour Mauburg, Korff, Tatin, De Saint Eloy, and several other members of Hacquet's Supreme Council. The decorations include a dog, and a sword passed through a crown, and in spite of the wording, they suggest, not the English R.A. but some Ecossais degree. The seals have been removed.

CERTIFICATE, engraved, in Latin, that Frater Ludovic Gaudric has paid his fee and been admitted to the degree of Scotch Knight of St. Andrew, dated November 27, 1801. Seal attached.

CERTIFICATE MS. in French, hand-drawn: that Bro. Demignot ainé has been made a mason in the Lodge held on board the ship Aimable Victoire de Bordeaux. Captain Paul Oré, Vénérable, in Lat. 15 N. and Long. 53 W. of Paris. 2nd Novr. 1784. The design is an angel with trumpet, and two pillars standing on a tessellated floor with the S. & C., Level and Plumbrule. Numerous signatures, including those of members of Lodges in Martinique and Dominica, and officers of the King's regiment of infantry. The text recites that the candidate has undertaken to have himself affiliated to a regular Lodge within nine months.

A cordial vote of thanks was accorded to those Brethren who had kindly lent objects for exhibition.

Bro. GEORGE ELKINGTON read the following paper:—

SOME NOTES ON THE "FREEMASONS' MAGAZINE OR GENERAL AND COMPLETE LIBRARY."

A MASONIC PERIODICAL AT THE END OF THE EIGHTEENTH
CENTURY.

BY BRO. GEORGE ELKINGTON, P.A.G. Sup.W.



HE first monthly number appeared in June, 1793, and the Magazine continued in eleven half-yearly volumes until December, 1798.

Preston, among the Masonic occurrences of the year 1793, mentions this publication as a periodical Miscellany and says it continued until 1798 when the title was changed.

Vol. I.

In Part I. on the frontispiece and on first page of the letterpress is: "Printed and published by J. W. Bunney No. 7 Newcastle Street Strand—Entered at Stationers Hall"; but on the title page is: "Printed for the Proprietor and sold by Scratcherd and Whitaker Ave Maria Lane and all booksellers in Town and Country."

Vol. II.

The title page is like Vol. I., but on the Contents page is: "Printed for the Proprietor by T. Burton & Co. 28 Little Queen Street Holborn sold by Scratcherd and Whitaker Ave Maria Lane and may be had of all booksellers and newscarrers in Town and Country."

In January is mentioned "the derangement of the Affairs of the late Proprietor," and in April "The sanction of Grand Lodge was unanimously conferred on the proprietor at the last Quarterly Communication, to engrave the portraits in the Grand Hall." Preston puts this more generally, saying: "It was for some time honoured with the Sanction of the Grand Lodge."

Several of these portraits were later published. They were after paintings by William Peters, R.A. He was a Mason, and subsequently taking orders, was appointed Chaplain to the Academy.

Vol. III.

Has: "Printed for the Proprietor and sold by J. Parsons No. 21 Paternoster Row and all booksellers in Town and Country."

An address to the readers begins: "The Proprietor begs to return his sincere thanks," &c., &c., and then it relapses to the Editorial "We". The next three parts were printed and published by Scratcherd and Whitaker, but in the October part is a note: "This Magazine will in future be published for the Proprietor by J. Parsons No. 21 Paternoster Row but may be had of all booksellers in Town and Country as well as in Scotland, Ireland and America."

Vols. IV. and V.

Continued to be printed by Parsons.

Vol. VI.

The title is changed to "The Freemasons' Magazine and Cabinet of Universal Literature," and on the title page is: "Printed and published by G. Cawthorne British Library Strand and sold by Symonds Paternoster Row"; whilst a portrait has inscribed: "Published for S. Stephenson by J. Parsons"—as before.

Vol. VII.

The printers and publishers are as Vol. VI.

Vol. VIII. (January, 1797).

The title is again changed to "The Scientific Magazine and Freemasons' Repository," but the title page is unaltered from Vol. VII. There is an Editorial Note from the Proprietor to the Subscribers, giving an explanation of the change of title.

Vol. IX.

Continues as Vol. VIII.

Vols. X. and XI.

Appear as "The Scientific Magazine and Freemasons' Repository or General and Complete Library." Cawthorne continues as printer and publisher.

In the final part of Vol. XI.—December, 1798—among "Notes to Correspondents" it is stated: "The supplementary number, which will conclude the Volume shall appear on the 1st of February," and the further note: "This Magazine can then be had complete in eleven volumes."

The supplement duly appeared, with an index (the latter wanting in the copy in the Q.C. Library).

There does not appear to be any valedictory statement as to the cessation of the venture. It simply ceased to exist!

The Magazine itself gives no names as those of proprietors or editors, but in the Library of Grand Lodge is an original prospectus setting out the objects of the proposed Magazine. This is dated April 1793, and is accompanied by a covering letter of same date commencing "Worshipful Sir," introducing and describing the proposed issue, and concluding: "Your humble and affectionate Brothers Wm. Stewart and J. W. Bunney."

There is a further note, dated February 1st 1794, mentioning that from the assignees of J. W. Bunney and for a considerable sum of money, the work, of which seven numbers have been published, has been acquired by the present Proprietor.

This (in the G.L. copy at any rate) is not signed.

It appears, therefore, that Wm. Stewart and J. W. Bunney were the original Proprietors, the latter also being printer and publisher of Vol. I.

The note of February 1st, 1794, in the G.L. Library agrees with that in the Magazine as to the "derangement of the affairs of the late Proprietor," and it would seem that trouble met Bro. Bunney and his interest had to be disposed of. Now J. W. Bunney on 9th April, 1793, joined the Union Lodge of Freedom and Ease (No. 46 at present), meeting at the Coal Hole Tavern, Fountain Court, Strand. He was a printer by trade and thirty-six years of age when he joined.

The identity of Wm. Stewart is not quite certain. In another circular about the Magazine in G.L. Library "M.A." is appended to his name.

He may be the Wm. Stewart mentioned by our late Bro. Wonnacott in the record of Members of the Lodge of Antiquity as "Gentleman of Crooked Lane. A York Mason. An Atholl Mason remade E.A. F.C. 1767." "An Irish Mason before"; and in the records of the Lodge returned as "still a Member in 1768," there being no further mention of his name. The varied Masonic experience of this Bro. Stewart, his degree of M.A. and his description as a Gentleman (most brethren being designated in this record by their avocation) would indicate him as qualified as Editor as well as Proprietor.

It seems certain that Bro. S. Stephenson succeeded Bro. Bunney as proprietor. The clue is afforded by the reference, before quoted, to Grand Lodge permission to engrave the portraits in the Grand Hall.

In Minute Book No. 4 of the Hall Committee Grand Lodge, meeting Tuesday 11th March 1794, it is recorded: "A Memorial to Bro. S. Stephenson was presented to the Committee stating he was proprietor of the Freemasons Magazine and requesting permission to have engravings made from the Portraits of the Grand Masters and ornaments of the Hall for the embellishment of the said Magazine.

Whereupon, after due consideration, it was RESOLVED to recommend to the Grand Lodge to comply with the request of Bro. Stephenson provided that the Portraits are not removed from the Hall."

"S. Stephenson" was Simon Stephenson, "Letter founder," of Burton Street, Westminster, and Breems Buildings, Chancery Lane. In 1786 he was a founder of St. Margaret's Lodge, Westminster, which joined the Tyrian Lodge in 1792 and is now the Westminster and Keystone Lodge No. 10. He took an active part in the Tyrian Lodge, J.W. 1792 and presented a pair of Globes; S.W. 1793, R.W.M. 1795-7 and again in 1801-2. Evidently a zealous Mason connected with printing and one likely to help the progress of the Magazine.

It seems probable that William Preston, through his circle of friends in the Lodge of Antiquity and elsewhere, was much interested in the production and promotion of the Magazine. There are liberal extracts from his "Illustrations" and numerous references to him, which could scarcely have been made without his full knowledge and consent, and the considerable part in the work taken by his friend Stephen Jones (*vide* Vol. IV.) strengthens the probability.

Coming now to the Magazine itself, apart from the details of its publication, it may be noted that this was not the first adventure of its kind, as a very similar Magazine came out in Dublin in July, 1792, and continued for three years.

Early in the pages of our Magazine (Vol. II., p. 113) is an article on the origin of Literary Journals which reveals somewhat of the mind of its founders.

The Author therein cites France as the country of origin and ascribes the invention to Denis de Salo, who, on May 30th, 1663, published the first number of his *Journal des Sçavans*. Not feeling certain as to its reception, he published it in the name of the Sieur de Hedonville, who was his footman. The venture, however, proved successful and was soon imitated throughout Europe. The Author then mentions English works such as *Philosophical Transactions* (this appeared in 1665 and was the semi-official Journal of the Royal Society), the *Memoirs of Literature* (about 1700) continued under the title of *The Present State of the Republic of Letters*.

Coming to his own times he says: "Of our modern Journals it becomes me to speak with caution. It is not treading on ashes still glowing with latent fire, as Horace expresses it, but it is rushing through consuming flames. Let it be sufficient that from their pages we acquire a rich fund of critical

observations; and by them are taught something of the delicacy of taste, and something of the ardour of genius."

If such were the opinions endorsed by the Editor or Producer of the *Freemasons' Magazine*, he was certainly aware of where to find a "warm corner" or where to look for trouble, and apparently on several occasions found the knowledge useful.

In No. 1 the Editor, with the proper professional "We", commences with an address to the Masonic Body and the Public in general, setting out the objects and aims of the publication. He aims high and sketches an attractive programme. "One part of our Magazine is to be devoted to topics of general interest, including Essays tending to the promotion of good morals, and original and pleasing miscellaneous subjects, useful or entertaining, the other part is to be devoted to Masonic objects, for which the Magazine is principally undertaken, affording an honourable medium through which fraternal communications and correspondence may be conveyed and disseminated."

This two-fold object, fairly well adhered to, renders it easier to deal with the Masonic items with which we are chiefly interested, although a few references to the "General" portion have been added so as to afford some idea of its scope.

Before passing on to any detailed examination of the work, one outstanding feature must be emphasized and eulogized, and that is the intense patriotism, sustained loyalty, and devotion to their King and Country, of our Brethren of that time.

During the whole period 1793-1798, England was engaged in a life and death struggle with France, and the Magazine records the progress and excesses of the Revolution, the rapidly rising power of Napoleon, his victories on the Continent, the continual fear of his threatened invasion of this country, and—on the other side—the British victories by sea and in the East. These events are duly set out, sometimes within two or three weeks of their occurrence, and with as much detail and apparent truthfulness as we have become accustomed to in our present Journals.

An enterprising feature was the engraved charts and plans of the principal sea fights.

Not many years ago such records of warfare and political upheavals might have been regarded as musty history, but from our recent experiences in the Great War, these regain vitality and almost read like contemporary happenings.

This is the more so as much of the earlier British fighting was in the Low Countries and on the same ground and involving several of the same places, as are now familiar to us with their proud but poignant associations. The menace and terrorism of the French Revolution have their parallel in similar events in Soviet Russia, whilst the thoroughgoing detestation of Buonaparte, "the Corsican upstart," can be faintly realized by what we thought, and many still think, of the tinselled megalomaniac who has found *his* St. Helena in the ignoble safety of Doorn.

The devotion of the Brethren to the Throne and Royal Family is dwelt upon throughout, sometimes in terms of what we should now consider fulsome adulation, and is pathetically idealized in the references to certain of the Royal Dukes, sons of George III., and especially of the Prince of Wales when Grand Master.

It is difficult to recognize in his portrait as drawn and described, the generally accounted sensual and selfish Ruler of a few years later. There are, however, a few anecdotes and stories disclosing some of his weaknesses, and some at least of the prominent Brethren evidently painted their fancy portrait from policy and knew a good deal more than it was expedient to say.

Our Brethren, moreover, did not confine themselves to fervent addresses and patriotic resolutions, but formed, or joined up to, some of the numerous bodies of volunteers and contributed to equip them.

There are numerous Essays of varying merit and criticisms of contemporary writers and actors, fairly well reasoned and acute, but most of the articles on Scientific subjects are, naturally, quite out of date. Another feature is the quantity—yards of it—of 'wishy washy' poetry.

Presumably it met the taste of the day, especially of the Ladies, for whom the Magazine was claimed to cater, and it is not, perhaps, for us to judge too hastily seeing the present vogue for 'best sellers,' jazz and crossword puzzles.

It must be borne in mind that the last decade of the Eighteenth Century was a time of rapid change and progress. The industrial movement from the country to the towns was active, aided by Telford's roads and Palmer's Stage Coaches and fostered by many mechanical inventions.

The repercussion of French revolutionary ideas influenced men's thoughts. Circulating libraries were founded, Lackington and others did good work as second hand and remainder booksellers in spreading reading matter, and periodical magazines were multiplying.

This Magazine was quite "in the movement."

The position and history of Masonry in the last decade of the eighteenth century are fairly well known, and the period does not present the fascinating opportunities for research to be found in the earlier period of the resuscitated Craft, whilst the interesting events leading up to the amalgamation of the rival Grand Lodges and the emergence of Modern British Masonry, were still in the future, although the subject of occasional discussion.

The modest object of these notes, therefore, is to extract some of the more personal and intimate matters wherein our Brethren of about 130 years ago differed from ourselves, or wherein their ideas and practices are still current.

It appeared preferable to let the Magazine tell its own tale in sequence, rather than to collect or select Masonic references according to their present relative interest and importance.

Vol. I. June, 1793.

Number 1 opens with a "Beautiful Emblematical Frontispiece." This "Represents Justice, Fortitude and Prudence supporting a medallion of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, Grand Master of Masons in England, with the different Insignia of Masonry distributed around the Masonic Pyramid."

The Prince of Wales' feathered coronet, floating about in mid-air, has a droll effect. The "Elegant dedicatory plate" is thus described:—

"To the Rt. Worshipful and Rt. Honourable Lord Rawdon. The Rest of the Officers composing the Grand Lodge of England. The Freemasons' Magazine is most humbly inscribed."

The engravings are after "Mather Brown, Historical Painter to T.R.H. the Duke and Duchess of York." Mather Brown was an American, a pupil of Benjamin West, R.A. He was but a poor painter.

An address to the King is printed: "Given unanimously in Grand Lodge at Freemasons Hall this 6th day of February 1793," signed Rawdon A.G.M., Peter Parker D.G.M., countersigned William White G.S.

On page 68 is the first item of "Masonic Intelligence," namely, the Dedication of the Shakespere Lodge No. 516 at Stratford-on-Avon, Tuesday, June 4th, 1793.

"The Grand procession" was "most respectably attended by the different Lodges." "The Ladies in particular seeming to vie with each other as to who should best express their respect on the occasion."

"The thanks of the County is (*sic*) justly due to Mr. James Timmins, the Deputy Provincial Grand Master, for the very able and elegant manner in which he delivered the lectures."

On the following day a "Free Ball" was given. "Every Brother appeared in his apron and the Grand Provincial Officers and the Masters and Wardens of the different Lodges wore their sashes and jewels."

One Brother wore "a set of buttons with Masonic Emblems elegantly set which cost upwards of ten pounds and many wore aprons worth from five to ten pounds each."

A song of four verses was composed and sung by Mr. James Bisset, Steward of the St. Albans Lodge, Birmingham.

A few lines may be quoted:—

"Great honours have been paid before
But Shakespere's name to blazon
Or give him fame—None can do more
Than say He was a Mason."

"The Child of Fancy ev'n in Youth
In knowledge he surpassed her
None ever could with him compare
But Hiram our Grand Master."

On page 95 is an engraving of a very 'Motherly' Charity accompanied by an extract from Preston's Illustrations, headed "Charity the distinguishing Characteristic of Masons." This is the first mention of his name in the Magazine. The description of the plate is verbatim from Preston.

There is a record of the institution of the Royal Cumberland School (1788) under the patronage of Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Cumberland. "The plan was submitted to H.R.H. by Chevalier Bartholomew Ruspini."

The qualifications for Governors and Candidates are not unlike the present, but it reads rather oddly that children were debarred who had *not* had the small-pox.

Preston, however, has the words "or cowpox" in his later editions, and in Vol. XI. of the Magazine, under the heading of "Scientific Intelligence," is a note of the advocacy of Inoculation by Drs. Pearson and Jenner.

On August 1st, 1793, "The Patrons Rulers Council and Companions of the Ancient and Venerable Order of Harodim held their annual feast at the Grove House, Camberwell, W. Meyrick Esqr. M.E.C.H. presiding." This is fully described by Preston, but the description adds: "It was found to be the birthday of Bro. William Preston who was present, and he was very fraternally congratulated."

In August also was held at Chelmsford the Provincial Grand Lodge of Essex—being on the birthday of the Prince of Wales, Grand Master. Thomas Dunckerley Esq., Rt. Worshipful Provl. G.M., presided.

Inter alia a Bro. Cook was appointed Grand Architect.

The procession to Church is amply described. In this Bro. Cook, Deputy Grand Master, Master of the Lodge of Goodfellowship No. 462 Chelmsford, is mentioned as carrying "the first great wax light in an elegant inlaid candlestick near three feet high." The Master of the Lodge of Goodwill No. 401 Braintree, carried the second great light in "a more elegant candlestick than the former," whilst the Master of the Lodge of Friendship No. 227 Ilford carried "the third and last great light in a most magnificent superb candlestick curiously inlaid with different Masonic hieroglyphics." Then followed the Master of the Colchester Lodge No. 47, with the Book of Constitutions, and the Master of the Well Disposed Lodge No. 28, Waltham Abbey, with the Bible "magnificently bound and gilt on a rich crimson velvet cushion."

Next the Royal Arch Masons with sashes and medals, two and two, followed by "the Grand Register (*sic*) of the Order of Masonic Knights Templar, in uniform, and the Companions of that sublime Order with black silk sashes ornamented with a silver star of five points, a cross of gold and an appendage of white satin."

The members of the Grand Lodge came last. From Divine Service the procession returned to the Saracen's Head and dined.

After dinner the Lodge of Good Fellowship, which for more than three years had been acting under dispensation from his late Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland, was constituted in due form.

The report goes on thus:—"At an early hour the Provl. G.M. took leave of the Brethren, who accompanied him to the 'Black Boy' preceded by the band of music, and after giving him three hearty and heartfelt cheers, parted with this amiable veteran, who has been justly termed the Great Luminary of Masonry."

This description is quoted rather fully, as it is typical of many later recorded functions.

In the October number is a sketch of the life of Thomas Dunckerley by Bro. White, Provincial J.G.W., of Essex.

This recites the full story of Dunckerley's parentage and his subsequent recognition in high quarters.

There follows an interesting memoir of James Heseltine, Grand Treasurer and P.S.G.W. He was initiated, by dispensation from the Grand Master, in his nineteenth year, in June, 1764. He was a Grand Steward 1767, Grand Secretary 1769—resigning 1784—Master of the Lodge of Antiquity No. 1 and the Somerset House Lodge No. 2, also serving all the Offices in the degree of Royal Arch Masonry.

The December number contains an address delivered at the Stewards Lodge held at the Horn Tavern, Fleet Street, November 1773, by Thomas Edmonds, G.W., advocating the establishment of Freemasons' Hall. This is frankly "padding," but in the light of recent procedure anent the New Masonic Hall, one paragraph reads quaintly: "That every brother skilful in drawing or in contriving a plan for such a building would be so kind as to deliver his proposals to the G.M. to be examined and considered." A very primitive competition!

In this same number, in "Comments on Sterne" by John Ferriar M.D., it is mentioned that Sterne inserted in *Tristram Shandy* a black page. The writer goes on to say: "I cannot consider it an imitation, for it must appear by this time that Sterne possessed no great store of curious learning, and the black page of earlier date is to be found in Dr. Fludd's 'Utriusque Cosmi Historia.'" A footnote adds: "And is emblematic of the Chaos."

Finally this very full number gives a good sketch of the life of Chevalier Ruspini.

This states he was born at Bergamo (Italy) about 1730, studied and became a dentist, came to England about 1750, practised with success, and moved to London 1760.

The Pope, without solicitation, made him a Knight of the Golden Spur with the title of Chevalier.

Founder of the Royal Cumberland Freemasons' School, Grand Steward 1772, Master of the Royal Lodge 1778. Served all the principal Offices in Royal Arch Masonry, and established the Lodge of the Nine Muses.

The Prince of Wales as G.M. conferred upon him the rank of Grand Swordbearer, which, although normally changed annually, Ruspini was empowered to hold until such time as he was pleased to resign.

Vol. II.

Contains a very full description of the ceremony to be observed at Masonic funerals "according to ancient custom with the service used on these occasions."

This is almost verbatim as described by Preston and need not be repeated, although just a few extracts within the scope of these notes may be given.

"All the Brethren who walk in procession should observe as much as possible an uniformity in dress" with "decent mourning, white stockings, gloves and aprons" (footnote), "as this is the usual cloathing of Master Masons."

"Officers of visiting Lodges ornamented with white sashes and hat bands and the Officers of the convening Lodge, moreover, distinguished with white rods, the Brethren of this Lodge having flowers or herbs in their hands."

It may be worth mention that recently a Mr. William James Caie, a former Mayor of Bury St. Edmunds, who died February, 1927, by his Will desired a Masonic service at his funeral very much on the old lines, so that the custom has not passed into complete disuse in this country.

In this Volume is an extract from a circular letter from the Grand Master of Knights Templar in England signed "Your faithful Brother and Knight Companion Thomas Dunckerly G.M." advocating enrolment in Prince Edward's Royal Volunteers, which evidently led to some effective response, as one reply from Redruth mentions enrolment of two Knights Companion who were already volunteer Officers, and start of a subscription. Under the heading of "Masonic Intelligence" is an official communication recording at some length "the Grand Feast of the most Ancient and Honourable Society of Free and Accepted Masons under the Constitution of England"—held at Freemasons' Hall May 7th, 1794.

In consequence of the re-election of the Prince of Wales as G.M., the G.M. in the Chair (John Dent. S.G.W.) was installed in ample form and by authority declared the other Grand Officers.

The Grand Stewards having been thanked for "their elegant entertainment" presented to the G.M. for his approbation, the list of their successors.

The toast list is given and must have been a very long-winded affair, being as follows:—

The King and the Craft.
H.R.H. the Prince of Wales Grand Master.
Lord Moira (A.G.M.).
The Duke of York and the Army.
The Duke of Clarence and the Navy of Gt. Britain.
The Chairman (John Dent M.P. for Lancashire).
The Grand Wardens.
Sir Peter Parker, Deputy G.M.
The Grand Officers (announced from the Chair).
Peace, Harmony and Unanimity to Masons in general.
The Board of Stewards.
Prince Edward.
(Music and songs between each.)

Then follows a rather curious note:—

"The Lodge being closed Earl Pomfret took the Chair and many of the Brethren prolonged the pleasures of the evening by several excellent songs and contributions."

How long all this took is not stated, but when these Worthy Brethren indulged in their thoroughgoing programme, one is prepared to hear that "the dinner consisted of a profusion of every delicacy that could be procured: the dessert was of the most elegant kind—cherries, strawberries, &c. Ices and confectionary in an abundant variety." Singularly enough, nothing is said as to the liquid refreshment, and the recital ends with something like bathos.

"[Note]—that if the usual price of the tickets (10s. 6d.) had been continued, there would have been a much more numerous Company."

Vol. III.

The opening number (July, 1794) contains the well-known address to Prince Edward as G.M. of the Province of Lower Canada, advocating unity of the Grand Lodges and his reply.

In an account of the state of Freemasonry in Sunderland we read: "The exalted Order of the Harodim is attended to and practised by both Lodges and a very ancient and mysterious degree of Masonry. The Passage of the Bridge is here known and cultivated."

In the August number it is related that the Lodge at Stockton-on-Tees was originally consecrated February 2nd, 1725, by Dr. Desaguliers, at

the Swan and Rummer, Finch Lane, London, and in 1756 was transferred to Stockton as the Lodge of Philanthropy No. 19. At Staindrop, the Raby Lodge No. 372, Constitution granted by the Duke of Cumberland G.M., was solemnly consecrated by the Master, Past Masters, Wardens, and Brethren of the Restoration Lodge, Darlington: Brethren of other Lodges attended. "The Brethren moved in grand procession to Church, each Lodge distinct with their colours flying, with insigne jewels and a full band of music."

A little later is the Constitution of the Lodge of Apollo, Alcester—July 31st, 1794—when, after reciting the local Lodges taking part, we read that it all concluded with a free Ball to the Ladies, numerous attended, and "that it was not till Phoebus made his appearance that the Company thought of parting."

In September is a reference to Masonic tokens. "Some copper pieces newly struck from a die, superior to any of the Provincial coins at present in circulation, came into the hands of the Proprietor of this Magazine."

He goes on to say these were invented by a Brother James Sketchley, of Birmingham, to serve as pocket pieces, but from their novelty or excellence of workmanship have been received in change as halfpence. The reference is accompanied by an engraving.

Brother Sketchley was present as Provincial Grand Secretary at the Consecration of the Apollo Lodge. These tokens are well known to collectors. One, found in an automatic machine by a railway official, was recently brought to the G.L. Library.

Hereabouts are four verses by Robert Burns.

"Farewell to the Brethren of St. James' Lodge, Tarbolton."

In the October number is one of those references to George Prince of Wales which shed light on future events. Apropos of his proposed marriage to Caroline of Brunswick, it says: "Juvenile pursuits at that time suspended all further discourse about it."

Vol. IV.

January, 1795, opens with a portrait of William Preston by Drummond and a memoir, signed S.J., in which it is mentioned that Preston presented this portrait to the writer of the memoirs.

Preston's history is too well known to repeat, but one short extract from the memoirs is pleasing:—"Being invited to visit the Lodge of Antiquity, No. 1, then held at the Mitre Tavern, Fleet Street, the Brethren of that Lodge were pleased to admit him a member, and, what was very unusual, elected him Master at the same meeting."

This is confirmed by the Records of the Lodge by which it appears that Preston joined in June, 1774, and was R.W.M. for the second half of that year. He had visited the Lodge in 1772, and was no doubt very well known to many of the Brethren. S.J. also says, in the memoir, that his known intimacy with William Preston pointed him out to the Proprietor of the Magazine, who at sundry times asked him (S.J.) to get permission from Preston to engrave his portrait and publish some memoirs.

Both Stephen Jones and Preston were employed by William Strahan, and Andrew Strahan, his son, who succeeded to the business, continued to employ Preston in a confidential capacity. Stephen Jones, under the initials S.J., had several letters and essays in the earlier volumes, and in this Vol. IV., he produced a biographical notice of William Strahan which ends rather neatly: "The uninterrupted health and happiness which accompanied him for half a century in the Capital, prove honesty to be the best policy, temperance the greatest luxury, and the essential duties of life its most agreeable amusement." The portrait of William Strahan accompanying the notice states it was taken from a portrait in the possession of John Spottigwoode Esq. (*sic*).

William Strahan was for some time M.P. for Malmsbury, and had as his colleague Charles James Fox.

On page 17 "No. 1 of the Freemason" is printed as part of the Magazine. It was only a sub-title.

On page 113 is an amusing instance of the partiality of the time for the word "elegant." Describing the consecration of the Lodge of Unanimity No. 136 at Coltishall, Norfolk, it reads: "A rich crimson velvet cushion with elegant gold fringe and tassels," "An elegant and well adapted discourse was preached to them," and "On their return an elegant and well conducted dinner was provided."

One other example—from a Grand Warden's Address (in Vol. I.): "Oh let us sing together like morning stars, as Job elegantly expresses it."

In this Volume is described the Anniversary Meeting of Freemasons' School, held at the Hall. "By 4 o'clock scarcely a seat was to be had so popular is this charity."

The Earl of Moira presided, and after a very plentiful and elegant dinner, ladies who had tickets were admitted to the gallery to view the procession of the little female objects of the Charity, who passed three times round the room preceded by the Stewards—the Chevalier Ruspini, the Institutor, leading the two youngest—the band of the first regiment playing several pieces of music.

The Noble Chairman in the course of his speech mentioned "the great industry of the little innocents, the labour of whose hands had produced £158 during the past year," and, after money donations, stated "the Shakespeare Lodge had given 20 iron bedsteads, the Lodge of Rural Friendship 60 blankets towards the new School House then nearly completed." "After songs, about 9 o'clock Lord Moira quitted the Chair amidst reiterated applause." Then follows this rather strange concluding note:—

"The rude and unwarrantable behaviour of one of the Stewards towards the Proprietor of this Magazine a short time before the tables were covered, would justify a severe reprimand: feeling, however, the advantage this medium would give us over the person alluded to, we disdain to use it in any more particular manner, as we trust he has felt by this time the impropriety of his conduct."

This pleasing ceremony of the parade of the children round the Hall was the subject of the well known picture by Bro. Stothard, R.A., engraved by Bro. Bartolozzi, R.A.—which refers to the Anniversary in 1801, as the Prince of Wales is shown as present. A copy of this engraving is in the Quatuor Coronati collection.

The June number opens with the "History of Masonry from the Creation of the World to the present time, from the best Authorities," and in a footnote, "principally from the writings of our highly respectable and well skilled Brethren Northouck and Preston."

Vol. V. July, 1795.

In this Volume are published plans and elevations of the Girls' School—a plain and uninviting edifice—whilst later is a complaint that the professional description of the School is withheld.

In November, under the usual heading "Masonic Intelligence," we have: "One of those Brotherly Greetings which would do honour to the Craft in proportion to their frequency took place at Freemasons Tavern."

It was a "visit in due form" paid by the Jerusalem Lodge to the Foundation Lodge. "The rites of the Order were most ably performed by the two Lodges in unison. About 150 persons were present including other visiting Brethren. Brother William Preston was discovered among the Visitors and delivered a long and impressive discourse."

After that one is glad to read: "A very elegant supper (and well served, the largeness of the Company considered) concluded the evening's festivity."

Vol. VI.

In the May number is described an anniversary meeting of the Provincial Grand Lodge of Kent, held at Dartford under Bro. William Perfect, Provl. G.M., who arrived with about fifty of the Craft, followed by the Brethren from the Lodges at Deptford, Woolwich and Lewisham, who entered the town preceded by colours flying and an excellent band of music. A procession was formed, headed by the Provincial G.M., who, in honour of the Prince of Wales, wore in his hat three beautiful feathers with the motto of *Ich Dien* on an enamelled plate with the Arms of Kent. In addition to this uncommonly brilliant, numerous and respectable procession, much beauty and elegance was derived from the LADY MASONS who assembled in great numbers, dressed in white and purple, and, after joining the procession, were politely conducted into the Church by the Provl. Grand Master. After service an oration was delivered by the Provl. G.M., later the Company partook of an elegant dinner, and in the evening a Ball was given to the Ladies.

It seems worth recording that in a memoir (in Vol. V.) of this Bro. Dr. Perfect, after the usual laudatory passages, is a tribute to his skill and enlightened success in the care and cure of insanity; this, too, at a time when the horrors of Bedlam and similar places were actual and usual facts.

In this Volume is an engraving of the beautiful jewel of the Master of the Lodge of the Nine Muses, followed by one of the Treasurer's jewel.

Vol. VII.

In Vol. VII. is a representation of the P.M. jewel of the Lodge of Symbolic Masons, engraved by Leney after Cipriani, and precisely similar to the jewels of the Lodge of the Nine Muses.

This Volume contains: "The manner of constituting a Lodge according to ancient usage, with the ceremonies of consecration and installation." These are given with considerable detail and do not seem materially different from present forms.

In the July number is an entry that the Grand Lodge met at Brother Sutton's, Canonbury House, Islington, to celebrate the Deputy Grand Master's Feast. "A very numerous and respectable assemblage of Brethren."

After an excellent dinner provided by Bro. Sutton, under the inspection of the Stewards, Grand Lodge was opened in due form, and "the afternoon was spent in social and brotherly mirth, and rational conviviality, nor was Charity, that adamant pillar of Masonry, forgotten."

In the October number is an entry which seems to show that the Editor was caught napping. It purports to be a record of the Swan Lodge (locality not given) to which is ascribed, almost word for word, the remarkable entry in the Minute Book of the Lodge at the Maid's Head, Norwich, as set out in W. Bro. Daynes' paper on that Lodge. It seems strange that this misstatement was not exposed, as in one or two other cases erroneous statements were followed by Editorial correction or explanation.

Vol. VIII.

In the February number is described "The Royal Arch." "This is a very superior degree of what is termed Free-Masonry and consists of a greater number and variety of Officers." The description states there are 104 Chapters, and gives the names of some of the Royal Personages concerned, including H.R.H. the Duke of Clarence, Grand Patron, and the Dukes of Brunswick and Mecklenburgh-Strelitz. "Patrons in Germany." The latter may have some interest as to the connection of this degree with Continental working at that comparatively early period.

There is a note: "Prestonian Lectures."

"These Lectures still continue to be honoured with the support of many skilful and intelligent members, whose time and place of assembly we understand

to be 8 o'clock every Sunday evening at Mr. Fox's 'The Hercules Pillars' opposite Freemasons Hall." After commending these Lectures to "every zealous and curious Mason," and explaining the design of investigating and discussing the Masonic Lectures, it concludes by referring to Preston as "the worthy Author of the Illustrations of Masonry," and one of the principal directors, as a sufficient recommendation.

Vol. IX.

In the September number a Masonic funeral at West Malling, Kent, is fully recorded. An oration was delivered by Dr. Perfect, Provincial G.M., "impressive fraternal and so pathetic as to draw tears from many of the audience."

In the notices to correspondents prefacing the December number are some rather 'snappy' items.

"The next time Alexis attempts to write poetry it may not be improper for him to pay some small attention to rhyme and reason."

"Will N.F. have the goodness to inform us whether his piece is prose or verse—*We* are unable to discover."

Considering some of the "Poetry" which did get printed, poor Alexis and N.F. must have been perfectly hopeless!

Vol. X.

In January, 1798, is a description of "Symbolic Masonry." "With plate the first of a series of elegant engravings." This one represents "Freemasons at Work." The short description reads: "Freemasonry is represented by three genii traversing the sky in that part called the Empyreum, around the seven planets, with the square, level and plumb by which they discovered the seven Virtues and seven Sciences, consecrated in the worship of that sacred object formed in the ninth Arch." On the disc showing the planets, &c., is a curious conflict between tradition and science as it was then known.

Everyone knows how the ancients enumerated their seven heavenly bodies, planetary in the sense of their movements, but here are shown Mercury, Venus, the Earth with its attendant Moon, Mars, Jupiter with four moons, and Saturn with six, with indications of their circular orbits round the Sun in the centre. One cannot well make this seven anyway unless the Sun is included and the Moon left out. Very soon after this the seventh real planet 'Uranus'—first called Herschell—was discovered, and this would have helped the computation very usefully.

In March is a portrait of H.R.H. the Duchess of Cumberland with a very eulogistic description of her connection with the Girls' School and a reference to her marriage as the occasion for the passing of the Royal Marriage Act, which the writer calls famous, but evidently thinks otherwise.

In the same number is an article on "The Cabalistical Philosophy of the Jews," which, even now, might interest some who devote attention to the Mysteries of the Cabala.

Vol. XI.

The number for August, 1798, opens with an engraved portrait of "Masonicus."

No name is given, but under the portrait is his Coat of Arms.

The brief but complimentary memoir states that he was initiated in the Lodge of Amity, Preston, No. 224, February 17th, 1792, and as having been for some time a Member of the Lodge of Antiquity. W. Bro. Makins (Assistant Librarian, Grand Lodge) identifies him as Thomas Bradshaw, Counsel, of Garden Court Temple, who joined the L. of Antiquity 1795, Secretary 1796 & 7, and J.W. 1798.

Half a dozen essays by this writer "On the Masonic Character," appeared in Vols. VIII. and IX. In notes to correspondents, Vol. X., is found: "Where is our respected Brother B? The enquiries after the continuation of his Essays on Masonic Character are numerous."

B. obviously stands for Bradshaw.

In a description of the dedication and opening of Sheffield General Infirmary, October, 1797, there is mention of three processions, in one of which were carried two silver pitchers with corn and oil and a golden one with wine.

The Cutlers Company of Sheffield held the post of honour in the second procession.

As many of us know, this is still an important provincial equivalent to the City of London Livery Companies with many of which the Sheffield Company interchanges fraternal visits and courtesies.

In the number for December, 1798, in a memoir of John Errington, Provl. G.M., Northumberland, it is related that he was initiated into the mysteries of Masonry in the caverns of the ancient Catechumens of Naples at the time he made the tour of Europe.

Time and space permit mention of very few of the Non-Masonic items in the Magazine.

Vol. I.

Has a lament on the increase of buildings in London. This supposes a stranger to enter the town by Portman Square, Hyde Park Corner, Blackfriars Bridge, or Moorfields.

The jeremiad advocates a "back to the land" policy, with quite a modern ring about it.

In "Remarks on Pulpit and Bar Oratory," and speaking of preachers, the writer says: "The transcendent joys of heaven and the exquisite tortures of hell are themes on which they discuss with the same tone of voice and uniformity of language as if they were reciting an uninteresting narrative. It is true that their congregations are generally even with them. Whilst the downy Doctor tells his emollient tale his principal parishioners enjoy the sweets of slumber."

Vol. III.

There is a description of Ypres, recording eight previous captures of the town.

There was presented at Drury Lane "The Glorious First of June." "The immense stage was turned into a sea. Two fleets manœuvring. Not the usual 'paste-board' ships. The vessels are large perfect models of the real ships they represent, made with minute beauty. All manœuvres of the day executed with nautical skill. Lines formed. They bear down on each other on different tacks. The action is fought, the firing is tremendous. Ships are dismasted boarded taken and sunk as on the real occasion."

Among ordinary domestic intelligence it is recorded that a man—a publican—sold his wife and child to a neighbouring publican for £1. 1. 0 which "was immediately paid down and the wife delivered up with the usual formalities to the purchaser, who conveyed her and the child to his house."

In a very detailed description of the then new building of Drury Lane Theatre it is said: "Besides other precautions an iron curtain has been contrived which on any such occasion (*i.e.*, fire) would completely prevent all communication between the Audience and the Stage, where alone accidents by fire have been known to commence."

L.C.C. regulations anticipated by 130 years!

The "chair door for company coming in chairs" is also described.

Further on is an account of the death of Baddeley the Actor, his charitable bequests, and the institution of the "Baddeley cake."

Baddeley was a Mason and served the office of Grand Steward in 1789.

Page 435, we find: "Mr. Godbold, proprietor of the Vegetable Syrup, was lately initiated into the mysteries of our order and to evince that he deserves the appellation of Brother, tendered the gratis supply of his valuable medicine to any distressed Mason having occasion to use it, on proper recommendation."

Vol. IV.

Prints "An experiment is under consideration for constructing a common stage waggon with 8 wheels—they are to stand under the bed of it by which contrivance the width of stowage will be increased, lateral pressure reduced, and loading and unloading made more easy."

One wonders why this was not followed up. It describes practically a present-day railway truck or motor lorry, and horse traction would only limit its speed.

In the April number is a reference to Brothers the Prophet (Richard Brothers an ex-officer of the Navy). It begins with a letter to the Editor: "Presuming that all kinds of secrets and mysteries are agreeable to the plan of the Magazine some few observations on a Brother's predictions, whose signs and tokens have created no little altercation, will I trust be acceptable." He says he has made an impartial summary—and this takes up several pages.

In March, 1795, this Brothers was arrested under a warrant signed by the Duke of Portland, under an Act of XV. Elizabeth, his offence, shortly, being that of writing and publishing fantastical prophecies.

The Lord Chancellor attended at the Secretary of State's Office, examined the prisoner, and an order was issued for his remaining in custody. Probably the real reason for his arrest was that he was "against the Government." He was afterwards declared insane and his income appropriated towards the maintenance of his wife and child, whom he had deserted. There is a later article in the Magazine claiming partial fulfilment of some of his prophetic vapourings. Some of us may recall lines:—

"Walking down Tottenham Court Road
Either by chance or by whim
There he saw Brothers the Prophet
And Brothers the Prophet saw him."

Vol. V.

Gives extracts from a curious manuscript containing directions for the household of Henry VIII.

Inter alia (and supposing it be genuine), this reads:—

"His Highness's baker shall not put alum in the bread or mix rye oaten or bean flour with the same, and if detected he shall be put in the stocks.

"His Highness's attendants are not to steal any locks or keys tables forms cupboards or other furniture out of Noblemen's or gentlemen's houses where he goes to visit.

"Master cooks shall not employ such scullions as go about naked or lie all night on the ground before the kitchen fire.

"Dinner is to be at ten and supper at four.

"There shall be no romping with the maids on the staircase by which dishes and other things are often broken.

"The pages shall not interrupt the kitchen-maids and he that gets one of them with child shall pay a fine of two marks to His Highness and have his allowance of beer withheld for a month.

"Coal to be allowed only for the King's Queen's and Lady Mary's chambers.

“Twenty-four loaves a day allowed for His Highness's grey-hounds.”

There is also a quotation from “The Laws and Constitutions of Burghs made by King David I. of Scotland, commonly called St. David”:

“Na man shall play at the golfe nor at the fute ball under the paine of fiftie shillings. Because they are esteemed unprofitable sports for the common good of the realme and the defence thereof.”

Vol. VI.

Devotes a good deal of space to what we now know as the “Ireland forgeries.”

The subject is argued ‘pro and con,’ the damning of “Vortigern” at Drury Lane is described, and the final editorial comment is judiciously non-committal.

There is a case in the Court of King's Bench in which two rival journals with oddly sounding modern names were concerned: Proprietors of the Newspaper “The Telegraph” v. the “Morning Post.”

Defendants had printed a spurious French paper containing a pretended renewal of armistice, &c., between the Emperor and the French Republic, and sent this from Canterbury to the “Telegraph.” The latter published a translation of this fabricated intelligence and sustained discredit and reduced sales. The jury gave £100 damages.

The celebrated “Westminster Tobacco Box” was also before the Courts.

The Lord Chancellor, sitting at Lincoln's Inn Hall, held and determined a Chancery suit and restored to the Plaintiff Club possession of the Box, which had been detained by Defendants owing to a dispute. It had then been in possession of the Club for upwards of four score years.

Vol. VIII.

In February, 1797, the Bank of England stopped cash payments and issued 40/- and 20/- notes. History repeats itself, so far as the substitution of notes for gold!

Vol. X.

May, 1798. An episode anticipating Zeebrugge is quoted from the *London Gazette*:—

“An expedition to destroy the basin, gates and sluices of the Bruges Canal.”

This was effected, and the report goes on to say that the Sluice gates were destroyed in the most compleat manner, the Boats burnt and everything done, and the Canal dry. Unfortunately, owing to change of wind and heavy sea preventing re-embarkation, the landing force had eventually to capitulate. In addition to the ordinary ships, they had the Hecla and Tartaros bombs.

There is a parallel in secrecy. “The troops were on shore before the landing was discovered.”

Vol. XI.

On page 120 is a description of a project for a tunnel under the Thames from Gravesend to Tilbury. This was to be 16 feet diam., cylindrical and constructed with key stones. “Therefore the greater the pressure the stronger the work.” There was to be a steam engine to run off any water that might drain in.

The detailed estimate of cost was £15,955.

The construction appears feasible and has some resemblance to the Greathead system by which our tube railways have been achieved.

The advantages of communication between Kent and Essex, and its military importance are advocated much as one reads now.

We are still waiting for this tunnel!

The estimate, even if multiplied tenfold, makes it the more regrettable that the project never materialized.

Possibly difficulties, such as actually supervened in the construction, later, of Brunel's tunnel, were anticipated and urged against it.

On page 181 is an illustration and description of an immense floating battery, said to be constructed in France for the invasion of England and grandiloquently called "The destruction of England." This is quite a wildly impossible affair, showing an armoured fortification floating on a huge raft, and propelled by banks of oars actuated by machinery, literally worked by so much horse-power, as the cavalry and artillery horses on board were to be employed for that purpose.

If the thing had been made more 'ship shape' so as to be navigable, it would have remotely suggested modern heavily armoured vessels.

One of the last records of interest in Vol. XI. is the launch, September, 1798, at Chatham, of the 98-gun battleship "Temeraire." She was the "Fighting Temeraire" of Turner's celebrated picture. The vision of this gallant ship being towed to her last berth may fitly close these few notes.

A hearty vote of thanks was unanimously passed to Bro. Elkington on the proposition of Bro. H. Poole, seconded by Bro. H. C. de Lafontaine; comments being offered by or on behalf of Bros. W. J. Williams, W. W. Covey-Crump, Lewis Edwards, Gordon P. G. Hills, B. Telepneff, John Stokes, and Wm. Jenkinson.

Bro. H. POOLE said:—

I have much pleasure in proposing a very hearty vote of thanks to Bro. Elkington for the paper he has given us this evening. The task of going through the eleven volumes of the *Freemasons' Magazine* does not at first sight look a formidable one: but I can well imagine that Bro. Elkington started his study of the first volume with considerably more enthusiasm than that with which he tackled the eleventh. For, besides the Masonic matter, there is a great deal of the dullest sort, with no bearing on the Craft at all; and the whole is apt to be marked by the prosy sententiousness and the complete absence of a sense of humour that must be familiar to most students of the period. Nevertheless, Bro. Elkington has stuck stoutly to his task, and has given us plenty of Masonic items all through.

But I hope he will forgive me when I say that I do not think he has made the fullest use of his opportunity. Even within the limits of the programme which he set himself—"to extract some of the more personal and intimate matters wherein our Brethren of about 130 years ago differed from ourselves, or wherein their ideas and practices are still current"—there is a great deal of material which might well have found a place among his extracts. Indeed, I venture to say that I have found the random perusal of several volumes more interesting than his remarks led me to expect.

I was not aware, for instance, that as early as 1794 Freemasonry had been accused of having a hand both in preparing the way for and in organising the French Revolution. Volume iii. opens with a covering letter from S[tephen] J[ones] introducing a letter quoted from the *Gentleman's Magazine* of the previous month, which gives a summary of the statements made in a work called "The Veil withdrawn: or, the Secret of the French Revolution explained by the help of Freemasonry." S.J. makes no comment: but another letter, signed by "A P.M. of the Lodge of Antiquity" (whose identity may be guessed at

with some probability), puts forward a defence very similar to that which a modern Masonic journal might have done—based, of course, on the assumption that the principles and tenets of the Order were the same on the Continent as they are in this country. Yet another indignant letter appears, very different in tone from the studied calmness of the former, which I cannot refrain from quoting: “. . . his arguments are so futile, and so weakly supported, as to destroy and confound the reasons adduced for a demonstration; and I should not have attempted an answer, but have passed over the illiberal and puerile aspersions contained in this malicious charge with the silent contempt due to such a *deformed bantling*, had not I in the overflowing of my indignation been pressed by a *worthy Brother* present to stand up in the support of the most excellent of all human institutions next to Christianity; an institution in itself totally repugnant to *rebellion, tumult, anarchy, war, and faction*,” &c., &c. This letter is dated from Malling, and may well have been inspired, if not actually written, by Dr. Wm. Perfect, the Pr.G.M. of Kent. A note at the foot of the same page states that a number of letters have been received on the subject, but not printed, “the Institution being founded on too firm a base to be shaken by the breath of an anonymous slanderer.”

The notes which Bro. Elkington quotes on Lodges in Sunderland and Stockton-on-Tees form part of a series on the “Present State of Free Masonry,” which dealt rather intermittently with the Provinces in turn, and, I think, might quite possibly provide facts of use to the Masonic historian. Besides the one he has given us, another interesting reference to the Harodim is to be found under Swalwell—“This ancient Lodge has flourished very much both in the principles and practice of Royal Science. The mysteries of the HARODIM were exercised and carried on at Winleton, the residence of P. G. M. LAYCOCK; and numbers of Brethren from the surrounding country repaired to this Lodge for intelligence and instruction.”

Another reference to ‘side’ degrees, not without its interest, appears under ‘Masonic Intelligence’ in the same number:—“Aug. 16. Being the birth-day of his Royal Highness the Duke of York, it was celebrated with all the honours of Masonry by the Order of *Knights Templars* resident at London, united with the Society of *Antient Masons* of the *Diluvian Order*, or *Royal Ark* and *Mark Mariners*, assembled at the Surry Tavern in the Strand, by summons from Thomas Dunckerley, Esq., Grand Master and Grand Commander of those United Orders.”

An interesting letter from Theophilus Jones, Master of the Cambrian Lodge, Brecon, deals with the “men who, though in the prime of life, and in full enjoyment of their health, make it a practice to go from town to town, and from Lodge to Lodge, with a plausible tale in their mouths, and support themselves in habits of idleness and intemperance by imposing upon the well-meant, though ill-directed, benevolence of their more industrious Brethren.” He asserts that he has “found from experience and from enquiry, that two out of three of those who have been relieved in that part of the kingdom where [he resides], have been undeserving of the assistance they have received,” and suggests a rather elaborate system of investigation to meet the “growing evil.”

I fully concur in Bro. Elkington's epithet “wishy washy” for most of the poetry contained in these volumes; but in October 1794 a new departure was made, in the publication of Masonic Songs complete with music. The first to appear was “Arise, and sound thy Trumpet, Fame”—a piece by no means without its merits, at any rate as to the music, which had appeared in the usual form of an engraved sheet not very long before. The following number gives, for what I believe to be the first time, a quite passable tune for “Ye thrice happy few,” the words of which made their first appearance in the *Pocket Companion* of 1759.

Such, Brethren, are some of the additional items which I have gleaned from one volume of the *Freemasons' Magazine*, and which struck me as being of sufficient interest to quote. Bro. Elkington has, I think, rather unduly restricted

himself as to time and space: I believe he might have enlarged his paper considerably, and included many items of great interest, without any fear that he was trying our patience, although naturally he and I might differ as to which particular items deserved selection—a matter of judgment, in which, after all, he is quite as likely to be right as I am.

I would, however, like to suggest that if he has preserved a complete record of the Masonic items in these eleven volumes, the printing of an index to them (if space can be found for it in our *Transactions*) would form a valuable Appendix to his interesting paper.

Bro. W. J. WILLIAMS said:—

We are much indebted to our Bro. Elkington for his painstaking paper in which he has collected many of the interesting items in these old Magazines.

It was not to be expected, nor was it desirable, that the paper should have so far exhausted the materials as to leave nothing for subsequent gleaners. Such papers as the present are important because they direct attention to the existence and value of the old periodical publications which were launched for the benefit of the Craft, and are still available as indicating the views taken by the proprietors, of the sort of thing that they expected would meet with acceptance among the Brethren. They also preserve many valuable contemporaneous records of the current history of the Society.

One can seldom peruse these Masonic periodicals without meeting evidence that whoever profited by them the Proprietors certainly did not do so from a pecuniary standpoint.

This particular Magazine, as our Brother says, "simply ceased to exist." Probably the lack of adequate financial support by the Brethren was the actual cause of cessation.

The volumes of the *Freemasons Quarterly Review*, which commenced in 1834 and continued for many years, and the *Freemasons' Magazine and Masonic Mirror*, which commenced in 1856, contain much very valuable information, and are a storehouse of the Masonic research work which was in progress during their publication. At a later period we have the *Masonic Magazine*, which was edited by Bro. Woodford for the period 1873 to 1882 (June), and continued for a further brief period as the *Masonic Monthly*. In these Magazines there are many contributions by such Masters in the art of Masonic Research as Brothers Matthew Cooke (who has not had his due tribute of praise for his documentary discoveries), Hughan, Woodford, Rylands, and others. I must admit that not infrequently the items scattered through the multitudinous pages of these old Magazine have given hints and put me upon the track of information which might otherwise have remained buried in something approaching oblivion.

Bro. GORDON P. G. HILLS said:—

Although I have not very much to add to what the previous speakers have said, I should like to express a word of thanks and appreciation to my dear old friend Bro. Elkington for the trouble he has taken in preparing and reading his paper, especially because I owe so great a debt to him in Freemasonry in that it was at his worthy hands that I received my initiation into the Order, so that when thanks are due I like to have a part in expressing them.

I will only comment on three points.

Richard Brothers, who I believe was certainly not a Mason, was an extraordinary character to whom my attention was drawn years ago when I was examining the Rainsford MSS., and it seems worth while in the present connection to add a brief note of his career. Richard Brothers was born in

1757, entered the Royal Navy, and rose to the rank of Lieutenant. In 1783 he left the Service, and travelled abroad. One of his great friends and supporters, William Bryan, the Quaker Druggist of Bristol, in his "Testimony of the Spirit" wrote an account of Brothers' life and details of his visit to the mystical bodies operating at Avignon in 1788. In 1789 the retired Lieutenant started an objection to the terms of the oath which he had to take before receiving his half-pay. He developed the idea that he had received a Divine Commission as a Prophet, published "Prophecies," and called himself the "Nephew" of the Almighty. Whilst objecting to the King's title "Sovereign Lord," as blasphemous, he claimed the throne for himself as successor of King David. In 1795 Brothers was arrested for treasonable practices and imprisoned as a criminal lunatic. An agitation on his behalf in favour of his release was carried on for many years. In 1806 he was restored to freedom and lived in London with friends until his death in 1824. In his later years he wrote on the identity of the English with the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel, and devoted attention to astronomical speculations.

Brother Elkington mentions that the Quatuor Coronati Library owns a copy of the engraving of Stothard's well-known picture of Bro. Ruspini leading the procession of the little Girls of the Institution in Freemasons' Hall: the original painting hangs in the Museum of Grand Lodge.

I should like again, as I did on occasions when I delivered my Prestonian Lecture, to correct the mis-statement about Bro. Preston's election to the Chair of Antiquity, which apparently had its origin from Bro. Stephen Jones' account in the *Freemasons' Magazine*. The point was dealt with by Bro. Rylands in the first volume of the Records of the Lodge (p. 273), where it appears that there is every probability that the Bro. Preston who attended a meeting on 5th February 1772 as a Visitor was our William Preston, who was proposed as a joining member on 2nd March 1774, and elected 1st June, when he was not present. It was not on this occasion, but on 15th June, when he made his first attendance after election, that Bro. William Preston was honoured by election to the Chair of that distinguished Lodge, the "premier Lodge" on the Roll of Grand Lodge, as he was proud to remember.

Bro. LEWIS EDWARDS said:—

I desire to add a humble tribute to the writer of the paper. It is of some little interest to point out that the set of the *Freemasons' Magazine* in the British Museum is incomplete, it lacking one volume, which has probably been lost.

The requirement that the candidates for the Royal Cumberland Institution should have previously had the smallpox was not so curious as has been suggested. In the days before vaccination, it was by no means unusual, *e.g.*, when engaging domestic servants, to make a similar stipulation, and one who had had the smallpox had an increased value analogous to that of a dog which had distemper.

I am inclined somewhat to deprecate the accusations made by a previous speaker, and indeed frequently made, that the writings of an earlier period were deficient in humour. It should be remembered that fashions in these matters, as in others, change, and that what we considered humour in our time might by our grandchildren be as reasonably (or unreasonably) considered dead and dull as we had held that of our grandfathers.

I am interested in the reference made to the contemporary war with France, in view of the fact that the Duke of York, a member of the Craft, and the hero "who had ten thousand men," played a prominent, if not altogether successful or glorious, part in the military campaigns on the Continent in the closing years of the eighteenth century.

BRO. JENKINSON writes:—

I have read with interest Bro. Elkington's Notes on the *Freemasons' Magazine*, and while the paper does not lend itself to much criticism, there are one or two minor details on which a comment may be permitted.

Bro. William Stewart, concerning whose identity some doubt exists, was probably the brother appearing on the Roll of Lodge No. 324, Dublin (1759-1818) as:—

“ William Stewart. 24 Jan^{ry}. 1764. Certified 2^d. Feb^{ry}. 1764.”

The phrase “ Certified 2^d. Feb^{ry}. 1764 ” indicates that Bro. Stewart was granted a G.L. Certificate on the date mentioned, or in the words of our Irish Constitution “ drew his Certificate.” In those days, and indeed for many years following, our Irish G.L. did not issue a Certificate to each Brother on his registration. As a general rule a G.L. Certificate was only taken out by a brother about to travel, and therefore requiring credentials of his status.

The issue of a G.L. Certificate to Bro. Wm. Stewart of Lodge No. 324 within practically a week of his registration, in the absence of clear evidence to the contrary, may be reasonably assumed as an indication of his identity with the “ Irish Mason before,” particularly as no other brother of the name appears on the Rolls of the Dublin City Lodges. As an Irish Mason he would naturally gravitate to the Atholl Brethren in the first instance, but, alas! “ the root of the matter ” cannot have been in him since in later days he succumbed to Modern influence and was re-made E.A. F.C. in 1767.

If this Member of 324 was William Stewart the Proprietor of the Magazine his M.A. does not appear to have been taken out in Trinity College, Dublin, the Alma Mater of so many distinguished members of our Order. A search of Burtchaell & Sadleir's “ Alumni Dublinenses ” fails to show any graduate of the name whose dates and particulars would fit in except the following unlikely instance:—

“ Stewart William. Pen. (Dr. Torrens) Nov. 1. 1764 (N.F.P.).”

Bro. Stewart's degree would be more likely from a Scotch University, many Irish students of the time taking that degree in Glasgow. A list of Scottish Alumni was not available to me, but perhaps some other brother may be able to extend the search as indicated.

It may be of interest to note that in the Irish *Sentimental and Masonic Magazine*,¹ published in Dublin just a year prior to the first issue of the *Freemasons' Magazine*, Preston's “ Illustrations ” also appeared. Although called a Masonic Magazine, it must be admitted that the Masonic portion of the Irish paper was largely outweighed by general subjects, ranging from law reports of cases in the King's Bench to “ The Method of Raising Early Potatoes.”

Nor would the comments of Bro. Elkington on the “ poetry ” in the English Journal be out of place if applied to some of that appearing in its Irish sister, although some passable verses are printed from time to time in the latter.

The Editor of the Irish Magazine seldom expressed his mind quite so freely as did his English brother in the case quoted by Bro. Elkington from Vol. IX.: the general monthly formula for unprintable material being:—

“ Several other pieces have been received from Correspondents, which are under Consideration ”: while possibles are described as—“ shall appear in a future month ”—a safe promise, but not always fulfilled, doubtless on account of its being capable of a wide interpretation.

Once, however, the easy good nature of the Irish Editor appears to have been ruffled, and we find:—

“ It has given us no small Concern, that we were under a Necessity of suppressing some Hints and Observations on Medicinal Plants, and some Lines

¹ Vide Lepper & Crosslé, vol. i., p. 317.

on a Gardener, particularly as they came from a Correspondent whom we shall always be glad to oblige, when we can do it consistent with our Engagements to the Public: But the Truth is, the first piece was so incorrect, we deemed it unfit for Insertion: and the other is a Production we have seen in our juvenile Days in Books printed for the late Mr. Newbery, of St. Paul's Church-Yard, London, and other well-meaning Book-sellers for the Instruction and Amusement of little Heroes not three Feet high."

Sentimental & Masonic Magazine, June 1795 (p. 483).

Irish Masonic Magazines, it may be remarked in closing, have never flourished in the Emerald Isle, doubtless because of the rooted antipathy of the Irish Craft to anything other than the barest reference being made in print to the ceremonies of our Order. Specimens of two of these extinct Magazines, issued with the sanction of the Grand Lodge of Ireland, are submitted for the inspection of the Brethren of Q.C.

Bro. B. TELEPNEFF writes:—

In his charming and instructive paper Brother Elkington refers to the Dukes of Brunswick and Mecklenburg-Strelitz, mentioned in the 8th volume of the *Freemasons' Magazine* as "Patrons" of the Royal Arch Chapters in Germany.

It is seldom realized what a continuous interchange of Masonic ideas and degrees was taking place in the eighteenth century between England and Germany, although the side-issues of Masonry, such as its "higher" degrees, were imbibed in Germany by a spirit quite different from the English Lodges. Ceremonies which appealed to the English Brethren did not always satisfy their German Brethren. Such was, taking one instance, the Royal Arch. This ceremony was introduced into Germany in 1786¹ by Count August Graefe, a Brunswicker and a captain in the English service in America: he had been a Deputy Past Grand Master of Canada and returned to Brunswick in 1785 as representative of the Grand Lodge of England. He established the Chapter of Zion at Hannover and, later, another Chapter at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, but did not meet with much success: the ceremony passed quickly into oblivion.

The Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz referred to by the *Freemasons' Magazine* was no doubt Carl Ludwig Friedrich,² who during his sojourn in England in 1786 procured with Graefe's assistance the re-instatement of the Provincial Grand Lodge of the Electorate of Hannover and British Dominions in Germany: he was then appointed Provincial Grand Master of the re-instated Lodge.

The Brunswicker "Patron" of the short-lived German Chapters, meant by the Magazine, must have been Duke Ferdinand, although deceased already in 1792. There was hardly any Masonic organisation in Germany this zealous Mason had not patronized, or any degree of importance he had not taken an interest in. One of the outstanding military leaders of his time, Duke Ferdinand was appointed in 1757 by Frederick the Great, Commander-in-Chief of the defeated allied forces on the request of England, and during the subsequent campaign covered himself and his troops with glory. Among his commanding officers were English Masons: thus, Masonic Brotherhood between England and Germany was fortified by the comradeship-in-arms, a very different state of affairs from the twentieth century!

¹ Allgemeines Handbuch, iii., p. 102. Leipzig, 1867.

² Born in 1741, died in 1816.

Bro. J. STOKES writes:—

Bro. Elkington refers to the opening of the Sheffield General Infirmary, which took place on Wednesday, 4th October 1797, in which ceremony the Cutlers' Company took a prominent part.

The following details of this event, which was of great local importance, may be of interest:—

(There were three Processions.)

The First Division will consist of the different Lodges of Freemasons, in the following order:—

Two Trumpeters on White Horses, dressed in White.
 Two Constables with Staffs.
 Band of Music.
 Two Tilers with Swords.
 Standard, Crimson Silk, Faith, Hope and Charity.
 A Steward with a pink wand.
 Visiting Brothers in White Gloves, two and two, according to the rank of their respective Lodges (Juniors first).
 Standard in the Centre of them blue silk, Brotherly Love, Relief and Truth.
 A Steward with a pink Wand.
 Flag of the Royal Brunswick Lodge.
 Royal Arch Masons, with Sashes, two and two.
 Knight Templars Banner.
 Knight Templar Masons, with Sashes, two and two.
 A Steward with a Pink Rod.
 Architect with Square, Level and Plumb on a Cushion.
 The Lodge, covered with White Satin, and carried by four Master Masons.
 Master of the Seventh Lodge with two Silver Pitchers containing Wine and Oil.
 Master of the Sixth Lodge with a gold pitcher containing Corn.
 Standard, purple silk, Justice, Fortitude, Temperance & Prudence.
 The First Light, carried by the Master of the Fourth Lodge.
 The Celestial and Terrestrial Globes, carried by two Master Masons.
 The Second Light, carried by the Master of the Third Lodge.
 The Lewis, carried by a Master Mason.
 The Third Light, carried by the Master of the Second Lodge.
 The Holy Bible, Square and Compass on a Crimson Velvet Cushion, with Gold Fringe and Tassels.
 The Chaplain.
 A Steward with a Pink Rod.
 Two Secretaries with green Silk Bags and Transaction Books.
 Two Treasurers with Blue Wands tipped with Gold.
 Junior Wardens with Pillars.
 Senior Wardens with Pillars.
 Book of Constitutions on a Blue Silk Cushion.
 Master of the two Lodges with White Wands carrying the Warrant of Constitution of Britannia Lodge.
 Two Stewards with Pink Wands to close the Procession.

We have no record to show the names of five out of the seven Lodges which took part in the procession. The Britannia 1761 (Antient), 1765 (Moderns) and the Royal Brunswick Lodges 1793 (Moderns) were the only ones in the town at that time, the last of the Antients Lodges (72) having amalgamated with the Britannia Lodge in the previous year.

The presence of Royal Arch Masons and Knight Templar Masons is most interesting, in view of the fact that it was not until March, 1795, that a Royal

Arch Chapter was constituted in the Town, though we know that the Arch, Knight Templar and Mark degrees had been worked for many years under the Antients warrant. The early records of the Britannia Lodge contain many references to Royal Arch Masonry, and the Lodge possesses a register of Marks belonging to Mark Masons whose date is uncertain, but includes brethren such as W. Rowley, and is probably late eighteenth or early nineteenth century. An inventory of the Britannia Lodge includes *inter alia* the furniture necessary for a Knight Templar Encampment.

A short note on the *Company of Cutlers in Hallamshire* will be found in the report of the Summer Outing 1922 (vol. xxxv., p. 227).

Bro. David Flather has given me the following note on the Cutlers' Company:—

While in outward form the Cutlers' Company is not unlike the City Livery Companies, yet in its origin and in its present state, it is vastly different.

There was not at any time a gild of Cutlers in Sheffield, nor is it so ancient as the Cutlers' Company of London, which was constituted in 1344.

The Cutlers' Company at Sheffield was incorporated in 1624, but in 1565 the Earl of Shrewsbury, who was Lord of the Manor of Sheffield, appointed a jury of Searchers to supervise the trade and especially to grant and control Trade Marks.

On the incorporation in 1624, the Company was constituted as follows, viz.:—

The Master
Senior Warden
Junior Warden
Six Seachers
24 Assistant Searchers

a total of 33.

The Office of Master is held for one year, though there have been instances where by reason of special circumstances, the office has been held for two or more successive years by the same man.

Promotion towards the chair is usually by seniority of membership of the Company.

The Master during his year of Office is in great request in the City, both for Social, Charitable and Industrial needs.

The chief public work of the Company is in connection with the granting of Trade Marks, and forms a very important and necessary part of the duties of the Company.

Bro. ELKINGTON *writes*, in reply:—

I am glad that my paper produced so interesting a discussion which indeed the varied range of its contents invited.

I accept the kindly criticism of the W.M. With practised skill he has extracted some more good metal from the mine; fitly adding to the specimens I brought to light.

I may add that I had cherished the idea of such an index as our W.M. suggests, but found it would have been very bulky and (to me) very difficult to classify.

Bro. W. J. Williams really sums up and adopts my views when he says: "It was not to be expected, nor was it desirable, that the paper should have so far exhausted the materials as to leave nothing for subsequent gleaners." He has done good service in continuing the record of subsequent magazines of somewhat similar character.


I thank my old friend Bro. Gordon Hills for his fraternal personal remarks and for his very interesting statements as to that curious character "Brothers the Prophet."

Bro. Stokes supplements very fully my allusions to the Cutlers' Company of Sheffield. Without controverting his statements, I rest content with the undoubted fact that the Sheffield Company is recognized by the Gilds of the City of London, at whose banquets the Master Cutler of Sheffield is frequently an honoured guest.

With respect to Bro. Lewis Edwards' statement, may I say that the reference to candidates for the Royal Comberland School having to have had smallpox was not that such a requirement was then curious or unusual, but that it seems now to be so to us.

I thank Bro. Jenkinson for his explanatory notes as to Bro. Wm. Stewart and also as to the Irish Magazine, which was for a time contemporary with the English one.

Finally, Bro. Telepneff has ably dealt with the early connection between English and German Masonry which I briefly mentioned without at the time trying to follow this up.



SUMMER OUTING, 1929.

LEEDS.

BY BRO. E. HAWKESWORTH.



THE choice of Leeds as the scene of our Outing this year was the occasion of a certain amount of criticism on the part of some brethren, not all of them hailing from south of Trent, in whose minds that city was only associated with the dingier aspects of industry. But before they had been in the place many hours they saw their error. Few cities in England can boast of finer environs, and none can rival the archæological treasures for visiting which Leeds is so admirable a headquarters, comprising as they do Temple Newsam, Kirkstall, Adel, Fountains, and Bolton Priory.

A most cordial invitation had been extended to us by the Leeds Installed Masters' Association, and its Reception Committee worked out for us an instructive and carefully considered programme. The Committee consisted of W. Bros. Dr. W. H. Maxwell Telling, P.Pr.G.W., President; E. Hawkesworth, Pr.G.D., Hon. Secretary; J. H. Oldroyd, P.Pr.A.G.D.C., Hon. Treasurer; W. H. Bean, P.Pr.G.D., Prov G. Librarian and Editor of the *Transactions*; J. A. Lowther, B.A., P.Pr.G.D.; J. C. Innes; W. E. Ball, P.Pr.G.D. (Durham); W. F. Houlding; and J. Elston Cawthorn, P.Pr.G.W., Local Secretary of 2076.

The visiting Brethren taking part in the Outing were:—

Bros. Dr. D. D. Anderson, of Mauritius, 2546; Dr. E. Allen, of Barrow-in-Furness, P.M. 1021; F. J. Asbury, of London, P.A.G.D.C.; Wm. N. Bacon, of London, P.M. 15, P.G.Stew.; Rodk. H. Baxter, of Rochdale, P.A.G.D.C., P.M. 2076; A. H. Bichard, of Banbury, 39; H. Bladon, of London, P.G.St.B.; F. J. M. Boniface, of London, P.M. 2694; Wallace Bridge, of Rochdale, Pr.G.Treas., E. Lancs.; Walter H. Brown, of London, P.M. 23, P.G.Stew.; Geo. W. Bullamore, of Much Hadham, 441; Dr. T. M. Carter, of Bristol, P.Pr.G.W., Bristol, I.G. 2076; G. S. Collins, of London, P.A.G.D.C.; Thos. M. Copland, of Falkirk, I.P.G. Architect; Rev. W. W. Covey-Crump, of Wisbech, A.G.Ch., P.M. 2076; Dr. A. J. Cross, of Dalton-in-Furness, J.G.D.; Gilbert W. Daynes, of Norwich, P.M. 4569, J.W. 2076; R. A. Dickson, of London, P.Pr.A.G.D.C., Essex; H. K. Duckworth, of Grange-over-Sands, P.M. 1715; S. Duckworth, of Grange-over-Sands, P.M. 1715; Erskine Edmonds, of Lydbury North, P.Pr.G.D., Shropshire; David Flather, of Sheffield, P.A.G.D.C.; F. W. Golby, of London, P.A.G.D.C.; Dr. R. T. Halliday, of Glasgow, G.Marsh.; Weldon Hanson, of Norton-on-Tees, P.M. 4027; Arthur Heiron, of London, L.R.; John Holt, of Yarm, P.Pr.G.W., Durham; Andrew Hunter, of Falkirk, G.Sup., Stirling; J. P. Hunter, of Sheffield, P.M. 4092; Gilbert Y. Johnson, of York, P.Pr.G.W., N. & E. Yorks.; Hugh C. Knowles, of London, P.A.G.R.; Dr. Fred Lace, of Bath, P.A.G.D.C.; C. E. L. Livesey, of York, P.M. 236; H. E. Miller, of Grange-over-Sands, P.Pr.A.G.D.C., Durham; W. F. Morrison, of Stenhousemuir, G.Stew.; C. A. Newman, of Peterborough, P.Pr.G.W.; Dr. C. E. Newman, of London, 4453; Dr. George Norman, of Bath, P.G.D., I.P.M. 2076; J. Herbert Parker, of Norwich, P.M. 1452; H. D. Parsons, of Eaglescliffe, P.Pr.G.W.; Rev. H. Poole, of Sedbergh, P.Pr.G.Ch., W.M. 2076; Cecil Powell, of Weston-super-Mare, P.G.D., P.M. 2076; F. A. Powell, of



From a Water Colour Drawing by Bro. F. A. Powell.

BOLTON PRIORY.

together without the control of a single mind. The result is undoubtedly very picturesque, and the building is planned with excellent good sense in regard to the particular form of service contemplated.

After inspecting the seventeenth century silver Communion plate, in the vestry, W. Bro. Rev. W. W. Covey-Crump, A.G.Chap., voiced the sincere thanks of those present, to the Vicar, for his kind welcome and instructive guidance.

So as to give the visitors an opportunity of seeing some of the suburbs of Leeds, a long, circuitous route was then traversed. After riding for some time, some of the Brethren enquired how far they were from Leeds, and were much surprised to hear that they were still in the city. The drive through Roundhay Park was particularly enjoyable, enabling us to see what is perhaps the largest and most beautiful public park in the country. It covers an area of over 600 acres, contains two lakes, has great stretches of woodland and shrubberies, besides ample accommodation for games, and abounds in the most glorious views.

Eventually Temple Newsam was reached. The mansion and park were acquired by the City of Leeds from the Hon. F. L. Wood, now Lord Irwin, Viceroy of India, in 1922, mainly through the instrumentality of W. Bro. Sir Chas. H. Wilson, J.P., LL.D., P.Pr.G.W., who had looked forward with much pleasure to conducting us through the house, but, unfortunately, was confined to his room by illness. So we had to divide into two parties, and go through conducted by official guides, whose descriptions of the various rooms, their history and contents, were exceedingly helpful. Through the generosity of the former owner, many beautiful pieces of furniture, pictures, and other works of art remain in the house, so that most of the rooms retain their former appearance.

The hamlet of Newsam is mentioned in Domesday Book, and, as it is noted that at that time the value of the manor was only a tenth of what it was twenty years earlier, it must have been in existence long before. In 1086 it was part of the great estate of Ilbert de Lacy, first Lord of the Honor of Pontefract, who was succeeded by his eldest son, Robert, whose eldest son died without issue, so Ilbert's second son, Henry, became Lord of Pontefract in or about 1141. He transferred Newsam to the Poor Knights of Christ and of the Temple of Solomon (commonly called the Knights Templar), most likely in 1155, which, from the undated document confirming the transfer, but containing circumstantial evidence, may be taken as the date of the foundation of Temple Newsam. This same Henry de Lacy was the founder of Kirkstall Abbey.

For a century and a half Temple Newsam was a Preceptory of the Knights Templar. On the dissolution of the Order, it consisted of a chapel, hall, kitchen and dormitory, and certain outhouses. The inventory then taken shows that the furniture and fittings were few, and plain, but there were more than eleven hundred animals on the estate, with large stores of grain.

In turn, the manor was owned by kings, and granted to their courtiers. In 1337 Edward III. granted the reversion to Sir John Darcy, and the estate remained in this family for over 150 years. In 1534 Henry VIII. granted it to his niece, Margaret, and her second husband, Lord Lennox, and it was in the house then in existence that their eldest son, Lord Darnley, was born, in 1545. To further the schemes and plots of his mother, he married the ill-fated Mary, Queen of Scots, in 1565. After other changes, Sir Arthur Ingram purchased the estate, and founded the family which held it for about 250 years. His second grandson was created Baron Ingram and Viscount Irwin by Charles II. Latterly it came into the possession of the Hon. Mrs. Meynell Ingram, daughter of the first Viscount Halifax, who, on her decease, left it to her nephew, Edward Wood, the only son of the present Viscount Halifax, who, after serving the State in various capacities, was appointed Viceroy of India in 1926, and raised to the Peerage, when, adopting the old title so long borne by the owners of Temple Newsam, he became the first Baron Irwin of a new creation.

There are no definite remains of the old preceptory buildings, though probably some of the foundations are incorporated in those of the later structure.

London, P.A.G.D.C.; John H. Pullen, of London, P.M. 410; A. P. Salter, of London, P.M. 2932; W. Scott, of Saltburn-by-the-Sea, P.M. 543; Thos. Selby, of Eaglescliffe, P.Pr.G.W.; Augustus Smith, of Bristol, P.M. 3884; W. J. Songhurst, of London, P.G.D., Treas., 2076; J. Wm. Stevens, of London, P.A.G.Supp.W.; Dr. John Stokes, of Sheffield, P.G.D., Pr.A.G.M., P.M. 2076; Ed. Tappenden, of Hitchin, P.Pr.G.W.; F. J. Underwood, of Worcester, P.M. 280; Lionel Vibert, of London, P.A.G.D.C., P.M. and Sec., 2076; Geo. C. Williams, of London, P.M. 25; W. J. Williams, of London, P.M. 2696, J.D. 2076; Ernest Winpenny, of Stockton-on-Tees, P.Pr.G.O.; H. R. Wood, of St. Annes-on-the-Sea, P.Pr.G.W., E. Lancs.; J. H. Wright, of Grange-over-Sands, Treas., 1715.

THURSDAY, JUNE 20TH, 1929.

The Brethren who arrived by train from London were met at Leeds Station by W. Bro. E. Hawkesworth, Pr.G.D., Hon. Secretary of the Leeds Installed Masters' Association, and members of the local Reception Committee, who conducted the visitors to the Hotel Metropole, where others had arrived already. Rooms were allotted without much difficulty, and the party was soon ready to start the programme, before doing which, everyone was handed a booklet containing "Notes on Leeds and the Places to be Visited," written by W. Bro. E. Hawkesworth, Pr.G.D.; and "Notes on the Provincial Library of West Yorks., written by W. Bro. W. H. Bean, P.Pr.G.D., Pr.G. Librarian.

Comfortable coaches were in waiting, and conveyed us to the Church of St. John the Evangelist, the first place of call, where we were welcomed by the Vicar, W. Bro. D'Arcy S. Rudd, M.A., P.Pr.G.Ch., who related the history of this most interesting church, and conducted us over it. It was the oldest church in the city, until the parish of Adel was included, quite recently, and may best be described in the words of Mr. (now Sir) Reginald Blomfield's *Short History of Renaissance Architecture in England*:—

In S. John's Church at Leeds, we have a rare and very interesting example of an entirely new church. In 1632-3, the old parish church being too small for the congregation, John Harrison, a citizen of Leeds, built the church of S. John's, and endowed it with £80 per annum and £10 for repairs. The church was consecrated by Archbishop Neile in 1634. In plan it consists of two aisles of the same size, treated throughout exactly alike, with a square tower at the west end of the north aisle. The aisle arcade has pointed arches, and both aisles have square-leaded windows with cinquefoil lights. The two east windows have geometrical tracery of very fair design, but rather wiry in execution. The parapets have battlements. With the exception of the semi-circular arch to the porch, and the curious capitals to the pillars of the arcade, all the details of the masonry are late Gothic, with slight technical variations. When, however, the carpenters, joiners and carvers were turned into the church, Gothic detail was abandoned. The framing of the roof with its square plaster panels, the richly carved screen, running across the whole width of the church, with the two great semicircular arches and open strap-work spandrels, the details of the wainscot pews, the pulpit and the reading desk, are all of Jacobean type, that is, based on German models, with variations according to the fancy of the workmen. The probable explanation of the capitals, which, though Gothic in outline, are Renaissance in detail, is that a carver was set to work on them at some little interval after they were built. It is clear from this church and from similar instances, . . . that the Gothic tradition was preserved in masonry long after it had died out in other building trades. It is probable from the heterogeneous character of the details, that no architect was employed to design this church at Leeds. John Harrison may have given general instructions, but the building as a whole represents the unaided efforts of different craftsmen working

It is certain there was a house of some importance when Lennox took possession, and he most likely made considerable additions. Preserved in the Record Office is an inventory of the goods and chattels found in the house, at the time the Earl and Countess were expelled by Elizabeth in 1565, and the number of the rooms about corresponds with that of the present house, and they were arranged on a similar plan. After this date the buildings fell into a state of dis-repair, and when the first Ingram took possession of the estate in 1622, he made extensive alterations and additions. Further alterations were made from time to time by subsequent owners. An inscription on the south wing reads as follows:—

THIS SOUTH WING
WAS INTIRELY REBUILT
BY FRANCES SHEPHEARD
RELICT OF CHARLES 9TH
VISCOUNT IRWIN
IN THE YEAR 1796

The building is of brick, built round three sides of a square, and is practically void of ornamentation. It has massive bay windows at regular intervals, and the vertical lines of these, bound together by the long horizontal lines of the balustrade forming the skyline give the house a most dignified appearance. On the three sides of the balustrade facing into the court is an inscription, part of Sir Arthur Ingram's work, originally in stone letters, since replaced by metal ones, as the stone was decaying rapidly:—

ALL - GLORY - AND - PRAISE - BE - GIVEN - TO - GOD - THE
FATHER - THE SON - AND - HOLY - GHOST - ON - HIGH.
PEACE - ON - EARTH. GO - OD - WILL - TOWARDS - MEN.
HONOUR - AND - TRUE - ALLEGI - ANCE - TO - OUR -
GRACIO - US - KING - LOVING - AF - FECTI - ON - AMONGST -
HIS SUBJECTS. HEALTH - AND - PLENTY - BE - WITHIN -
THIS - HOUSE.

Inside the house the first striking feature is the Oak Staircase, which, although modern, is quite Elizabethan in style. It was designed by G. F. Bodley, R.A., and erected by Mrs. Meynell Ingram. On the walls of the staircase and corridors are portraits of various owners of the estate and members of their family, some painted by eminent artists. A tour of the various rooms was made, each containing much of artistic or historical interest, described by the guide, and at greater length in a well-written handbook, a copy of which was acquired by most of those present. Special mention may be made of the oak panelling and the elaborate display of heraldry surmounting the mantelpiece in the Dining Room; the stained glass (seventeenth century) in the Great Hall, depicting a series of armorial bearings from the Lacies down to the Ingrams; the iron deed-chest of Sir Arthur Ingram, its beautiful workmanship being almost identical with that of Sir Thomas Bodley (1545-1613) now in the Bodleian at Oxford; the elegant Chinese wall-paper in the Blue Drawing Room; the pictures and furnishings in the bedrooms; the series of portraits relating to Darnley, in the room bearing his name; and the extensive and famous collection of weapons, formed by M. François Renkin, of Liège, and acquired by the Leeds City Council a few years ago, in the two Armoury Rooms. The Gallery is the largest room in the house, and originally extended the full length of its north side, but was later reduced to its present dimensions—108ft. long, 29ft. wide, and 18ft. high. The ceiling is most elaborately decorated, thirteen roundels containing portrait busts of members of the Royal Family. *c.a.* 1745. A wonderful collection of pictures, by eminent English, French and Italian painters, is displayed on the walls. Mention may also be made of a large Chinese sacrificial bowl, dating back to about 200 B.C., and two smaller incense bowls, of Ming dynasty date. At one end of the Gallery is the Chapel, which is richly decorated. In accordance with one of the provisions of the deed of sale, a celebration of the Holy Communion

must be held here annually. The original Chapel was what is now the kitchen, the change having been made when this part of the house was re-modelled in 1796.

The opportunity of inspecting this stately house and its treasures was greatly appreciated. Many of the Brethren compared it, favourably, with Hampton Court, and expressed surprise that such a magnificent place was not more widely known, though it is visited by about a hundred thousand people yearly.

After dinner at the hotel, we made for the Masonic Hall, Great George Street (where many of the local Brethren had gathered), and were received by W. Bro. W. H. Maxwell Telling, P.Pr.G.W., the President of the Leeds Installed Masters' Association, who, when all had assembled in the Lodge Room, said he esteemed it a great privilege to have the pleasant task of extending a welcome, on behalf of the Association, to the Brethren of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge, who should be under no misapprehension as to its extreme cordiality. The welcome was a twofold one—welcome to them as Masons, and welcome to them as a Lodge distinguished and appreciated throughout the Masonic world on account of its magnificent record of work in Masonic research. He hoped they would have a good time in Leeds, that the arrangements made for their Outing would prove satisfactory, that they would find interest in the places to be visited, and that they would go away with pleasant recollections of their visit and the Association of which he was proud to be President.

W. Bro. Richard Gill, J.P., P.G.D., Deputy Provincial Grand Master of West Yorks., associated himself very heartily with the welcome extended by the President. He had also to be the mouthpiece of the Rt. W. the Provincial Grand Master, the Viscount Lascelles, K.G., D.S.O., P.G.W., who was absent owing to other duties, in welcoming the Lodge to the Province.

W. Bro. George Whittington, P.G.D., Assistant Provincial Grand Master, also joined in the welcome.

W. Bro. Rev. W. W. Covey-Crump, Asst.G.Chap., P.M. 2076, said it was his duty, in the temporary absence of the Master of the Lodge, to respond, though he could not do so in adequate words, to the very hearty welcome the members of the Lodge had received. It was a characteristic of Yorkshiremen that, whilst they did not say much, they always meant what they did say, and the cordiality of the words of welcome and fraternal greeting used on this occasion augured well for the enjoyment and success of the next two or three days. To many of them these Outings were almost a necessity, as, not only did they afford opportunities for meeting many Brethren from a distance, but a great deal of Masonic knowledge was acquired and disseminated, and those attending were able to exchange information, and discuss many important matters relating to the Craft.

The Brethren then dispersed to other parts of the building. Many of them spent a profitable time in the Library of the Province, where, by the kind permission of its chief officers, W. Bro. W. H. Bean, P.Pr.G.D., the Provincial G. Librarian, had arranged a special exhibition of MS. Constitutions, rare books, old Masonic clothing, jewels, furniture, glass and pictures. This included a selection from the collection of the eleven MSS. of the Old Charges and Constitutions owned by the Province, a list of which is given in the booklet already mentioned (*vide* Appendix).

A large collection of prints, photographs and drawings was displayed in the large Dining Room. Groups of Brethren were occupied most of the evening in examining and discussing the many rare and interesting exhibits.

In the small Dining Room ample opportunity was afforded for Conversation and Refreshment.

During the evening a short programme of music was performed by Bro. J. Lupton Whitelock (Flute) and Bro. Albert Jowett, Mus.Bach., Oxon., P.Pr.G.Org. (Pianoforte), of some of the latter Brother's own compositions; and



From a Water Colour Drawing by Bro. F. A. Powell.

RIPON.

Bro. Oliver E. Cookson sang several songs, which added considerably to the enjoyment of those present. The singing of the National Anthem at 10.30 p.m. terminated a really happy function.

FRIDAY, JUNE 21st.

The Brethren were astir betimes, welcomed by glorious sunshine, and commenced a long day's programme by a visit to Kirkstall Abbey, situated within the western boundary of the city, close to the banks of Aire. When the estates of the Earl of Cardigan, of which it formed part, were disposed of in 1890, the Abbey was purchased by the late Colonel J. T. North, of nitrate fame, and presented by him to the Corporation of Leeds. Needless to say, it is a highly valued possession of the citizens, and a considerable amount of money has been spent from time to time for the better preservation of the ruins, which, from their extent and condition, and the complete manner in which they illustrate the characteristic architecture of a Cistercian monastery, are only second to Fountains in importance.

Lieut.-Colonel E. Kitson Clark, T.D., M.A., F.S.A., &c., a well-known archæologist, who has made a special study of the monastic buildings of Yorkshire, met the party, and in the Cloister, in a most genial and lucid manner, related the history of the Abbey, pointing out the most interesting features of the surrounding buildings. In 1147, Henry de Lacy, being ill, vowed that on recovery he would build an abbey of the Cistercian order in honour of the B.V.M. Accordingly, he assigned land at Barnoldswick (on the borders of Yorkshire and Lancashire) to the Abbot of Fountains, for this purpose. The usual humble offices were there built, and on May 19th, 1147, the mother-house of Fountains sent forth Dom Alexander, a prior, who was ordained Abbot, with twelve monks and ten lay-brothers. Owing to the severity of the climate, the loss of their goods by raiders, and perhaps friction with the local clergy, it was found inadvisable to build the monastery there. The present site was discovered and secured, Alexander and his house removing here on May 19th, 1152. We read that "the Abbot, being a man of piety and prudence, watched with unwearying sagacity over the progress of his house in every direction." Also that "throughout Henry de Lacy stood by him, now providing the fruits of harvest, now supplying money as the needs of the establishment required. He had part in providing the buildings, laid with his own hand the foundations of the church, and himself completed the whole fabric at his own cost." Abbot Alexander died in 1182, and during his reign, we read further, "the buildings of Kirkstall were erected of stone and wood bought there, that is, the church and both dorters, to wit, of the monks and of the lay brothers, both their fraters, the cloister, the chapter house, and other offices necessary within the Abbey, and all these were covered excellently with tiles." With the object of providing suitable lodging for the lay-brothers during the building operations, the *cellarium* was the earliest erection, and the order of succeeding parts of the work of Alexander can be traced fairly well. The infirmary block and chapel, to the south, and the guest-house, west of the church, were not erected until about 1220, and various additions and alterations continued to be made down to the fifteenth century. These were mainly for convenience and increased accommodation, but they made very little difference in the original plan and arrangement of the buildings, so that we are left with an almost complete example of Cistercian architecture. After his illuminating address, Colonel Kitson Clark conducted us through the buildings, explaining the architectural details and describing the every-day life of the monks,—the devotional duties of the *fratres clerici* and the varied activities of the *fratres laici*.

The church itself is of striking proportions, both in height and width. The groining of the aisles remains, but all the other roofs are gone, as are those of the cloisters. It is over 224ft. long, over 118ft. wide from transept to transept, the width of the nave and aisles being over 62ft. The aisles are rather narrow, and are separated from the nave by eight massive and well-

preserved pillars of clustered columns. The east window is of great size, but all its tracery has gone. The original central tower was not much higher than the roof, in accordance with early Cistercian custom, but it was raised to a much greater height early in the sixteenth century. The Chapter House, which was enlarged in the fourteenth century, is of great interest, its roof being supported by two massive columns whence spring the arches of the groining.

The ruins have been scheduled as an "Ancient Monument," and recent excavations have revealed much more of the original plan, whilst work of restoration and preservation was seen in progress.

ADEL CHURCH.

Adel Church, dedicated to St. John Baptist, and situated in beautiful rural surroundings, was then visited, the party being welcomed by the Rector, Rev. Canon Postlethwaite. Assembling in the church, Colonel Kitson Clark again took charge, and described the building and its history. There is no record of the date of its erection, its simple plan might almost suggest Celtic influences: whilst some authorities date its building to about 1130, others to the time of Stephen, whose favourite emblem of a centaur shooting an arrow is carved on one of the capitals of the chancel arch, the architectural details point to a date about 1160, when Anglo-Norman architecture was in the height of its glory. It has an aisleless nave, and a short square-ended chancel. Humble in plan and rich in detail, although slight restorations have been made, in the main it stands as originally built. Its fine chancel arch and its magnificent south porch and doorway, with its remarkable contemporary bronze knocker, very like the sanctuary knocker of Durham Cathedral, give it a distinction not possessed by other churches of similar age and type.

In concluding his remarks, Colonel Kitson Clark said:—

The District in which the Members of the Quatuor Coronati are being welcomed is one that presents an interest both as to place and to period, from the age of prehistoric man to the record of Romans and the incidents of medieval and modern life.

Here in Adel Church we are but a few furlongs from a workshop in flints that must have been famous more than two thousand years B.C. It is a remarkable place for such a manufacture, at least seventy miles from the nearest flint-producing ground (east coast of Yorkshire), midway between the shores of Bridlington and those of Blackpool, no more than fifteen miles from the great South and North route which runs on the eastern side of the Pennine Range. It is clear that Adel is in a wonderfully central position, and that fact will account for the installation here of this, the earliest mechanical trade. The way hither across the great swamps of the Humber and Ouse trough was by no means easy. But we know by examination of the terrain and the discoveries of burial mounds and dropped implements that prehistoric man found a way on the tiny hills which are the spoil of the moraines left by the great glacier which once filled the Vale of York, laid where now Stamford, York and Tadcaster mark the crossings of the Derwent, Ouse and Wharfe.

Not only are prehistoric remains found here, but they point out the line on by Ilkley up to the high moors, and so across to the passes through the Pennine Range.

At Ilkley and above on the moors fabricated flints are found. On those moors also are the great stones on which prehistoric men carved representations of their tombs in "cup and ring" markings, or long stones were reared in circle arrangement at special points. There must therefore have been an important traffic by Adel and a sufficient population in this district to warrant such an installation as a flint manufacture. We are not surprised, therefore, to find here traces of Roman occupation, and we recognise that on this route, to which they had been directed

doubtless by the tracks of their predecessors, the Romans were further attracted by the massive gritstone. They found this strong material invaluable as footings under the more fragile limestone for the walls of York; and for the manufacture of their leaders' coffins.

Not far away is Leeds, where there stands, in the Parish Church, a cross of the tenth century A.D. At even less distance is Kirkstall, where there is the wonderful Cistercian Abbey completed in 1151. And here stands this little Church of Adel constructed of the same kind of stone as that desired by the Romans, as that which helped the Cistercians to teach their local adherents the masonry fit for their magnificent abbey. The Church of Adel is an expression of the simplest form of Christian Church, an aisleless nave and a chancel narrower than the nave, but Adel was free from the restriction against ornament, which has been noted earlier to-day at Kirkstall. The Porch was decorated with emblems of the Evangelists, of Our Lord in Glory and of the Agnus Dei. The Capitals of the small pillars are delightfully carved. Inside the church there are designs full of fancy and vigour presenting beasts of the Scandinavian fashion and depicting the Baptism of Our Lord and the Deposition from the Cross, with a boldness enforced on the sculptor by the stern material. There is cause for grievous regret that our modern atmosphere is working ruin on the figures outside and no known expedient will save these.

In the neighbourhood on the other side of the Wharfe stands Leathley, which you will visit later, earlier in foundation than Kirkstall or Adel, though now more changed. But its tower is marked by pre-Norman belfry windows, and the whole is distinguished by the beautiful picture at the hands of Turner a century ago.

In the story of your region of to-day Fountains has its connection. It was from Fountains as a mother that the monks first went who made a settlement at Barnoldswick far in the mountains westward, which was eventually transferred to Kirkstall. The surroundings at Fountains are even more easy than those of the valley in which Kirkstall is found. The abbey developed in greater wealth, but the basis of its life and worship and service of the monks and the lay-brothers was in every way the same for both monasteries.

Starting from Adel and proceeding west along the trail, in Ilkley we find another Roman route with a fort at Wharfe crossing. This way joined in from Manchester and was the way the Romans took to attack the hitherto undefeated Yorkshiremen or Brigantes as we then were called. We ruled at that time (as we should) most of the North of England.

Aldborough in some measure seems to sum it up. There you will find prehistoric implements, Roman buildings of useful, ornamental and military character, a beautiful medieval church with one of the most famous brasses in England, a village that in later days has produced great classical scholars. A whole history seems to be epitomized in this charming Yorkshire village, and perhaps we may ask in all modesty that you find in the tale some exemplification of the independence on which Yorkshiremen are supposed to pride themselves, for it is supposed that at Aldborough Queen Cartismandua held her court. She was one of the last tribal heads to treat with, hold out against, fight and beat and be beaten by the invading Roman power.

Unfortunately, business engagements necessitated Colonel Clark taking leave of the party, but not before its deep gratitude had been expressed to him for the pleasure and instruction which he had afforded. The Rector also was thanked for his presence and guidance. Before leaving Adel, various objects from the site of the adjacent Roman settlement, *Burgodunum*, were inspected.

A drive of several miles through beautiful country then followed, during which we passed Farnley Hall, an Elizabethan mansion, noted for its association with J. M. W. Turner, who was a frequent visitor. Many of his paintings portrayed local scenery, and there is a collection of about 150 of his works in the house, also a number of relics of Cromwell and Fairfax.

A call was made at Leathley Church, prettily situated near the junction of Wharfe and Washburn. At the entrance gates are the Village Stocks, with *five* holes, and nearby is the shaft of the old Village Cross. The most interesting feature of the church is its ancient tower, generally considered to be of Saxon workmanship. One authority claims that its windows and lights "are certainly not later than 1100." The tower is square in plan, massively constructed, the wall on the western side being about fifty inches in thickness. Internally, the tower arch has been closed up, but the greater part of an old door remains, the woodwork of which is almost covered by unusually fine iron work, in the form of elaborately foliated stanchions and hinges, the design suggesting that of the crosses and tombs of late Saxon or early Norman age. The arches of the nave are pointed, and rest on octagonal columns, which may date from 1300 to 1400. The capitals are of unusual form, and decorated with interesting symbols, including the *tau* cross, the crescent, and the fetterlock, the two latter being badges of the Percies, early patrons of the church. The chancel arch is undoubtedly early Norman. The list of rectors dates back to 1230, and the register to 1673. We were welcomed by the Rector, W. Bro. the Rev. R. Rogers, who pointed out the features of this interesting old church, and was thanked for doing so.

The route was continued through some of the most beautiful scenery imaginable, up the Washburn Valley, with its three reservoirs, Lindley Wood, Swinsty, and Fewston, the first for compensation purposes, the others for storage, all completed about fifty years ago, for the water supply of Leeds. Since then Nature has effaced most of the artificial aspect, and these sheets of water sparkled as gems, in the summer sunshine, amongst the bright verdure of this attractive valley. During the past few years, the Corporation has planted over a thousand acres of the slopes with trees, to form a protective belt to the reservoirs, and it practically owns all the farms in the valley, so as to control the drainage with a view to preventing contamination of the water.

Passing through the villages of Fewston and Blubberhouses (on Watling Street), we drove over Blubberhouses Moor, where the scenery changes to a wilder type, rough heather-clad moorland, the home of the grouse and sheep. The great weathered masses of Millstone Grit add to the grandeur of the landscape. Reaching about 1,000ft. above O.D., the road gradually descends into Wharfedale again, crossing the river by Bolton Bridge. With appetites whetted by the moorland air, the Brethren welcomed luncheon at the Devonshire Arms, a noted hostelry, nearby.

After refreshment, further delights awaited the party. Entering the grounds by the "Hole in the Wall," a magnificent view presents itself, BOLTON PRIORY, in a setting unsurpassed by any other English monastery. It has been made famous by Turner and other artists, and has been described by Ruskin in a passage of great beauty. It was a Priory of Augustinian canons, first founded at Embsay, a few miles away, about 1120, and removed to its present site about the middle of the same century, when the buildings were commenced, various additions being made down to as late as 1520. The ruins, though not as extensive and imposing as others in Yorkshire, are of great interest, and recent excavations have added to our knowledge of their original plan. The nave is used as the Parish Church, and the gatehouse, fourteenth century, is part of Bolton Hall, one of the residences of the Duke of Devonshire, to whom the estate belongs, and who has often entertained H.M. the King here for the grouse shooting, for which the surrounding moors are famous.

Driving up the dale, passing the memorial to the late Lord Frederick Cavendish, amidst the most lovely scenery, BARDEN TOWER was reached. It was probably built in the fourteenth century, as one of a series of 'pele towers' as a defence against the raids of the Scots. It was enlarged, or re-built, by Henry, 10th Lord Clifford, in 1485, as a residence. He was known as the Shepherd Lord, from the romantic story of his having been brought up by a shepherd, in Cumberland, after his father had been deprived of his estate on the downfall of the Lancastrian cause in the Wars of the Roses. On the final triumph of the cause, the family estates were restored to him, and he lived here for many years, preferring its seclusion, only leaving his retirement to lead the men of Craven (as this part of the county is called) at the battle of Flodden. The story of the Shepherd Lord is used by Wordsworth in his "Song at the Feast of Brougham Castle." This family was long connected with the history of the district. The subsequent history of the Tower is recorded in an inscription above the doorway.

Leaving Wharfedale, and passing over a somewhat wild country, we arrived at SKIPTON, the capital of Craven, famous for its Castle, though time did not permit an inspection of it, but the gatehouse was seen in passing. Little of the original fortress remains. It was re-built by the first Lord Clifford in the early part of the fourteenth century, and restored and extended by the Shepherd Lord in the early sixteenth. He died in 1524, and under his son, Henry, first Earl of Cumberland, the castle played a part in the Pilgrimage of Grace, being attacked by the insurgents. It was damaged by siege in the Civil War, which ended its history as a fortress, and, as they now exist, as a residence, the buildings are a good example of the transition from military to domestic architecture.

A drive of some miles over the watershed between Aire and Wharfe brought us again into the vale of the latter, to ILKLEY (*Olicanum*), a pleasant little town, a favourite place of residence of Leeds and Bradford people. It has some large hydropathic establishments, and considerable fame as a holiday resort, situate as it is in such glorious surroundings. W. Bro. Stanley Downs, W.M., and several Brethren of Olicana Lodge, 1522, welcomed us, and, after showing us their Masonic Rooms, accompanied us to the Parish Church, in the inspection of which W. Bro. Seaman acted as guide. It is built on ground which was formerly occupied by the Roman fortress, many remains of which have been found at times, and some of the stones are built into the tower: two of these, inscribed altars, have been taken out, and are now in the church. It has a very fine arched doorway (Norman), but the Saxon crosses, in the churchyard, are its most interesting features, with their elaborate carvings of scroll-work, men, birds and animals. The list of incumbents dates back to 1242. On the rocks exposed on the adjacent Rombalds Moor, many examples of 'cup and ring' markings have been found. Some of these are preserved near St. Margaret's Church, and were inspected with interest. These markings usually take the form of cup-shaped hollows, around which are carved one or more rings. Similarly marked stones have been found over a very wide area—Scotland, France, Scandinavia, and eastward to India, Thibet, and the Fiji Islands, but they appear to be more numerous on Rombald's Moor than elsewhere. They are, unquestionably, of human workmanship, but their meaning and purpose have never been satisfactorily explained. One authority supposes them to be "plans of camps": another to be "symbolic—most probably of religious ideas": another that they are connected with funeral rites: whilst it has been contended that they have some astronomical significance, or even had something to do with a game. They are supposed to date from the Bronze Age, but, in the absence of direct evidence, these various markings remain among the unsolved problems of antiquity.

Leeds was reached in time for dinner, after which a large number of the Brethren proceeded to the Masonic Hall, in Carlton Hill, where they were given

a very cordial welcome by W. Bro. J. Stancliff, W.M., and W. Bro. H. Peckitt, P.Pr.G.D., of the Lodge of Fidelity, 289, founded in 1792. Reference to the history of this famous old Lodge is made in the paper which was read on the Saturday evening by our W.M. It has in its possession a large collection of old Minute Books, engravings, books, photographs, aprons, jewels, and furniture, which had been laid out for inspection, and was described by W. Bro. Peckitt. The columns, gavels, working-tools, and other furniture still in use date back to the commencement of the Lodge, and the seal was designed and obtained in 1793. Some early Certificates, with the seal attached, were seen. The beauty and design of the jewels of the officers, worn by them since 1792, were admired greatly. That of the Tyler—the trowel—was lost, but has since been found and restored to use. The Bible (1588 edition), still in use, was purchased in 1817. The silver Square and Compasses were obtained at the same time, and in 1819 the Derrick, of unique design, still in the Lodge Room. Amongst the large collection of portraits of distinguished members of the Lodge were noticed those of Rt. Hon. John Lord Viscount Pollington, Pr.G.M. of West Yorks, 1822-1860 (afterwards Earl of Mexborough); the Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies Jackson, M.P., Prov.G.M. of West Yorks, 1893-1914 (afterwards Lord Allerton); Chas. Lee, Dep.Pr.G.M. of West Yorks, 1828-1856; Rd. Wilson, Pr.G.M. of West Yorks, 1914-1918. Also those of three members of the Lodge, still taking active part in its work, who have celebrated their Masonic jubilee—W. Bros. D. R. Glover, Joseph Dobson, and Wm. Greaves. Some of our experts were able to furnish valuable information about some of the objects exhibited. Time was all too short for the inspection of such a wonderful array of material. After partaking of the hospitality of the W.M., W. Bro. Poole, Master of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge, voiced the gratitude of those present.

SATURDAY, JUNE 22ND.

Summer sunshine, after an early shower, again welcomed us, and we made an early start for Knaresborough, passing Harewood House, the seat of the Harewood family, along Harewood Avenue, a gorgeous avenue of great trees, with magnificent views across Wharfedale, through the ancient market town of Wetherby, crossing Wharfe by a fine old bridge, by Ribson Park, the supposed birthplace of the Ribston Pippin apple. On arrival at Knaresborough Castle, we were welcomed by W. Bro. W. Wilkinson, W.M., Knaresborough Priory Lodge, 4171, and several of the Brethren, the W.M. generously presenting us with a Guide Book, in a specially printed cover, as a souvenir of the occasion. W. Bro. Lea Arnold then took charge, and, after pointing out various distant objects of interest, conducted us over the Castle, which is situated in a strong defensive position on the north bank of Nidd, which here flows through a deep well-wooded gorge. Little is known of the early history of the Castle or its builders. The first authentic record is in a Pipe Roll, 1130. Eustace Fitz John resided here in 1133. In 1170 the four Knights who slew Thomas à Becket took refuge in the castle, and remained for some months. There were many changes in the lordship of the castle and manor until it was granted to Philippa, Queen of Edward III., who died in 1369. Three years later the King gave it to his third son, John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, and ever since the manor and castle have belonged to that Duchy. The ruins extend over an area of about two acres, and consist of part of the keep and a few dilapidated arches and semi-circular buttresses in the Decorated style. The walls were flanked with eleven towers, part of the principal one still remaining. It formerly consisted of three stories above the dungeon, the lower one being the Record Room, adjoining which is the Guard Room, with a vaulted roof supported by two massive pillars. Near this was the principal entrance to the castle, the outer gate having been defended by a portcullis and drawbridge. The second storey was the State Room, or King's Chamber. The walls of the dungeon are of hewn stone, the roof being arched with stone, supported by twelve arches, springing from a circular pillar 9½ft. in circumference, the only

one of its kind in England. Comparatively little of the ruins of this one-time great fortress still remains, but it is satisfactory to know that great care is being taken of the remnants, and excavations made during recent years have revealed more of its plan, also a subterranean passage 71ft. long, leading from the castle yard into the moat. The view from the castle is most picturesque, "Knaresborough from the Castle Hill" furnishing a subject for many artists in oil and water colours.

After thanking the Knaresborough Brethren, the journey was resumed to Aldborough, a village standing upon the site of Iseur, the chief city in the north of the Brigantes. After the conquest of southern England by the Romans, they worked their way northwards, and by A.D. 78 Agricola had extended his territory as far as the Solway and Tyne, making *Eboracum* (York) the capital of the North in place of Iseur, which, however, continued to be a place of importance, receiving the name of *Isurium* or *Isubrigantium*—the *Isurium* of the Brigantes. All trace of many of the Roman remains found in earlier years has been lost, and it was not until 1830 that Mr. Andrew Lawson, of Aldborough Manor, made a systematic collection of the various coins, pottery, etc., as well as excavations, consulting some of the leading archaeologists of the day. The late Mr. Andrew G. Lawson carried on excavations up to 1913, and many foundations of houses were found, showing that the city walls, which surround an area of about sixty acres, contained a densely populated city with houses in close proximity to each other. Further excavations were made in 1924, when the northern gateway was discovered, also the road leading northwards to *Cataractonium* (Catterick), whence it eventually led to the Roman Wall. The foundations of many of the buildings show unmistakable signs of destruction by fire.

A visit was first paid to the Museum, in which are preserved most of the Roman relics. Its floor is composed partly of tessellated pavements. On the walls are wall paintings found in 1830 when excavating the baths. In the cases are numerous specimens of rings, chains, brooches, buttons, bracelets, bronze figures of animals, glass beads, coins of all Emperors from Claudius, A.D. 41-54 down to Valentinian II., 383-392: various objects made of bone, others of iron, including a Roman spade: many examples of pottery, including earthenware lamps, jugs, vases, tiles, and Samian ware. There were also six cinerary urns, containing ashes of human bones which were found just without the walls, along with one made of lead.

Several tessellated pavements have been found, the finest ones on the west side of the city. All traces of some of these have been lost, but there still remain seven, *in situ*: five are preserved, but not *in situ*, and there is a fine specimen figuring Romulus and Remus with the Wolf, in the Leeds City Museum. Three of the pavements form the floor of the so-called Basilica (Professor Haverfield considered it a Roman villa). One of them bears an inscription in Greek letters, of doubtful meaning. Such inscriptions are exceedingly rare in Britain. A figure draped in long flowing robes, the head and shoulders missing, is depicted in this pavement. There are two fine square pavements, well preserved, in the garden of the Aldeburgh Arms. One shows a panther or leopard reclining beneath a tree, the other an eight-pointed star on a white ground, surrounded by an elaborate border. Other pavements are known, but are not exhibited.


Lady Lawson-Tancred, of Aldborough Manor, who takes great interest in the Roman City, had hoped to meet us and act as guide, but, much to her regret, found it impossible. She had, however, instructed her head gardener to act in her stead, especially to show the city walls and gateways in the private grounds of the Manor House. Most of those present secured a copy of a lucid and interesting Guide Book, written by her ladyship, from which these notes are culled.

The Unicorn at Ripon was the next place of call, where we were welcomed by W. Bro. M. G. Hardcastle, W.M., De Grey and Ripon 837: W. Bro. C. H. Moody, D.Mus., F.S.A., P.G.Org., and Brethren of the Lodge. A brief interval

after luncheon was spent by some of the party in getting a glimpse of the Cathedral, an ancient pile, the crypt of which, built by St. Wilfrid, Ripon's Patron Saint, still remains beneath the eastern end of the nave. The church possesses many interesting architectural features, but time did not permit of their being studied, as the afternoon had been set apart for an inspection of Fountains Abbey, the most remarkable ruin of a medieval monastery in this, or, perhaps, any other country. We were indeed fortunate in having W. Bro. Moody to act as guide. In a perambulation of the ruins, which occupied almost two hours, he explained the history of the buildings and the purposes for which they were used. He appeared to know almost every stone, and his knowledge of the monastery and the daily life of its inmates, so genially and lucidly imparted, charmed those present, who will long remember their visit to this magnificent ruin. Before he hurried away to his duties at the Cathedral, W. Bro. Moody was thanked most heartily for the pleasure and instruction he had so generously given us. He has been good enough to write the following notes:—

Fountains Abbey, the largest monastic ruin in Great Britain, is delightfully situated in the valley of the Skell, some three miles from the ancient Cathedral city of Ripon. It was founded by monks who had seceded from the Benedictine Abbey of St. Mary, York, in 1132, and is therefore approaching its eight hundredth anniversary. The Cistercian Order, to which it was attached, had been in existence exactly thirty years when the first English branch was founded at Waverley in 1128. Cistercian monks laid no claim to great learning, but they were expert agriculturists, and in the thirteenth century were the greatest wool merchants in England. It is certain that the foundation of Yorkshire's woollen industry was laid in the eight Cistercian monasteries of the county, and it is equally certain that the beauty of the landscape in which those monasteries are planted is due to the labour and skill of the monks who lived in them. "These monks knew how to choose a site" is a phrase which is frequently on the lips of visitors. As a matter of fact, they took what was given them. Fountains was built in a wild and desolate valley. Byland was a swamp, and so forth. It was the monk who made the wilderness blossom as a rose. Industry, with him, was second in importance only to the frequent service of prayer and praise. *Laborare est orare* was a solemn adjunct to the usual vows of Poverty, Chastity, and Obedience. The popular idea of monkish excesses may be correct in a few isolated cases. Normally the Cistercian monk rose at 2 a.m., when the first office of the day was sung in the Abbey Church. This was followed by no fewer than six other offices before nightfall. During the daytime, and between these offices their hands were employed in a variety of ways. The regular monks carried on the exacting routine of the monastery, while the lay-brothers tilled the land, reared great flocks of sheep, made roads, and in a hundred-and-one ways made this England a pleasanter place for their successors to live in. The nave and transepts of Fountains, completed before 1200, are typical examples of Cistercian severity. The thirteenth-century Choir is an illuminating commentary on Cistercian evolution, as is also the noble tower, which was added nearly three hundred years later. But the chief glory of Fountains is the unique Cellarium, over three hundred feet long, and vaulted throughout in stone. Above this was the dormitory of the lay-brothers. The Calefactorium, or Warming House, and the Muniment Room above it are still intact, but the inner walls of the Cloister were destroyed, apparently in the eighteenth century, to enable the then owner to make a kitchen garden there! The inner walls of the Chapter House show a profusion of Masons' marks. Fountains Abbey must be accounted one of the most alluring ruins, not merely of England, but of Europe. Here we may trace the simplicity and complexity of Cistercian aims, and grasp in some

ARS QUATUOR CORONATORUM.



Photograph by *Yorkshire Post*.


BOLTON PRIORY.




Block kindly lent by the Thoresby Society.

SCREEN, ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, LEEDS.

ARS QUATUOR CORONATORUM.




Block kindly lent by Messrs. Jowett and Sowry, Ltd.
TEMPLE NEWSAM.



Block kindly lent by Bro. W. H. Bean.

KIRKSTALL ABBEY.

ARS QUATUOR CORONATORUM.



Block kindly lent by Bro. W. H. Bean.

KIRKSTALL ABBEY.





ADEL CHURCH: SOUTH PORCH.



Block kindly lent by Bro. W. Wilkinson.

KNARESBOROUGH.

ARS QUATUOR CORONATORUM.



From Photographs by Walter Scott. Bradford.
FOUNTAINS ABBEY.

degree the magnitude of the obligations under which they laid a not always appreciative posterity.

After a glimpse of Fountains Hall, a fine Elizabethan building, most likely built of stones from the adjacent Abbey, the return journey was made to Leeds, by way of Harrogate.

After dinner the visiting Brethren were 'At Home' to the local Brethren and members of the Leeds Installed Masters' Association, at the Hotel Metropole, and a very pleasant evening was spent. The local Brethren initiated their visitors into the correct method of singing "On Ilkla Moor baht 'at." and also contributed to the harmony of the evening with several other musical items.

The W.M., Bro. Rev. H. Poole, read the following paper:—

A SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF MASONRY IN LEEDS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

Once outside London, the Masonic Antiquary turns naturally to Yorkshire for features of Masonic interest, for two reasons. In the first place, whatever we may make of the allusion to York in the old MS. Constitutions, or "Old Charges," it cannot be denied that there is abundant evidence of Masonic activity in that city long before the foundation of our Grand Lodge in 1717. And secondly, no single county, with the possible exception of Lancashire, has associated with it either so many copies, or so many different texts, of these Old Charges. I have long been convinced that if our history is ever completely written, it will be found to centre round some spot in the north rather than in the south of England—York, perhaps, rather than London.

And yet, when I started to gather material for a short paper on matters of Masonic interest in and around Leeds, I was surprised to find how little early material is available of which one can speak with any certainty. And here let me state my deep obligation to Bro. W. R. Makins, of Grand Lodge Library, for putting me in touch with most of the facts which I am able to put before you this evening.

First, as to the Old Charges. Of the copies at present known, no less than sixteen are more or less definitely associated with Yorkshire, representing ten varieties of text. One of the most recent finds was that of the Boyden MS. (D.g. 44), which was purchased by an American somewhere in the North Riding.

Of the magnificent collection now located in Leeds, in the Library of the Prov. Grand Lodge, no less than five, and perhaps more, are probably of Yorkshire origin. I do not propose to say any more about these; they have already been exhibited to the Brethren, and, so far as I know, there are no specially Yorkshire features to be observed in them.

Leeds is unfortunately devoid of all references to Operative Masonry, whether Municipal or otherwise. Though a flourishing town for many centuries—so that it had a staple trade in "clothing" as early as the reign of Henry VIII.—it appears to have had only one old Church, and that was demolished in about 1838, to make way for the larger Parish Church which is still standing. Consequently we have not even a selection of mediæval Masons' Marks from which, perhaps, to reconstruct. Of much greater interest are the Templar Marks, some of which have no doubt been seen by some of the Brethren here; but I cannot regard them as having any bearing on Masonry. Within the Borough there are no records of any sort of Trade Companies or Gilds, though it is very unlikely indeed that no such existed. There is thus no Masonic history whatever for the period anterior to Grand Lodge.

The earliest known reference to Masonry at Leeds is to be found in a newspaper of 1721:—"On New Years Day last at *Leedes* was a

meeting of the Antient and Honourable Society of Freemasons; and at *Pontefract* that Day 7 Night was another, where several neighbouring Gentlemen were admitted; the *Lodge* consisting of about thirty Persons in Number, walk'd to several of their Brothers Houses, having on white Gloves and Aprons, Musick before them, &c. Afterwards returning to the Gallery of the Lodge Room, they drank the *King, Prince, &c.* with the Earl of *Pontefract* and other loyal Healths, Money was thrown to the Croud by Handfuls, and the Night concluded with Illuminations, &c." (*Leeds Mercury*, 16th Jan., 1721.)

It is impossible to determine whether these meetings were held by local Lodges, or by the old York Lodge. We have more or less detailed records of meetings of the latter at Scarborough and Bradford; but Bro. Makins, who is probably better qualified than anyone else to express an opinion on the subject, considers that "when the old York Lodge paid its visit to Bradford in 1713, it was for the purpose of founding a Lodge there, being the nearest Town to the seat of the then Grand Master or 'President,' Sir Walter Hawkesworth," and that there may well have been Lodges at Leeds and Pontefract with similar origins.

Leeds can, however, boast that it was the third town in Yorkshire to start work under the regularly organized Grand Lodge, the two earlier towns being Scarborough (1729) and Halifax (1738), while the first Leeds Lodge was founded in 1754. Thereafter, with only a break of four years, which actually was not without its Masonic activities, between 1786 and 1790, Leeds can show a complete continuity; and after the latter date a record of steady prosperity. Indeed, it is perhaps due to the steady prosperity—as well as to the loyalty of Leeds to the 'Modern' Grand Lodge—that we owe the absence of special features of interest. Here there was no Lodge under the 'Grand Lodge of All England', such as Scarborough had; nor any Lodge under the 'Antients', whose chief supporters in the county were Hull and Sheffield.

There was, however, in Leeds a Lodge of even greater interest than these, as it was possibly unique—an entirely unauthorised Lodge of French Prisoners of War. This appears to have been originally formed at Basingstoke (Hants) in about 1756; later the bulk of the members were moved to Petersfield, and finally to Leeds in about 1759. While at Basingstoke they applied for authority to the Grand Lodge of England; but owing to the uncertainty of their movements they could not face the necessary expense of a Constitution. Again at Petersfield they seem to have approached Grand Lodge, but received no reply. However, their activities continued both there and later at Leeds, until they returned to France in 1763. It is interesting to know that these activities were not confined to French Prisoners, as it appears that local men were initiated in the Lodge, some of whom were not regarded with favour by the regular Lodges. This French Prisoners Lodge was the earliest of which anything is known; and, with the sole exception of one which met at York from 1762-3 under a Warrant from the Grand Lodge of All England, the only such Lodge known to have met in this county during the eighteenth century.

In the notes which follow, and which represent an attempt to sketch the history of Freemasonry in Leeds to the end of the eighteenth century, I have not a great deal to add to what was brought forward by the Authors of the history of the Lodge of Fidelity, in 1894; but I am in hope that there are some here who are not familiar with the early Masonic history of Leeds.

The earliest regular Lodge to be formed was the Parrot, in 1754. Practically no details are available as to the earliest members; the first return to Grand Lodge must have been considerably later than the formation of the Lodge, as it contains the names of only two members 'made' before 1761—namely Thos. Wallbank and Jos. Lorance, both

initiated in 1754, and the latter afterwards expelled for "bad behaviour to the Lodge." The Parrot Lodge had only a short life: for in 1771 the Master, Thos. Atkinson, writes to the Grand Secretary that the Lodge had been on the decline for several years: "and for this two Years past there has not been above three Members or four at the most and for the last year only the Master, but however as the Landlord at the Parrot who was a Brother is lately dead, we have six of us who was formerly members have agreed to meet regularly again . . . and to remove to the 'Ship.' So low had the state of the affairs of the Lodge sunk that its furniture had been taken over by a junior Lodge — the Golden Lion — "who had advanced money thereon, but on the condition of returning it, if the Members of the Parrot Lodge should think proper to open again, and repay the money advanced." We have no evidence as to whether this was done: but the revival must have been only a spasm, and the Lodge was erased five years later (1776).

This junior Lodge, the Golden Lion, had been formed in 1761. The correspondence relating to the formation has several features of interest. The Petition, which seems to have been drawn up on 12th Nov., 1760, was signed by eleven Brethren, who describe themselves as "more than a Competent Number to form a Lodge and make it perfect

(amongst which there are some invested with



Degree, to

which we think you are not Strangers)" and it concludes with the words

"Greeting you by 3 times 3 and



Cherished and known to

the Enlightened mortals only." I am not prepared to express an opinion as to the significance of this very curious feature: but I do think it worth while to add here that this Lodge was, or held, a 'Masters' Lodge. The Minute of the preliminary meeting records the decision to meet on the second Wednesday: but the engraved lists from 1762 onwards show the Lodge as holding a 'Masters Lodge' on the fourth Wed. as well.

The Warrant was dated 8th Jan., 1761: and on the 12th a most interesting letter of thanks to the Grand Lodge was drafted. This is given in full in the history of Fidelity: it contains a good deal of detail as to the state of Masonry in Leeds at the time, and, among other matters, gives some account of the French Prisoners Lodge, which was then working. The same letter hints that the affairs of the Parrot Lodge were not quite as they should be.

The membership of this Lodge seems to have been carefully scrutinized; for in 1770 James Heseltine, G.Sec., writes to Bro. Horace Cataneo (one of the 'founders') :—

" . . . Your maxim of not admitting Members or making M—ns for unworthy Considerations is very laudable, and will ever insure the approbation of the G. L. You by that means exclude Men from your Assemblies, who would be a disgrace to the Society, And tho' you may not be very numerous, the Company will be agreeable, Besides you would not wish to have among you Men, whose circumstances would be affected by the Expences of an Evenings Entertainment, were that the case, a short period would evince the pernicious tendency of it: and you would have the Mortification to see a Society, founded upon the noblest

principles, instrumental to the ruin of Individuals, contrary to every maxim of the Order . . ."

Perhaps partly through its exclusiveness, this Lodge evidently fell on bad times, and it was erased in 1786. But, as in the case of the Parrot, there seems to have been an attempt at a revival: for as late as 1788 John Eyre, the Master, writes to the G.Sec.:—

"We the under written were The Master and Secretary of the Lodge No. 205 lately held at the Golden Lion Inn in this Town but on account of the Death removal and Non attendance of nearly the whole of the Members thereof we found ourselves under the very disagreeable necessity of closing the same untill a favourable opportunity offered of again opening the same"—I pause to throw out the question, Is it possible that these phrases, 'open the same' and 'close the same' could be an echo from the Royal Arch?—"which has now offer'd by applications from a Number of regular and worthy Brethren who were not before Members of our Lodge & therefore we most respectfully solicit your advice and instruction respecting our future proceedings therein being desirous to be reestablish'd & put upon the same Footing we were before the closing of the said Lodge trusting with the assistance of our Grand Architect that we shall hereafter be enabled to work & carry on the same in such manner as may be most satisfactory to the Mother Lodge of all England . . ."

No reply seems to have been made to this letter: but as a new Lodge was formed two years later, it is not unlikely that its formation was a practical solution of the problem. It is probably idle to speculate on the identities of the "regular and worthy Brethren who were not before Members of our Lodge": but there may well have been a few surviving members of the Parrot. James Richardson, who also signs the letter, is, I think, the only certain link in the Masonic continuity of the town, as he was an early member, if not a founder, of the next Lodge to be formed.

This was the Loyal and Prudent, which was formed in 1790, and lasted for just over forty years, having been erased in 1832. This Lodge, which initiated no less than sixteen Brethren during its first two years of activity, was for some time without a 'number.' Meeting originally under a "Warrant of Constitution granted us by the Provincial Grand Lodge at York," it was later granted a "regular Constitution . . . by the same Lodge": but as late as Dec., 1791, the Secretary, James Richardson, is found complaining of the discourtesy of both G.L. and Prov.G.L., and the delay in providing a number for the Constitution, as, he says, "many of our Members have been refus'd admittance into other Lodges for want of it."

An interesting incident involving a member of this Lodge is referred to in a letter in the Grand Lodge files, in which two Brethren from Harrogate write to the G.Sec.:—

" . . . The matter is briefly this, a Mr. Hotchon [*sic*] of Leeds who is a mason, has or had in his possession a manuscript of the lectures belonging the three degrees of Masonry, as well as one also of the fourth or degree of Royal Arch which he has got for the purpose of teaching an intended Lodge & Chapter at Leeds, and that he procured them from the Provincial Lodge at York or some one or more of its Members.

"Wither it is masonic to commit any thing of this kind to writing we submit to your superior judgement, and can only say if not will do any thing in our power to bring the offenders forward that they may receive a severe reprimand for their imprudence. If on the contrary we humbly hope your goodness will attribute this to our Zeal for the cause and bury it where the secrets of all worthy Masons lay . . ."

The Bro. Hodgson referred to heads the list of members of both the Loyal and Prudent and the Alfred Lodges, and was also a member of Fidelity.¹

The next three Lodges, all founded before the end of the eighteenth century, are in existence to-day. It would be out of place if I attempted even to sketch their histories: I shall confine myself to a few details of interest in their earliest days.

The first was the Lodge of Fidelity, now No. 289, formed in 1792. No details are available as to the petition: but all the founders were Leeds men initiated at Halifax or Keighley, and it looks as if they had intended from the outset to form a new Lodge. Bro. John Smithson, a P.M. of Newtonian Lodge, Knaresborough, was present as a visitor at the first meeting, and shortly after became a joining member; and the authors of the history of Fidelity suggest that he was there to look after things, all the founders being quite 'young' Masons. In this connection I cannot help recalling that in the very same year the Lodge at Kendal invited a Bro. M. Mennell of the same Lodge (Newtonian, Knaresborough) to come to Kendal and give instruction in Masonry, and paid him five guineas for his services, besides his expenses. Is it possible that the Newtonian Lodge at that time had a reputation for its 'ritual'? This Bro. Mennell, by the way, was one of the two signatories of the letter which I have already quoted referring to the MSS. of the lectures.

In the next few years the Fidelity Chapter—the earliest in Leeds—was opened (1793)²: Philanthropic Lodge was formed on the petition of seven Brethren all initiated in Fidelity (1794), and the Alfred Lodge a year later (1795). In this latter year an interesting Lodge of Instruction was instituted, nominally under the auspices of Fidelity, but in fact practically an independent body, to which Masons from far and wide repaired for instruction.

A number of 'daughters' have sprung from Fidelity, probably the most interesting being the Nelson of the Nile, now No. 264, at Batley, formed in 1801. This Lodge met originally under a Dispensation from the Prov. Grand Lodge; but as, under the provisions of the Secret Societies Act of 1799, no new Warrants could be issued, the three Leeds Lodges which were promoting the formation of the new Lodge busied themselves in attempting to obtain a dormant Warrant. Enquiries at Skipton and Scarborough seem to have proved fruitless: and ultimately the Warrant of the Alfred Lodge at Wetherby was 'generously given up' to them. This, however, turned out to be of no value, as the Lodge was extinct, and not dormant, having been erased in 1797. Further enquiries, on the advice of the G.Sec., resulted in their securing the Warrant of the Lodge of Honour and Perseverance, at Cockermouth, dated 1788, which was transferred to Batley during the year 1803.

Two other Yorkshire Lodges formed in the next few years similarly received dormant warrants; and in each case the Lodge of Fidelity had the honour of performing the 'Consecration,' Grand Lodge being opened in due form by the W.M. of Fidelity as Grand Master, with almost all the acting Grand Officers furnished by the Lodge.

Here I must leave the history of Fidelity.

¹ He joined on December 15th, 1794. The Lodge removed to his Academy on December 12th of the year, under which date the Minutes record that the room "was dedicated to the Most High God, with prayer, psalms, and a lecture by Bro. Hodgson, Orator."—E.H.

² This was the earliest *working* Chapter in Leeds, but the Chapter of Unity, 72, was warranted in 1790, though there is no record of its meeting until 1796. The foresaid Bro. Hodgson is the first member on the list, under date January 12th, 1790 (*pre* Warrant), his name being followed by Unanimity of Wakefield, although there does not appear to have been a R.A.C. connected with the old Lodge. Unity Chapter changed its name to Alfred in 1819.—E.H.

Meanwhile the Philanthropic Lodge, now No. 304, had been formed in 1794, to meet the growing needs of Masonry in Leeds. For the first few years its story reveals little of special interest; but it is worth recording that in 1795 a resolution was passed that two Brethren, who were evidently selected by the Lodge, "Should go to York for instructions in the third step of Masonry, and that at the Lodge expence." But I must just go outside my period to refer to one early incident, not without its interest, in 1801: when, on the occasion of a proposal for a change of premises (so often a cause of dissension!), a split occurred, as a result of which one party secured the original Dispensation of the Lodge, while the other party got the Warrant, and both parties continued to meet for a year as separate bodies. The party with the Dispensation seem to have continued to "meet and make as usual"; but, as James Smith, the W.M., writes to the G.Sec., "we on the contrary although authorized by the Warrant of Constitution do not presume to make any, (though many worthy and respectable candidates have offered themselves) until the Grand Lodge acquaint us with their direction."

Travelling Brethren presented the usual problem in the late eighteenth century, and 'relief' took a very proper place in the Masonry of Leeds in those early times; but I think that the Philanthropic Lodge is very likely unique in a suggestion found among the Minutes of 1794—"That there might be some travelling Bros. that was very bright in the science of Masonry, whereby we might gain instruction." Two measures were taken, or proposed, to deal with the difficulty of 'duplicate' applications for relief: in 1794 it was proposed that Loyal and Prudence, Fidelity and Philanthropic should each undertake the duties of giving relief for four months in the year. And in 1797 the latter two Lodges, "being desirous of preventing imposition, and that we may not be deceived in the dispensing our charity, that we may not be betrayed in the tenderness of benevolence," formed a joint committee representing both Lodges, which was the origin of the present Masonic Charity Organisation of Leeds.¹

One other Lodge formed in the eighteenth century requires a word. This was the Alfred Lodge, now No. 306, formed by nine or perhaps ten members of Fidelity, who resigned their membership owing to some slight difference on financial matters. A dispensation to form a new Lodge was granted to them by the Prov.G.M. in 1795. So far as I can find out, there was no great animosity over this secession; and the Lodges at Leeds have ever since worked with a very commendable harmony.

So ends a very brief sketch of eighteenth century Masonry in Leeds. I can only hope that the Brethren present, even the Leeds Brethren, may have found something of interest in it, and may not pronounce it as 'not brief enough.'

Later on in the evening Bro. Poole, on behalf of the visitors, expressed their great appreciation of the hospitality of the Leeds Brethren and the Association, and of the admirable arrangements made on their behalf by the Reception Committee.

SUNDAY, JUNE 23RD.

A large party attended service at the Parish Church of Leeds, dedicated to St. Peter. It is probably the fifth church that has occupied this site. The present structure was erected 1838-41, its architect being R. D. Chantrell, who was a member of Fidelity Lodge, now 289. It contains many interesting monuments, also relics of the earlier churches. By the kindness of the Vicar,

¹ Now the "Local Charity Relief Fund," its object the assistance of itinerant masons. As they are referred to the Chief Constable, who is the Almoner, claims are few. The Leeds Masonic Educational and Benevolent Institution was founded in 1876, and now grants assistance and relief to the extent of about £500 per annum.—E.H.

Bro. Canon W. Thompson Elliott, M.A., and his Warden, Lieut.-Colonel E. Kitson Clark, a block of seats had been reserved for our occupation. Much to his regret, the Vicar had an engagement to preach in the outskirts of Leeds, but, previous to doing so, he came specially to the church, and, at the opening of the service, in a few charming sentences, extended to us a most fraternal welcome. After the service, which was most inspiring, especially the music, our friend Col. Kitson Clark, before taking leave of us, spoke to us about the history of the church, its monuments, which include a very finely sculptured Saxon Cross, and its associations.

Eventually the 1.10 train took the London Brethren back to town, and the rest dispersed, carrying away with them very happy recollections of a memorable Outing.

APPENDIX.

THE PROVINCIAL GRAND LODGE OF WEST YORKSHIRE OF ANTIEN T FREE AND ACCEPTED MASONS.

*Some Notes on the Treasures exhibited on the occasion of the Visit of
Quatuor Coronati Lodge No. 2076.*

The Provincial Grand Lodge Library was commenced in 1888, under the auspices of The Provincial Grand Master, R.W. Bro. T. W. Tew, J.P., P.G.D. W. Bro. William Watson, P.A.G.D.C., a member of Quatuor Coronati Lodge, was the first Librarian. It is owing to his peculiar knowledge and ability that so many of the treasures we now possess were obtained. The Manuscripts of the Old Charges and Constitutions are the most notable:—

- THE TAYLOR MS. (probable date 1629), formerly belonged to Bro. Thomas Taylor, a member of Unanimity Lodge No. 154, Wakefield.
- THE STANLEY MS. (1677), Scroll of parchment ten feet in length, seven inches wide.
- THE THOMAS WILLIAM TEW MS. (1680), six and a half feet in length, six inches wide.
- THE THOMAS W. EMBLETON MS. (1680), twelve feet in length, over five inches wide.
- THE H. F. BEAUMONT MS. (1690).
- THE WAISTELL MS. (1693), six pieces of paper stitched together to form a roll seven feet long. The Scroll is signed by Henry Kipling.
- THE CLAPHAM MS. (1700 or 1720).
- THE HUGHAN MS. (late 17th Century or early 18th), eight feet six inches in length, six inches wide.
- THE MACNAB MS., a roll of paper twelve feet long and six inches wide.

Besides the above, in The Province of West Yorkshire are: THE PROBITY MS., bound in the "Book M," the property of the Lodge of Probity No. 61, Halifax, and the HOPE MS. belonging to Hope Lodge No. 302, Bradford.

OUR MOST NOTED BOOKS ARE:—

“A Serious and Impartial Enquiry into the cause of the Present decay of Freemasonry in the Kingdom of Ireland with the Old and New Regulations of the London Constitutions.” Fifield D’Assigny, M.D., Dublin, 1744.

Apart from the Old Masonic MSS. in Library, this work may be considered the most precious book in the whole collection. For a century only one other Copy has been known. The Book contains the first known reference in print to Royal Arch Masonry.

A full set of Books of Constitutions from 1723 onward of The Moderns. Our copy of 1769 contains the book-plate of the celebrated Brother Thomas Dunckerley.

A full set of Books of Constitutions from 1756 (known as *Ahiman Rezon*) of the Athol Masons or Antients. The 1804 Edition, with supplement attached, is rare. It has a Roll of Lodges on the Register of the Antients and the Grand Lodge of Ireland. It is the earliest printed list of the Antient Lodges known.

Book of The Antient Constitutions of The Free and Accepted Masons. Cole’s engraved Constitutions, 1731, and Speech by Chas. Bathurst, G.M., York, 1734.

THE NATURAL HISTORY OF STAFFORDSHIRE, dated 1686, by Dr. Robert Plot, printed at Oxford. This book contains one of the earliest known references in print to Freemasonry.

LONG LIVERS. A curious History of such persons of both sexes who have lived several ages and grown young again, etc. Eugenius Philalethes, 1722. Dedicated to the Grand Master, Masters, Wardens, Brethren, etc.

HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE BLUE BLANKET OR CRAFTSMAN’S BANNER, etc., by Alexander Pennicuick, Burgess and Guild Brother of Edinburgh, 1722.

THE PLAIN DEALER, in 2 vols., 1730.

THE PLAIN DEALER, 2nd edit., 2 vols., 1734, printed by Samuel Richardson.

BROWNE’S MASTER KEY. 1st edit. and 2nd edit.

USE AND ABUSE OF FREEMASONRY. A work of great utility to the Brethren, etc. Capt. George Smith, 1785.

SECRETS OF FREEMASONRY CLEARLY AND FAMILIARLY LAID OPEN, to which are added the Freemason’s Secrets, Words, Signs, Grips and Catechism for the use of Lodges and Brothers in general by Samuel Prichard, W.M.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF MASONRY. William Preston (all editions).

A MASONIC TREATISE WITH AN ELUCIDATION, by W. Finch. Canterbury, 1802.

SECRET REVEALED AND THE MYSTIC BEAUTIES OF FREEMASONRY, developed by an ancient brother, 1820.

“THE BOOK M.” OR MASONRY TRIUMPHANT, Newcastle, 1736.

SOLOMON IN ALL HIS GLORY, or The Master Mason, being a true guide to the innermost recesses of Freemasonry, 1766.

THREE DISTINCT KNOCKS.

JACHIN AND BOAZ, or an Authentic Key to the Door of Freemasonry, 1765, 1767, etc.

FREEMASONRY STRIPPED NAKED, or the whole Art and Mystery of Freemasonry made plain and easy, etc., Charles Warren, late Grand Master of a regularly constituted Lodge in the City of Cork.

THE COMPLETE FREEMASON, or Multa Paucis for Lovers of Secrets, 1764.

WORKS OF JACOB BEHMEN, the Teutonic Philosopher, 1764.

A ‘BREECHES’ BIBLE, dated 1608. BLACK LETTER BIBLE, dated 1540. (Both presented to Alfred Lodge No. 306, Leeds.)

BIBLE, 1634, containing some interesting Genealogical Tables.

PORTFOLIOS, containing a photographic copy of every Lodge Warrant, every Centenary Warrant and every Royal Arch Charter in the Province of West Yorkshire.

OLD JUG, LEEDS POTTERY, with three diagrams, of the Antients. (*Found walled up in an old house in the slums of Leeds.*)

CARTOON "MAKING A SAILOR A FREE MASON."

BROWNE'S TRACING BOARDS. The set consists of First, Second and Third degree Boards, accompanied by four quarto pages of closely printed matter and a portrait of the author, Bro. John Browne. There is no actual date on them, but on the Casket in the Third Degree Board there is the No. 581 which Bro. Hughan considered might be 5812 (1812). The three tracing boards and portrait are all impressions from engraved plates coloured by hand.

ENGRAVED LEATHER APRON, formerly the property of the eccentric "Jemmy Hirst."

THE LODGE OF FIDELITY APRON, designed by Brother Butterworth, a member of Lodge of Fidelity No. 289, Leeds.

THE FIDELITY R.A. CHAPTER APRON, designed and painted by Bro. C. H. Schwanfelder, who was Animal Painter to the Royal Family and a member of Lodge of Fidelity No. 289, Leeds. (In the Leeds Parish Churchyard is a Gravestone designed by Bro. C. H. Schwanfelder, and carved by the Brethren of St. Alban's Lodge (operative).)

MARK APRON, 18TH CENTURY.

MASTER MASON'S CRAFT APRON, 1850, etc., etc.

APRON OF BRO. LAUGHTON, who was initiated into The Druidical Lodge, Rotherham, on Jan. 4, 1779. *This was one of the Lodges consecrated by the Grand Lodge of all England on 22 Dec., 1778, on the occasion of a meeting of the Grand Lodge of all England at Rotherham.*

LARGE COLLECTION OF MASONIC REGALIA AND JEWELS, of various Orders and Degrees. Extensive display of Festival Stewards' Badges of the three Royal Masonic Institutions, some of which the Institutions themselves do not possess.

THE LEEDS MERCURY for 1720, 1721, 1722. (*The oldest copy in Leeds.*)

GLASSES. Old Firing glass belonging to the Provincial Grand Lodge, and many others.

OLD PLAY BILLS, one of a performance of "Macbeth," under the auspices of The Newtonian Lodge, Knaresborough, August, 1768, which states "A Lodge will be opened on the stage and choruses and songs by Brothers Butler, Stansfield, etc."

WARRANT, dated April 1st, 1777, of the Antients to hold a Lodge at the Sign of the Cock, in Barnsley.

WARRANT of No. 85 Sheffield, Grand Lodge of the Antient, 1761.

WHITE HART LODGE No. 513, Huddersfield.

UNANIMITY LODGE No. 252, at Black Bull, Wakefield, 1783, signed by Richard Linecar, W.M.

MASTER MASON CERTIFICATE issued by Loyal Halifax Lodge No. 549.

MEDALS, TOKENS and other valuable curios.

In the Entrance Hall:—

Portraits of the various Prov. Grand Masters.

The Print of A Geometrical View of the Grand Procession of the Scald Miserable Masons, etc., etc.

St. John's Day in Harvest.

MONDAY, 24th JUNE, 1929.



THE Lodge met at Freemasons' Hall at 5 p.m. Present:—Bros. George Norman, P.G.D., I.P.M., as W.M.; H. C. de Lafontaine, P.G.D., S.W.; Cecil Powell, P.G.D., P.M., as J.W.; W. J. Songhurst, P.G.D., Treasurer; Lionel Vibert, P.A.G.D.C., P.M., Secretary; W. J. Williams, J.D.; Thos. M. Carter, P.Pr.G.St.B., Bristol, I.G.; and J. Heron Lepper, P.G.D., Ireland, P.M.

Also the following members of the Correspondence Circle:—Bros. W. T. Dillon, C. H. Baker, J. C. Browne, Arthur Heiron, M. W. Heath, H. W. J. Browse, J. R. Roxburgh, P.G.D., Wm. T. Russell, A. H. Crouch, Jas. R. Potts, Alfred Wells, Geo. Elkington, P.A.G.Sup.W., F. W. Golby, P.A.G.D.C., Harry Bladon, P.G.St.B., H. F. Mawbey, B. Telepneff, E. T. Hewlitt, J. Wm. Stevens, P.A.G.Sup.W., A. I. House, R. McIntosh, A. F. Ford, Major Cecil Adams, P.Dep.G.S.B., L. G. Wearing, W. G. Street, F. C. Stoate, Jas. Wallis, Gerald Slot, Geo. C. Williams, Walter K. Firminger, G. B. Brook, J. W. V. Mason, W. Geoghegan, E. Andriangi-Pontet, Donald Stevenson, J. D. Roberts, Lewis Edwards, A. L. Simpson, E. S. M. Perowne, C. A. Austen, E. A. W. Eyles, F. T. Cramphorn, Henry G. Gold, F. W. Davy, C. F. Sykes, G. Derrick, Geo. A. Hoskins, Chas. A. Barclay, D. Drysdale Anderson, W. Emerson, G. Kennedy Barnes, W. Brinkworth, A. W. Caddy, S. C. Keville, G. W. South, Geo. P. Simpson, A. E. Gurney, Wm. Butcher, Ivor Grantham, A. Sice, A. E. Jackson, A. S. Wedley, and F. Vuillermoz.

Also the following Visitors:—Bros. F. W. Bannister, Bisley Lodge No. 2317; A. W. Hare, W.M., Old Pauline Lodge No. 3969; E. H. Bastian, Acacia Lodge No. 276 (Vic.C.); R. Sandland, L.R.; Geo. T. Heard, Mitcham Lodge No. 2384; A. H. Merryman, P.M., St. Olave's Lodge No. 2764; H. Burgess, P.M., Lodge No. 19; and A. J. Ryley, A.D.C., T Square Lodge No. 3269.

Letters of apology for non-attendance were reported from Bros. Rev. H. Poole, P.Pr.G.Ch., Westmorland & Cumberland, W.M.; Ed. Conder, L.R., P.M.; S. T. Klein, L.R., P.M.; Sir Alfred Robbins, P.G.W., Pres.B.G.P., P.M.; R. H. Baxter, P.A.G.D.C., P.M.; J. T. Thorp, P.G.D., P.M.; F. J. W. Crowe, P.A.G.D.C., P.M.; J. Stokes, P.G.D., Pr.A.G.M., West Yorks., P.M.; Gilbert W. Daynes, J.W.; Rev. W. W. Covey-Crump, A.G.Ch., P.M.; and Gordon P. G. Hills, P.A.G.Sup.W., P.M., D.C.

Upon Ballot taken:—

BRO. DAVID FLATHER, J.P. Residing at Banner Cross Hall, Sheffield. P.M. of Hallamshire Lodge No. 2268, P.M. of Authors' Lodge No. 3456, P.M. of University Lodge No. 3911, and P.M. of Hadassah

Lodge No. 4871. Past Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies, England. Author of *What is Freemasonry?*, a paper contributed to the Authors' Lodge in 1915; *The Rosicrucians, Ancient and Modern*; a paper read before Notts. Installed Masters' Lodge in 1925; and, in conjunction with Bro. Dr. Stokes, *The History of Royal Arch Masonry in Sheffield*. Founder of the Sheffield Masonic Literary Society, and has, during the last twenty-five years, delivered many lectures on Masonic subjects at Lodges in and about Sheffield. Also Past Master Cutler, and author of a considerable number of papers for scientific societies and journals on the Metallurgy of Steel:

and

Bro. The Rev. ARNOLD WHITAKER OXFORD, M.A., M.D. Residing at 47, Oxford Mansions, Oxford Circus, London, W.1. P.M. of Royal Somerset House and Inverness Lodge No. 4. Past Grand Chaplain, England. Author of *No. 4: an Introduction to the History of the Royal Somerset House and Inverness Lodge, acting by Immemorial Constitution*; also *A Catalogue of Bristol and Plymouth Porcelain*, 1905; *The Ruins of Fountains Abbey*, 1910; second edition, 1926; as well as a handbook on *Fountains Abbey, the Monks and the Buildings*, in 1920; *A Short Introduction to the History of Ancient Israel*, 1887; *William Goldwin, 1682—1747*, published in 1911; as well as other Bibliographical Works; *The Berwick Hymnal*, 1886; etc.;

were regularly elected joining members of the Lodge.

One Lodge of Instruction and Forty-seven Brethren were admitted to membership of the Correspondence Circle.

The SECRETARY drew attention to the following

EXHIBITS:—

By Bro. Major A. MAURICE COCKSHOTT, of Cheltenham.

A Collection of Masonic Crests.

By Bro. J. T. THORP, P.G.D., of Leicester.

Engraved CERTIFICATE. Scots Maître Elu. Granted to Jean Frederic Eschenauer, by the Scots Chapter *Concordia Vincit Animos*, at Amsterdam on the tenth day of the fourth month, 1782. The body of the text is in manuscript. Signed by Henry Boet, Magister; W. G. Zurbiven, First Custos; H. P. Hugo de Bary, Second Custos, and S. C. Overbeek, Secretary. The seal of the Lodge on a white silk ribbon; the name but no motto. On a red ribbon a wafer seal of the Grand Chancellor, J. T. Du Bois, showing a Phoenix and Sun with the motto: *Perit ut vivet. Feliciter Ardet*.


A cordial vote of thanks was passed to the Brethren who had kindly lent these objects for exhibition.

The following paper by Bro. E. E. Thiemeyer, St. Louis, Missouri, was read by the SECRETARY:—

THE TRANSITION. SOME REFLECTIONS ON EARLY GRAND LODGE HISTORY.

BY BRO. E. E. THIEMEYER, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.

I. THE ASSEMBLY.



PROBLEM which confronts any writer who attempts to deal with the formation of the Mother Grand Lodge is the background from which this organization developed. Earlier writers accepted Anderson's official history as gospel, and for many years, roughly a century, read back into the past with him and believed in his account of the birth and growth of ritual and degrees. In recent years the pendulum has swung in the opposite direction. A critical examination of the Andersonian accounts has brought to light much in the story that is untenable: as a result, it seems that, by almost universal consent, this tale has been discarded in its entirety. An off-shoot of this supreme contempt for the veracity of Dr. Anderson has been that the formation of the Grand Lodge with its attendant institution of Grand Masters seems to appear upon the scene without antecedents—an absolutely new thing—a complete innovation, and this in a society marked by conservatism, traditionalism, and hatred of any attempt to replace old customs. The conservatism of the Fraternity was evidently so deeply instilled in the minds of its early members that they have succeeded in transmitting it through Masonic generations even to the present time. We still look more or less askance at anything which even suggests innovation. This may be more nearly true now than it was two centuries ago, but there is ample evidence to show that tradition and love of custom were deeply embedded in the mental makeup of our Masonic forebears. When the reaction from Anderson had reached its height there was still another effect. There were those who thought the whole institution was in effect new, that the Operatives had no system beyond the Gild and its regulations, together with their Manuscript Legend. While they were willing to admit that there was an Operative organization of a very crude sort, they liked to believe that it had fallen into a state of utter decay and that the meeting in 1716 was really a new effort to revive something which had long been dead with the changes in form that this type of revival would necessarily entail.

Thus has the history of Masonic scholarship borne out the old adage that the trend of human thought is like unto a pendulum, swinging from one extreme to another before finally coming to rest at a point midway between the two. Carrying out the simile, recent years have seen the tendency to come to rest. The conclusion that a ritual and degrees (two and not the now traditional three) were not new has been gaining in favour with the passing of years. It seems that we are still some distance from our final resting place, and it is my hope that this paper will aid in some small way to bring us nearer to a true and correct understanding of those years which have been called the Transition Period in Masonic history, by this term meaning the century from 1650 to 1750. There is much evidence to show that the organization itself was not new; that the Grand Lodge was only a development; that the meeting of 1716

was only a step in the march of progress. The earlier stages must, in large measure, be conjectured; the later ones, even if only a few years later, are demonstrable, or at least can be reconstructed in a logical manner. The material itself is not new, but it is presented from what I believe to be a different point of view.

If one approaches the question of early Grand Lodge history in the usual manner he will, in all probability, reach an orthodox conclusion. The fault of such a process of reasoning lies principally in the fact that a very significant chain of phrases fits in with the plan of things, but that they cannot be accepted as saying precisely what they do say and must be interpreted as meaning something else. Following the orthodox procedure the necessary interpretations are made subconsciously, and the conclusion that has been reached by earlier scholars is almost automatically thrust upon us. I am, perhaps unfortunately, prohibited from adopting an unorthodox plan of approach to the present problem by the necessity for brevity and a sequential chain of evidence. If those who feel inclined to criticize will shut this discussion from their minds and follow the line of approach which suggested itself to me, they will doubtless reach the same conclusion regardless of the paths they choose to follow. Begin quite simply by seeking for the first contemporary reference to a Grand Master: I mean by this the first mention of a given man as Grand Master during his term in office; then, when you have followed this line to its end, look for similar references to a Grand Lodge. The simplicity of the thing is startling; and the results even more so. In this very fact, perhaps, lies the reason for this theory not having been advanced at an earlier date. Strange as it may seem, such eminent scholars as Bros. Robert Freke Gould, William James Hughan, Lionel Vibert, and Gilbert W. Daynes have walked to the very threshold—Bro. Vibert has even knocked at the door—and all have stepped back as though the house were haunted. That is a severe indictment to come from one as inexperienced in Masonic research as I, but I feel confident of the ground and will endeavour to show, at the proper time, how near to a discovery these men have come. I can account for their seeming lack of observation upon the grounds already mentioned, that they have approached the question in the usual manner with the usual preconceptions and subconscious interpretations. It is not entirely a fault, but rather a bit of ill luck which accounts for their failure.

I have purposely refrained from mentioning the name of one who stands among the giants of Masonic research in connection with this problem, because he came even closer to a prophecy than any of the others. On page 54 of volume xi., *A.Q.C.*, Brother G. W. Speth made the following very interesting statement:—

“I have attempted to show that in the earliest days the passing of Masters and their reception into the fellowship took place at the annual assembly or Head-meeting Day. *The Grand Lodge was admittedly looked upon as replacing the assembly.*” (Italics mine.)

I have no desire to comment farther at this time. The significance of this statement will become clearer as we proceed.

Briefly stated, the theory I hope to establish is that the Grand Lodge was not an innovation, but a revival. Not precisely a revival in the usually accepted sense of the term as a resurrection of something dead, but rather in the sense in which the term is used in biology. The plant and animal kingdoms furnish numerous examples of species which have reached the peak of their development only to enter upon a period of dormancy which is more or less frequently followed by a period of rejuvenation. There is a certain element of continuity implied when revival is used in this sense, and it is precisely that continual development which it is my desire to stress in relation to the transition period of Masonic history. If there is a revival, or rejuvenation, it implies an evolution, and the first picture that must be drawn in any attempt to show a continuous development is, of necessity, a sketch of the simpler forms from which the higher and more specialized species developed.

To link this statement of purpose with the expression of Bro. Speth above-mentioned is not difficult. I wish to prove not only that the Grand Lodge was, in the earliest days, looked upon as replacing the assembly, but that it actually did replace that body and became its successor.

As has been indicated, such a picture of Freemasonry is most difficult to paint, though there are several admirable accounts of the operative gild, if I may term it such. These writings treat of various phases of the organization, and, so far as I have been able to ascertain, there has been no attempt to describe the precise type of government which was in existence during the fifty or sixty years immediately preceding the so-called Grand Lodge Era. In the space of a paper which must, of necessity, be all too brief to accomplish its purpose, it is impossible to attempt any detailed analysis of this particular problem. It is necessary, however, to arrive at some common ground upon which to base the assertions to be made later, and for this reason I shall try to sketch a picture of what seems the most likely character of the Craft organization during this period. Many points are, of necessity, still matters of conjecture: others will be omitted which have no direct bearing upon the question at hand. I trust, however, that the picture to be painted will be received as a foundation upon which it will be possible to build without any major premise being found fallacious.

Common agreement among Masonic scholars is found to exist on at least one point, namely, that the present system of organized Freemasonry finds its roots in the Operative Craft which existed for at least several centuries prior to the now famous meeting at the Goose and Gridiron Tavern on 24th June, 1717, and the preceding one at the Apple Tree in 1716. Since that time developments of the Grand Lodge system are traced with a fair degree of ease, though it must be confessed that the actual happenings during the earliest years are overshadowed with doubt. Practically all that is known with absolute certainty about the period from 1716 to the appearance of the first Grand Lodge Minutes dated 24th June, 1723, is the names of the men who presided over the revitalized institution during that time. The period immediately preceding this re-organization is even more confusing. We cannot construct with accuracy the exact status of the Craft, particularly in London, though there is some evidence upon which to base opinions. This material seems, at times, to be contradictory, and a pitfall into which many Masonic writers seem to have fallen must be avoided. It is not to be assumed that customs known to exist in one place actually did exist in another. This is a period of transition as well as one of decay, and many varying customs may be found in scattered sections. To hope for agreement of detail is impossible, the most that can be expected is to find agreement in general form. That there was such a thing as a national organization, or even a provincial one, is very doubtful. There were a number of Lodges in existence, and these, we are sure, exercised some sort of supervision over their members. No body which controlled the action of the Lodges is known unless it was the Assembly. Even in that group there was, apparently, no claim made to the privilege of controlling the institution of new Lodges, the actions of a group of Lodges (though there is some indication that such may have been the case in certain sections, the most notable of which is London where the Masons Company seems to occupy a peculiar position in relation to the Lodges), the exercise of general charity, or any of the countless powers which are now vested in the Grand Lodge. It is not even known whether those in attendance at the Assembly were the members of one Lodge or many, though there are some indications given in the Old Charges which may act as guides to the solution of this problem in a more or less general way. The Assembly certainly was not a representative body such as the present Grand Lodge, but was composed of all Masons in a given territory, and attendance was compulsory under certain well defined conditions. It seems most likely that in the early days of this body it was a place for the airing of disputes between members of the Craft, and for the free exchange of trade secrets. It is doubtful whether there was anything of a very formal nature about this 'shop talk': perhaps it was carried on in

private conversations and general discussion. The thirteenth clause from the *Old Rules of the Grand Lodge at York, 1725*, No. 8, seems to indicate that there may have been something of a more formal nature since it provides that "An Hour shall be set apart to talk Masonry." This hardly seems to be an operative provision, though it may be a survival of some old Craft custom. It is difficult to reach any positive conclusion, and it cannot be considered as having any real weight in the argument. Doubtless, by some means, new developments in the Craft were discussed and in this way published to the members at large. In any event, it is perfectly clear that membership in the Society carried with it the privilege and duty of attending the Assembly with full power to act.

No less a scholar than the eminent Brother Robert Freke Gould has raised the question as to whether these Assemblies were actually held. Though I cannot agree with his theory, it cannot be ignored even though it does not seem to have any general acceptance to-day. It was his contention that these Assemblies, as purely Masonic gatherings, at least during the fourteenth century, were impossible, and he held to the view that the meetings to which the Old Charges refer were those that went by the name of the Sheriff's Tourn, *i.e.*, the Assembly of the Shire. He has brought some weighty arguments to bear, and we cannot discuss the Assembly without first giving consideration to his views. (*A.Q.C.* v., 203ff.) There is at least the germ of a suggestion in the paper mentioned, but I do think that Bro. Gould has erred materially in stating that it was impossible for a strictly Masonic Assembly to be held at the particular period in question. About fifteen years ago, Mr. H. E. Malden, then Secretary of the Royal Historical Society, in correspondence with Bro. R. J. Meekren, expressed the opinion that it was not at all unlikely that purely Craft Assemblies might have been held in local centres, during the Middle Ages. Aside from the position of Mr. Malden in the Historical Society, the fact that he is not a Mason adds materially to the value of his opinion as evidence. We need not conceive of the Masons' Assembly as a National affair; in fact, such a conception is impossible. The Old Charges are notably unreliable so far as historical information is concerned, but they are so uniformly explicit on at least one point that we must give them due consideration. The fact that they make attendance at Assembly obligatory on all Masons within fifty miles (the distance varies in some versions) would seem to point to the view that a *national assembly* was not the correct interpretation to be placed upon these manuscripts.

The opinion of Bro. W. J. Hughan expressed in his comment on Bro. Gould's paper is worthy of more than passing notice:—

"Were the Assembly, so to speak, a legal one, the decision would have been final, but the Assembly was to avoid recourse to the Law. The reasons offered and the facts adduced by Bro. Gould go far to demonstrate the official character of the very early Assemblies, but yet, it seems to me, there must have been provision for the holding of separate annual meetings of each of the Crafts, for otherwise, to decide all disputes would have taken a much longer time for the Mayor, Sheriff, and other dignitaries to get through the work, than we presume they devoted to the Assembly.

"I see no reason to get rid of our own annual Masonic Assemblies, though we accept Bro. Gould's discovery (as I am inclined to do), as respects the early congregations, for both may have been held during the same day, and in the same town." (*A.Q.C.* v., 219.)

During the period from the twenty-third year of Edward III. to the beginning of the sixteenth century there were numerous laws for the control of labourers enacted. The Act of 1360 specifically prohibited "all alliances and covins of masons, carpenters, congregations, chapters, ordinances and oaths betwixt them made." (*Encyclopædia Britannica* xvi., 8.)

It seems evident that such "alliances, covins, etc." were held prior to 1360, else there would be no need to prohibit them. It also seems likely that their

prohibition had little or no effect upon the parties mentioned because the same laws were re-enacted, in various forms, until at least 1425, when the following provision is found in 3 Henry VI., C. I.:—

“First. Whereas by the yearly Congregations and Confederacies made by the Masons in their General Chapters assembled, the good Course and Effect of the Statutes of Labourers be openly violated and broken, in Subversion of the Law, and to the great Damage of all the Commons: Our said Lord the King willing in this Case to provide Remedy, by the Advice and Assent aforesaid, and at the special Request of the said Commons, hath ordained and established that such Chapters and Congregations shall not be hereafter holden: and if such be made, they that cause such Chapters and Congregations to be assembled and holden, if they thereof be convict, shall be judged for Felons: and that all other Masons that come to such Chapters and Congregations, be punished by Imprisonment of their Bodies, and make Fine and Ransom at the King's Will.” (R. F. Gould, *History of Freemasonry*, 1, 351.)

In view of these acts, and others that might be cited, I do not see how it is possible to accept Bro. Gould's thesis: surely the King is not prohibiting the holding of the Sheriff's Tourn.

I disagree with Bro. Gould when he says:—

“In the first place, I think there can be no doubt whatever that, in the fourteenth century, a strictly Masonic Assembly, to which persons repaired from a distance, would have been a downright impossibility. It is proverbially hard to prove a negative, but, not to multiply evidence, I shall rest this part of my argument, on the Statutes of the Realm, Wylie's *History of England under Henry IV.* To understand whether a particular event could have happened in an age remote to our own, that age should be studied, and if any brother *after* studying the history of the fourteenth century, tells me that he believes in the possibility of purely Masonic Assemblies having then taken place, I will not argue any further with him.” (*A.Q.C.* v., 219.)

To my mind, those same “Statutes of the Realm” upon which Bro. Gould placed such firm reliance prove conclusively, not only that purely Masonic Assemblies did exist, but that they continued to exist in spite of repeated legislation. It is difficult in the extreme to legislate a thing out of existence. We, in this country, have a particularly glaring example before us in the experience of the American Government with respect to the Eighteenth Constitutional Amendment.

While I believe that it was entirely possible for Masonic Assemblies to have been held, and, in fact, that just such meetings were convened, I can see no reason for supposing that they were national in character. There is abundant evidence in one clause of the Old Charges which reads as follows in most versions:—“And every Master or fellow shall come to y^e Asemble of Masons if itt be within fifty miles” (Newcastle College Roll), for believing that they were not of a national scope, aside from many arguments which have nothing to do with Masonry. The transportation facilities would make a journey from one part of England to another a hazardous and difficult undertaking for one thing. Let us suppose that a national Assembly was held at the traditional location in Yorkshire: we can easily see the difficulties in the way of London and Dorsetshire members of the Craft attending such a gathering. It would have entailed at least six or eight weeks' absence from work if the attendants travelled in the usual way, and even if they were fortunate enough to be provided with some means of conveyance it would have meant an absence of two or three weeks at least. When it was three days from London to York by

coach as late as the eighteenth century, it must have been at least twice that from Cornwall, to say nothing of the fact that only people of considerable wealth and station could afford that mode of travelling. At an earlier period the time necessary would doubtless be greater still. According to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the Stage Coach was known in England from the sixteenth century. The closed carriage or coach did not come into general use in England until the fifteenth century, and then its use was confined to ladies of rank almost exclusively. All of this forms a side issue and has only an indirect bearing upon the discussion. It does show, however, that as we go backwards along the scale of time, conditions become less and less favourable for a national gathering. Then, too, there was the danger of some over-zealous representative of the law providing incarceration for the strange traveller. The numbers gathered at such a national congregation would certainly arouse the suspicions of a medieval monarch, as Brother Gould suggests. If there was only one Assembly for the whole Craft, and compulsory attendance was limited to those within fifty miles or less of the gathering, we must suppose that the commingling of the Brethren was very restricted. This compulsory provision of the Old Charges seems to make it quite clear that there were meetings held at various times and in various places. Brother W. H. Rylands has ably discussed the Assemblies on St. Rook's Hill, near Chichester, in Sussex (*A.Q.C.* xi., 170). The early eighteenth century records of Alnwick and York seem to substantiate this opinion. The general meeting days at York were the two St. John's Days, while at Alnwick, 29th September seems to have been the traditional day. We shall have more to say on this score a little later. It seems there is further substantiation of this opinion in the Old Charges themselves. Comparatively few, I think at most three or four, make any mention of a specific date for the Assembly, and it seems entirely possible that Bro. Hughan was not far wrong when he expressed the opinion that the Masonic Assembly and Shire Meeting may have been held "on the same day and in the same town." It may even be likely that the territory covered by the Assembly and Sheriff coincided, if there were any territorial restrictions imposed upon the Assembly other than the limit of distance given in the MSS. Under some such arrangement the difficulties arising from large meetings of Masons would be negligible because there would probably be no more than a hundred or so at any one meeting. At any rate, an arrangement whereby the Sheriff's Tourn and the Masonic Assembly were held at the same place and at the same time would do away with many of the difficulties raised by Bro. Gould. It would be convenient to adjust differences which had to be taken to the "Common Law"; travel difficulties would be largely overcome because of the influx toward the central point, and the number of Masons would not be so large as to cause alarm, either to the King or his officials.

The Old Charges themselves are not consonant with the theory advanced by Bro. Gould, as I have already suggested. Almost every one of them contains a provision something like the following, taken from the William Watson Manuscript:—

"That every Master & fellow if they haue trespassed to stand at y^e reward of Masters & ffellows to make them accord there if they may: and if they may not accord them, then to goe to y^e Comon Law."

Surely the Operative Craft was not going so far out of its way as to include in practically every Manuscript Constitution a provision that disputes which could not be settled in the Assembly should be carried to the Common Law, if, as Bro. Gould would have us believe, this Assembly was the Sheriff's Tourn, which was itself a court of the Common Law. I think the case is perfectly clear and that we cannot doubt for one moment that the Masons held Assemblies of their own.

There is another point which is worthy of note before we leave Bro. Gould's theory. Perhaps its proper place would have been in an earlier portion of the discussion, but since it is based so largely upon speculation it had best

be set off by itself. It has been generally accepted that the references in that portion of the Old Charges which has been termed the "Legend of the Craft" and which mentions the Assemblies in the time of Euclid, Charles Martel, St. Alban, and Edwin necessarily mean a national Assembly in the sense of including the territory which is now England. The particular clauses are well known and only one citation is given to point specifically to the portions meant.

Euclid: And also that they should come & Assemble themselues once every yeare.

Charles Martel: And confirmed to y^m a charter to hold their Assembly from yeare to yeare where they would.

Alban: And he gave to y^m A Charter w^{ch} he obtain'd of y^e Kinge and his Councell for to hold a Generall Councill, and gave it y^e name of an Assembly.

Edwin: And he obtained of his father ye Kinge a Charter & a Commition to Assemble Every Year, once

. . . and he w^{ch} many other Masons Held an Assembly at York

. . . and when y^e Assembly weare gathred to geather.
(Beaumont MS.)

It may be because of a preconception that there could not have been a national Assembly in the sense of including the territory which comprises modern England that I am led to the conclusion about to be expressed, but I cannot feel that these references necessarily mean a national gathering in that sense, though they may mean an assembly covering each of the old kingdoms, in which event we would have precisely the necessary root for the assemblies of limited areas which I believe did exist at a later period. It would obviously be impossible during the period preceding the first quarter of the tenth century for any national assembly to include anything like the region which we now call England. There was at that time no unified England and it was not until the union of Mercia with Northumbria that it would be at all possible for a national assembly (in the sense of an all England meeting) to take place. I am inclined to the opinion that perhaps Masonic scholars have erred in unconsciously projecting the boundaries of present day England back to the time of the Alban Legend. If there is any historic basis for the Legend of the Craft, and I am inclined to the opinion that there is, we might be able to trace quite simply the development of the early Craft organization.

Bro. C. C. Howard, of New Zealand, has written a paper dealing with the Edwin and Alban Legends (*A.Q.C.* iv., 73ff.) to which I think insufficient consideration has been given by scholars who have attempted to deal with early Craft Customs. It is impossible at the present time to enter into a minute discussion of this theory as I should like to do because there are some minor details with which I cannot agree, but in the main I think the argument may be sound, or, more conservatively, sufficiently suggestive to demand further consideration. Without going into great detail, I wish to plagiarize Bro. Howard's theory and insert a few variations which to me seem necessary. These insertions will become apparent to those familiar with the paper mentioned, and those who are interested may make their own comparisons.

If, as we suppose to have been the case, there was a total loss of the building art after the Roman exodus from Britain, we have only sporadic attempts at building during the centuries immediately following. It seems to be fairly well proven that such attempts as actually did take place were undertaken by foreign architects. The early influxes do not seem to have been in sufficient numbers to cause the formation of a permanent organization, and it is likely that there was not enough work to make the continuance of their trade practicable. The immigrants may have remained on the island, but they probably followed other trades after the task for which they had been brought over was completed. The first sizeable importation of such workmen seems to

have occurred at the time Offa erected his "goodly minster" to St. Alban, during the latter portion of the eighth century. This would naturally bring a large group of Masons into the South of England. There is some reason for believing that Wilfrid imported a large group of workmen to assist him in the re-construction of York Minster almost a century prior to the time of Offa's building operations. If workmen were brought from the Continent to assist in the work at York, it would seem logical to suppose that we should look for the first attempts at reviving the building arts at this point. Such a conception is one which is worthy of due consideration. There is nothing known of any great buildings being erected in the North of England between the erection of York Minster and the building of St. Alban's. It is hardly likely that the workmen at York did not revive their traditional organization, if they had one. The fact that there were no other great building enterprises which would serve to knit the Masons together during this century would make it rather difficult to imagine a continuance of a trade organization during a period in which that trade was not being followed. The sporadic importations of workmen into various parts of England would not be sufficient to account for the beginning of an organization which has continued down to the present day, even in much modified form. If we grant the possibility of such an organization continuing in the North of England it does not in any way affect the argument. It would be almost impossible for any new developments in the Craft around York (I mean new developments in the sense of affecting England) to percolate through the natural barriers which separated the North and South at this particular period. The only effect such a hypothesis would have upon the theory we are discussing would be to make the existence of two organizations possible.

The discussion has somewhat anticipated itself through this excursus on York. Returning now to St. Alban's, let us suppose that these foreign artificers came into England with some tradition of an organization. (If this hypothesis is granted, the development would be similar in both York and St. Alban's.) It would be only natural for them to try to continue that tradition in their new surroundings. According to some writers the traditional organization of the Roman artificers did not die out completely in Southern France and Northern Italy. Offa, we know, went to Rome to secure the canonization of St. Alban. Wilfrid travelled extensively upon the Continent. It would be reasonable to suppose that for the erection of either of these two edifices the best trained and most efficient workmen possible would be secured. These would naturally come from the France-Italy region, and if we accept the opinion of those who adhere to the Comacine theory, they would probably have a traditional organization. Perhaps there were others, from other parts of the Continent; whether or not these had any such traditions would make little or no difference. Those possessing the traditional organization (regardless of the locality from which they came) would naturally seek to continue it, and the others would doubtless be asked to join in time. Our Masonic Legend would then be reconciled with the course of history except for the fact that St. Alban is said to have secured a charter from the King. This difficulty need not bother us because it is a well-known fact among students of folklore that stories are sometimes warped almost beyond recognition. The events remain the same, but the characters and the places are often changed. Such an evolution would naturally account for the insertion of the man St. Alban for the place which came to be known as St. Alban's.

As the use of cut stone became more popular and the building trades prospered, it would be only natural for this organization to spread with the growth of the trade. It would eventually come to take in all of Mercia and perhaps the whole of Southern England. The natural barriers between Mercia and Northumbria would preclude the possibility of its spreading to the North from this territory, unless we imagine some such instigating event as the erecting of St. Alban's Abbey or York Minster taking place. Even then, it is hardly likely that two countries as frequently at war as these two would interchange workmen to any extent. What has been said about St. Alban's and Southern England might apply with equal force to York and Northern England.

When the country became unified and Northumberland came under the crown of the Southern monarch (the unification was, of course, more complex than this, but for our purposes it is not necessary to go into detail), the natural course of events would bring Southern customs into Northern territory, and here we have a nucleus from which the supposed York Assembly may have developed, even if it was not a revival (under official sanction of the conqueror) of a pre-existing institution. If there were two organizations it would be likely that they descended from the same source and that there would be little or no need for modification upon the part of the new rulers. There would be no transference of the seat of the Assembly from the South to the North: it would be the institution of a new organization, or the continuance of one already in operation.

Supposing that Edwin did call an Assembly at York, the Old Charges do not tell us that this was the only Assembly which was held. The mere fact that Edwin secured a charter from the King which enabled the Masons to assemble once a year, does not, by any stretch of the imagination, mean that all Masons assembled at one particular place, or at one particular time. If a portion of them met in Sussex, another portion in or about London, and a third group at York, they might Assemble *every year once* just as efficiently, probably more so, as if all the Masons in England assembled at one spot each year.

There is another difficulty which needs some explanation. The Old Charges say that various wars caused the decline of Masonry after St. Alban's time. There are approximately one hundred and fifty years intervening between the building of St. Alban's Abbey and the holding of the traditional Assembly at York. We need only suppose that the Legend of the Craft was written in the North of England to do away with this difficulty. If this were the case, it would be natural that after the uniting of the kingdoms the Southern Masons would bring their traditions to the North. The Northern Masons in attempting to account for the difference in time between the organization in the South and the revitalization of the Craft in the North would naturally blame it upon the wars which were taking place during this period of England's history.

Before we have done with supposing we might consider the possibilities as suggested by Bro. E. H. Dring in his discussion of *The Naimus Grecus Legend* (A.Q.C. xviii., 179, and xix., 45.) In these papers the author ventures the opinion that the 'Charles Martel' of the Manuscripts is actually Charlemagne, and St. Alban is equated with Alcuin. This theory cannot be reconciled with that of Bro. Howard, and we must accept either one or the other. So far as the present purpose is concerned, it makes no difference which is accepted. We know that Alcuin assisted at the building of York Minster, and can be almost certain that the stonemasons were imported from the Continent to assist in the work. If such was actually the case their procedure would be much the same as in the South. The traditional organization would be continued for so long a time as there were sufficient Masons at York to warrant it. Whether this organization persisted to the time of Edwin is immaterial. These two alternatives have been previously suggested.

The two opposing theories agree in one particular only:—Offa certainly imported foreign workmen, and Alcuin probably did likewise. If he did not, then the organization may have come into York as has already been suggested. If he did, then Edwin (or someone else, time and persons are immaterial) simply continued a pre-existing institution. If he did, and the organization died out, then we revert to the case first mentioned.

Let me again stress the point that time and characters are only incidental. I have adhered to the two theories presented solely for convenience. If we try to reconstruct along a purely hypothetical line we come to the same conclusion. It is fairly well established that the revival of architecture in England was assisted in large measure by the importation of foreign (Continental) workmen. York and St. Alban's seem likely places for the beginning to have been made, but even that is not essential. The only thing that matters is that these imported workmen have a traditional organization, or that they develop one

after landing on English soil. The times and conditions will take care of everything else.

We do not have to adhere to dates or personages, as mentioned in the Legend, but if it has grown up, as most scholars seem to believe, it would develop from word of mouth transmission, and all sorts of variations are possible under such conditions. Sir James G. Frazer has done much to show that there is a germ of historic truth in almost every folk legend, and certainly our Masonic Legend should be classed as folklore. The point I hope to make is simply that the development of architecture in England would seem likely to preclude the possibility of such a thing as a national assembly in the sense in which it is taken to-day. There may have been a National Assembly for Mercia, and even for the Northern Kingdom, but there certainly could not have been one for the territory covered by the United England which came into being at the close of the first quarter of the tenth century.

We have nothing to indicate that these assemblies did not, at a later stage in their development, become national, but when the difficulties which were advanced earlier in this paper are taken into consideration it hardly seems likely that this was the case.

How long these Assemblies continued to exist and whether they properly form a part of the picture of Masonry immediately preceding the Grand Lodge Era is to be conjectured. There are a few things which would incline one to the opinion that they lasted through several centuries at least. Dr. Anderson's account of the Assembly to which Queen Elizabeth sent investigators may have no more foundation than many other fables from the pen of this gentleman, but I am inclined to the opinion that perhaps there is a germ of truth in it. I do not for a minute believe that the episode happened as described, but I think there may have been Assemblies of Masons held in Elizabeth's time and it is entirely possible that she may have investigated their actions, though hardly in the manner suggested by Anderson. The statement of Dr. Plot in his *Natural History of Staffordshire* may be more authentic than the Andersonian fable because this learned man was a friend of Elias Ashmole. He says, in discussing the Act of Henry VI.:—"Yet this *act* too being but little observed, 'tis still to be feared these *Chapters of Free-Masons* do as much mischief as before, which if one may estimate by the penalty, was anciently so great, that perhaps it might be usefull to examine them now." There is something of an explicit character in this statement which might lead one to believe that the congregations had continued, at least in Staffordshire, and from other remarks made by Dr. Plot, it would not be illogical to assume that they also existed in other places down to the time his book was written.

Whether or not these statements point to a continuity of the Assembly proper, we can be certain that there were Assemblies held in the region around York as late as 1693. Proof of this is to be found in the Hope Branch of the Sloane Family of Manuscripts, all three members of which show a concurrence in form which differs from any other versions I have been able to consult. Since I have seen only those manuscripts which have been reprinted in some form, and not all of those, it is impossible to say that these phrases are not to be found in any other manuscripts, though this does seem probable. All three of these documents concur in changing the wording "Comon Law" which appears in the Watson MS. as above quoted to "Common Assembly"; the exact phrase reading as follows in the three manuscripts belonging to this group:—

HOPE: "And if they may not accord then to goe to the comon assembly."

WAISTELL: "and if they may not accord then goe to the Common Assembly."

YORK No. 4: "if they cannot account then to go to the Common Assembly."

According to Bro. Hughan these three manuscripts seem to have descended from some missing prototype. He says:—

“These MSS. (Hope and Waistell), with the York (No. 4). are the only three that I remember which reverse the usual order of the Seven Sciences, in respect to Music and Arithmetic. As some fifty else ‘agree to differ’ from this trio, it seems reasonable to suppose that the prototype of these three must have contained an erroneous reading in that particular.” (*The Hope, Waistell & Probity Masonic MSS.* Edited by William James Hughan and William Watson, 1892, p. 7.)

Some further confirmation of this view is contained in the following statement relative to the York No. 4 MS.:—

“It is written on a Roll of Paper, and excepting the Invocation at the commencement, is in good condition, and was evidently transcribed from an older set of Charges of a purely operative character.” (Hughan, *Masonic Sketches and Reprints*, p. 51.)

If the above statements are true, and we have no valid reason for doubting them, it would seem that these three Manuscripts differ in still another respect from the others. It would hardly be possible for three copyists to make identically the same mistake in transcribing “Law” as “Assembly,” and we can only presume that the phrase was “Common Assembly” in the missing original just as Brother Hughan believes to be the case in the reversal of order in the Seven Sciences.

This change of terms would seem to point to the fact that there was some distinction to be drawn between the Common Assembly or Common Law and the Masonic Assembly. In every other case the latter is referred to as either the general Assembly, and in these cases it is perfectly clear that nothing but a Masonic Assembly was meant, or simply as to the Assembly. We may presume, I think, that the Common Law and the Common Assembly are to be taken as referring to one and the same thing, and that the change, whether through careless copying in the prototype from which these three Manuscripts came, or through intentional changing of the word, had some background in fact.

There is a sentence appearing in practically all of the Manuscripts which reads as follows:—

“furthermore at dyu’s assemblies Certain Chardgs haue byn made and ordeyned by the best advise of m^{rs}. & fellowes.”

The above is taken from the Grand Lodge No. 1 Manuscript of 1583, because it is the earliest reference to this point, and I shall have more to say about it at a later time.

I wish now to return to the three manuscripts we have been considering. Quoting the same portion of each of these three documents we find the following interesting variations:—

YORK No. 4: “Furthermore at divers assemblyes there have bene added to it divers charges more and more by the best Maisters, and fellows advices.”

HOPE: “and furthermore at Private Assemblyes their haue been Added to it diuers Charges more and more by the Mast^{rs}. and fellows advices.”

WAISTELL: “and further more att private assemblies their hath been added to it diverse Charges more & the Masters and fellows advices.”

Practically all the manuscripts agree in mentioning “diverse Assemblyes,” and it is possible that the designation *Private* which is used in the Hope and Waistell documents is no more than a mistake of the copyist. These two manuscripts agree almost verbatim, while the York No. 4 Roll differs materially

in phraseology from either of them. It is, I think, evident that the Waistell MS. agrees more closely with the prototype of this group than either of the others, because, in spite of the close agreement of this MS. with the Hope, it is clear that in the latter case the spelling has been modernized, although the wording has been preserved rather carefully. It would almost seem that the copyist who made the York No. 4 Roll had more than one original from which to work, or else that in some respects he was more careful than the authors of the other two documents. It is not only difficult, but unpractical, to draw any conclusions relative to the descent of these manuscripts from transcripts only, but it may be safely assumed, I think, that the designation *Private* was not to be found in the prototype which formed the main foundation for the members of this group. If, as I think may have been the case, the author of the York No. 4 Roll had more than one manuscript before him, it would seem evident that the word *diverse* was poorly written and may have been taken for *private*, not an impossible error when one considers the chirography of the older documents and remembers that *diverse* was sometimes spelt *dyvers*. It would take some stretching of the imagination to believe that such an error could have actually been committed by two scribes unless there was some reason for the use of the word *private* in relation to assemblies.

This leads us to a branching path, and either branch we take seems almost too good to be true. It is with no little trepidation that I advance such a theory, but it demands consideration. If the "dy" were written in the original so as to appear not unlike a "p," then it would not be difficult to imagine the "v" taking on the characteristics of an "r" or even an "ri." The resemblance would cease at this point, however, except for the possibility that the final stroke of the "s," if carelessly made, might look like a "t." We have, then, "pri—t" with the dash representing some unintelligible scrawling, originally intended to form an "er," and it is rather hard to understand how, even with very poor handwriting, this could be made out as a "va," unless the word *private* was associated with the word *assembly* in the mind of the transcriber. We come back, then, to the two possibilities, either the mistake was due to common association of terms and poor chirography, or it was an intentional insertion upon the part of some scribe, either by the author of the missing prototype, or the authors of the Hope and Waistell Manuscripts, and most likely the latter. There are some other instances of the use of the word *private* in this connection, namely, in the Dumfries No. 4 and the Thistle MSS., one, the Melrose, uses "*certain assemblies*." This last seems to indicate that there may have been more than one kind of assembly. This conclusion may, however, be due to a false sense of proportion influenced by evidence which will be adduced later, and for the present may be neglected. It does seem strange that from a total of seventy-seven MSS. examined, sixty-one have some mention of Assemblies in the above sense, and only five vary from the customary usage of *diverse* in this connection. In the light of evidence which will be cited later, I think the conclusion that there was some connection between *private* and *assembly* is one which is justifiable. I must for the present ask that this statement be accepted as proven, or at least made possible, on the basis of the evidence which has gone before. When we come to consider the old Lodge Minutes we shall, I think, find the additional confirmation needed to establish this view.

It would, perhaps, be well for us to recapitulate and make an effort to see just how far we have gone in our endeavour to reconstruct pre-Grand Lodge Freemasonry. In the first place it has become apparent that purely Masonic Assemblies of a local character would not be impossible even as early as the fourteenth century. Furthermore, it has seemed, from the fact that they were *legislated against*, not only that it was possible to hold such meetings, but that they actually were held. There is some evidence, the most valuable of which is that contained in Dr. Plot's work, to show that they continued to exist even in the last half of the seventeenth century. Certainly Dr. Plot has shown us their existence, at least in Staffordshire, even as late as 1686, or a very few years

earlier. The three manuscripts discussed seem to indicate that there may have been some sort of a Masonic Assembly, in or about York, at a date not later than 1693. If the Masonic Assembly continued, or was revived in Staffordshire and York, it follows, almost without question, that there is no reason for believing that other portions of England were very different from these two localities. We might add that the Alnwick and Gateshead records make this assumption seem even more plausible, and we cannot forget the Sussex case where, according to tradition, Masonic Assemblies were held from the time of Julius Cæsar. The London Lodges, on the same basis, add something to the widespread distribution of Masonic Lodges, and we must presume that if one group of Masons was holding its Assembly, the others were, in all probability, doing likewise, unless they had deteriorated to such an extent that such an assumption is impossible. The possibility of their assembling is all that is necessary to prove at this time. The London Lodges, during the seventeenth century, offer much in the way of evidence, but I shall refrain from mentioning this subject until we come to discuss the London craft. There is a danger involved in trying to establish a uniformity of Masonic custom over the whole of England during the latter part of the seventeenth century, and perhaps it would be better to say that while these Lodges were meeting in various localities it is not necessary for us to presume that they were all governed in the same way, or that they all held Assemblies. It is sufficient for our purpose to establish a possibility that such meetings were held in various parts of England at various times. This once effected, it would seem that we have established a basis upon which we can begin to build as soon as we have definitely shown that Masonic Assemblies were being held in one part of England at a period sufficiently close to the magic date of 1716, and may have been in existence in others with sufficient proximity to be remembered by the older Masons at least.

An attempt to reconstruct the powers that were invested in these Assemblies will, perhaps, throw some more light upon the establishment of the organization which came to be known as the Grand Lodge. It must be borne in mind that in any such reconstruction it is very difficult to generalize. What may have been true in one particular locality may not have been the case in another. The period from 1650 to 1716 was apparently a period of decadence in the Craft, and we would naturally expect to find all stages of decay showing themselves in various places. In some localities Assemblies might continue to meet and exercise the functions which had been theirs from time immemorial. In others there may have been no more than a remnant of the old trade organization, perhaps no more than a few members of the Craft who never met in a formal way, and who had given up all thought of a permanent Masonic organization. These are two extremes, and in various places we might find every stage of activity between them. The suggestive example of one locality might inspire the others to resurrect their previous organization. So far as the present argument is concerned, it makes no difference whether those who have made a special study of certain portions of England agree with the possibility of a Masonic Assembly in their particular field or not. If it can be shown, and I believe that it can, that the Assembly form of government survived in any one portion of England, there is no necessity for showing that it was also in existence in any other portion. If, for example, the North-Eastern portion of England held to the Assembly, and this meeting was also an institution at York, it is impossible to imagine that the Masons of London, even if they had no organization, would be entirely ignorant of the fact. We only have to show that somewhere in England (or Scotland, it makes no great difference) there was a body of Masons who still preserved the traditional form of government, and that the following of this tradition was sufficiently widespread for it to reach London, to make our thesis entirely possible. We can then rely upon the evidence of London itself for the proof of the theory. Of course, this is only a minimum requirement. Once the Assembly is shown to be a widespread practice during the period immediately preceding the formation of the Grand Lodge, the theory advanced becomes conclusively proved. It makes no difference whether we consider the prevalence of the

Assembly during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries a revival or a survival. While I am personally inclined to the opinion that it was a survival, I have no quarrel with those who feel that it must have been a revival. For the present purpose it is necessary to show only that it was an influence of sufficient potency to make itself felt, and this theory becomes a tenable one. As I have repeatedly said, I am here making a statement of minimum requirements. I leave it to others to decide whether this minimum has been met, and they may also judge the extent to which it has been exceeded.

Brother Gould gives us a very interesting observation upon Masonry in York when he says:—

“Happily, there is undoubted evidence, coming from two distinct sources, which in each case points to the vigorous vitality of York Masonry in 1705, and inferentially, to its continuance from a more remote period. At that date, as we learn from a Minute-Book of the Old Lodge at York, which unfortunately only commences in that year, ‘Sir George Tempest, Barronet,’ was President, a position he again filled in 1706 and 1713. Among the subsequent Presidents were the Lord Mayor of York, afterwards Lord Bingley (1707), the following Baronets, Sir William Robinson (1708-10), Sir Walter Hawksworth (1711-12, 1720-23), and other persons of distinction.

“The ‘Scarborough’ MS. furnishes the remaining evidence which attests the active condition of Yorkshire Freemasonry in 1705. The endorsement in this roll may, without any effort of the imagination, be regarded as bearing indirect testimony to the influence of the Lodge or Society at York. This must have radiated to some extent at least, and an example is afforded by the proceedings at Bradford in 1713. These, I shall presently cite, but the position of York as a local and independent centre of the transitional Masonry, which interposed between the reign of the purely operative and the purely speculative Societies, will be examined at greater length hereafter. We learn at all events, from the roll referred to that at a *private* Lodge held at Scarborough ‘*in the County of York*,’ on the 10th of July, 1705, ‘before’ William Thompson, *President*, and other Freemasons, six persons, whose names are subscribed, were ‘admitted into the fraternity.’ It is difficult to understand what is meant by the term ‘private Lodge,’ an expression which is frequently met with, as will be shortly perceived, in the Minutes of the York body itself. Possibly the explanation may be, that it signified a *special* as distinguished from a regular meeting, or the words may imply an *occasional* and not a *stated* Lodge was then held?

“Indeed the speculation might even be advanced, that the meeting was in effect a ‘moveable Lodge,’ convened by the York Brethren. Such assemblies were frequently held in the *county*, and on the occasion of the York Lodge, meeting at Bradford in 1713, no less than eighteen gentlemen of the first families in that neighbourhood were made Masons. A further supposition presents itself, and it is, that we have here an example of the custom of granting written licences to enter Masons at a distance from the Lodge, such as we find traces of in the Kilwinning, the Dunblane, and the Haughfoot Minutes. If so, we may suppose that the precedent set by the Lodge of Kilwinning in 1677, when the Masons from the Canongate of Edinburgh applied to it for a roving commission or ‘travelling warrant,’ was duly followed, and that the Scarborough Brethren were empowered to admit qualified persons ‘in the name and behalf’ of the Lodge of York.” (Gould, *History of Freemasonry* ii., 270.)

Let us consider the evidence mentioned by Bro. Gould in reverse order. The “Endorsement” to the Scarborough Roll to which he refers reads as follows:—

"M'dum That att A private Lodge held att Sc-rbrough in the County of York the tenth day of July 1705 before William Thompson Esq^r. P^rsident of the said Lodge & severall others brethren ffree Masons the severall psons whose names are herevnto subscribed were then admitted into the said ffraternity.

Ed: Thompson

Jo: Tempest

Rob^t: Johnson

Thos: Lister

Samuell Buck

Richard Hudson."

There is little to startle anyone in this note. It tells us simply that a Lodge meeting was held at "Sc-rbrough" in the County of York on the tenth day of July, 1705, and that six men were made Masons. The one striking feature is that this meeting was of "A private Lodge." We must, of necessity, recall the references to private assemblies in the Hope and Waistell MSS.

Before going deeper into that question, however, we must look at the second bit of evidence to which Bro. Gould refers. I have, unfortunately, to work under the handicap of not being able to consult the original Minutes of any of the Lodges. It is, therefore, necessary to rest my case upon such references to them as are readily obtainable. In the present Minutes I am depending upon the excerpts from the York records printed in Bro. Gould's *History of Freemasonry* (ii., 270 *et seq.*):—

"March the 19th, 1712.—Att a private Lodge, held at the house of James Boreham, situate in Stonegate, in the City of York, Mr. Thomas Shipton, Mr. Caleb Greenbury, Mr. Jno. Norrison, Mr. Jno. Russell, Jno. Whitehead, and Francis Norrison were all of them severally sworne and admitted into the honorable Society and fraternity of Free-Masons.

Jno. Wilcock also
admitted at the
same Lodge.

Geo. Bowes, Esq., *Dep.-President*
Thos. Shipton. Caleb Greenbury.
Jno. Norrison. John Russell.
Fran. Norrison. John Whitehead.
John Wilcock.

"June the 24th, 1713.—At a General Lodge on St. John's Day, at the house of James Boreham, situate in Stonegate, in the City of York, Mr. John Langwith was admitted and sworne into the honourable Society and fraternity of Freemasons.

Sir Walter Hawksworth, Knt. and Bart., *President*.
Jno. Langwith.

"August the 7th, 1713.—At a private Lodge held there at the house of James Boreham, situate in Stonegate, in the City of York, Robert Fairfax, Esq., and Tobias Jenkins, Esq., were admitted and sworne into the hon^{ble} Society and fraternity of Fremasons, as also the Reverend Mr. Robert Barker was then admitted and sworn as before.

Geo. Bowes, Esq., *Dep.-President*.

Robert Fairfax.

T. Jenkins.

Robt. Barber.

"December the 18th, 1713.—At a private Lodge held there at the house of Mr. James Boreham, in Stonegate, in the City of York, Mr. Thos. Hardwick, Mr. Godfrey Giles, and Mr. Tho. Challoner was admitted and sworne into the hono^{ble} Society and Company of Freemasons before the Worshipfull S^r Walter Hawksworth, Knt. and Barr^t., *President*.

Tho. Hardwicke

Godfrey Giles

his

Thomas T Challoner
mark

"1714.—Att a General Lodge held there on the 24th June at Mr. James Boreham, situate in Stonegate, in York, John Taylor, of Langton in the Woulds, was admitted and sworne into the hono^{ble} Society and Company of Freemasons in the City of York, before the Worshipfull Charles Fairfax, Esq.

John Taylor.

"Att St. John's Lodge in Christmas, 1716.—At the house of Mr. James Boreham, situate (in) Stonegate, in York, being a General Lodge, held there by the hono^{ble} Society and Company of Freemasons, in the City of York, John Turner, Esq., was sworne and admitted into the said Hono^{ble} Society and Fraternity of Free Masons.

Charles Fairfax, Esq., *Dep-President*.

John Turner.

This comprises all of the Minutes before 1717 which are quoted by Bro. Gould. The remainder have no particular interest for us since they refer only to private Lodge meetings. Their only value would be to show that the designation private Lodge had continued down to a date later than 1717, and by inference, at least, that the *General Lodge* also continued in use.

Bro. Gould has, in the citation above given, made some speculations as to the meaning of *private* in distinction to *general* Lodge. So far as I have been able to discover, the Old Lodge at York and the manuscripts previously mentioned are the only references we possess to this designation of *private*, either in respect to an Assembly or a Lodge. There are other evidences of the use of the word *general* in this connection, or better, in parallel instances.

We have the Minutes to show that there was a distinction at York between a private Lodge and a general Lodge as early as 1713 at the latest, and probably as early as the beginning of the Minute Book in March of 1712. The Scarborough MS. carries the distinction back to 1705, presuming, of course, that the mention of a private Lodge in the Manuscript entitles us to assume that there were two distinct kinds of Lodges at the time. If there were not, there would be no need for designating the particular Lodge mentioned as *private*. There is, then, a difference of only twelve years between the appearance of the word in the text of the Hope and Waistell MSS. and its use as a designation for a Lodge meeting. It would almost seem that our conclusion that there was some connection between the word *private* and *assembly* in the minds of the scribes who compiled these documents was not very far afield. This is made even more certain when we find that by inference, at least, the same practice was followed at Alnwick and Swalwell. The Dumfries No. 4 and the Thistle MSS., as has been indicated, add just a little more weight to the opinion.

So far as York is concerned, it seems probable that the meetings on St. John's Day in Summer and at Christmas (probably on St. John's Day), were the only meetings of the *General Lodge*. Aside from the views expressed by Bro. Gould, it would seem that this distinction had a very clear meaning. The meetings termed *General* were those at which all members of the Craft were present. These were the meetings to which the compulsory attendance clause mentioned previously referred. They were also the business meetings of the Lodge and all matters of importance were brought before it. On the other hand, the *private* meetings were gatherings of a small number of Masons whose business was that of initiating or making Masons. There are certain reservations which must, of necessity, be made in connection with this point. The private Lodge in an Operative Craft could not make apprentices free of the Craft at the expiration of their apprenticeship. That was one of the functions of the general Lodge, as will be shown a little later. Private Lodges may have had no other power than that defined above. While this is not at variance with any of the suggestions advanced by Bro. Gould, it does carry them a bit farther. It may seem that in so doing we are merely being presumptuous, but a consideration of the customs at other places, not very far distant from York, will tend to substantiate this view in some measure.

It is said of the Gateshead Company that:

“the annual assembly on the day of St. John the Baptist is noteworthy, and not less so the meeting on that of St. John the Evangelist, in lieu of Christmas Day—the latter gathering forming as it does the only exception to the four yearly meetings being held on the usual quarter-days.

“In holding four meetings in the course of the year, of which one was the general assembly or head meeting day, the Gateshead Company or fellowship followed the ordinary guild custom. The ‘making of freemen and brethren’ is a somewhat curious expression, though it was by no means an unusual regulation that the freedom of the guild was to be conferred openly.” (Gould, *History of Freemasonry*, vol. ii., p. 152.)

In a footnote to the second paragraph of this quotation the author says:—

“Mr. Toulmin Smith gives at least twenty-three examples of quarterly-meetings. ‘Every Gild had its appointed day or days of meeting—once a year, twice, three times, or four times as the case might be. At these meetings, called ‘morn-speeches,’ in the various forms of the word, or ‘dayes of spekyngges tokedere for here comune profyte,’ much business was done, such as the choice of officers, admittance of new brethren, making up accounts, reading over the ordinances, etc.—one day, where several were held in the year, being fixed as the ‘general day.’”

There is one statement, the last, in the reference to Mr. Toulmin Smith to which I am compelled to take exception, at least so far as it may relate to the Masons. In this instance the Masons seem to have called each of their stated meetings (if I may be so rash as to use this designation) a general meeting. We have already seen an instance of this practice at York, and we shall see others very soon. In the Alnwick Orders, which incidently are headed “Orders to be observed by the Company and Fellowship of Freemasons att a Lodge held at Alnwick, Septr. 29, 1701, being the Gen^l. Head Meeting Day,” we find a substantiation of the opinion above expressed by Mr. Smith, although the difference in terminology shows our position to be well-founded:—

“1st.—First it is ordered by the said Fellowship thatt there shall be yearly Two Wardens chosen upon the said Twenty-Ninth of Septr., being the Feast of St. Michaell the Archangell, which Wardens shall be elected and appoynted by the most consent of the Fellowship.”

The General Orders of the Swalwell (or Gateshead) Lodge constitute a further proof:—

“That there shall be on St. John Baptist’s day, yearly by the majority of Votes in the assembly be chosen a Master and Warden for the year ensuing and a Deputy to act in (the) Master’s absence as Master. (No. 1.)

“That the Chief Meeting day be June 24th each year, the 29th September, the 27th of December, the 25th of March, Quarterly meeting days.” (No. 2.)

The practice at Alnwick seems to be at considerable variance from Gateshead in that the Lodge there seems to have had only one general meeting a year. This opinion is confirmed by the fifth item in the *Orders*, which provides “Thatt noe mason shall take any Apprentice (but he must) enter him and give him his charge within one whole year after.” Why this provision if there were other general meetings during the year at which all Masons were required to be

present? Further confirmation of this view is found in the absence of any provision for Quarterly meetings. In the Swalwell-Gateshead records provision is made that "When any Mason shall take an Apprentice, he shall enter him in the Company's Records within 40 days." There is some difficulty in reconciling these provisions with the Quarterly meetings, but even more would be encountered if we endeavoured to formulate an opinion upon the basis of an annual meeting. We may account for this variation perhaps by the tradition of the founding of the Swalwell Lodge by Sir Ambrose Crowley. But it is not really necessary to account for it. The records show quite conclusively that there was such a thing as an annual meeting which would correspond to the Assembly at Alnwick, and it is not to be expected that we would find the same practice prevailing everywhere. Evolution would, of itself, account for the Annual meeting at Alnwick, the Semi-Annual meeting at York, and the Quarterly meeting at Swalwell-Gateshead.

It has been shown that there were two types of meetings at York, and we have shown that there were meetings at Alnwick and Gateshead which corresponded to one of those types, namely, the General meeting. It remains to show that there were meetings of the other type.

The Alnwick Orders have the following interesting passages:—

"9th. Item, There shall noe apprentice after he have served seaven years be admitted or accepted but upon the Feast of St. Michael the Archangell.

"12th. Item, That noe Fellow or Fellows within this Lodge shall att any time or times call or hold Assemblys to make any mason or masons free: Nott acquainting the Mastr or Wardens therewith."

At Swalwell these passages find a parallel in:—

"That noe apprentice when having served 7 years, be admitted or accepted into the fellowship, but either on the chief meeting day, or on a Quarterly meeting day."

"That no master or fellow take any allowance or fee of any, for their being made a Mason without ye knowledge and consent of Seaven of the Society at least."

It seems quite clear that there must have been other meetings than the chief or quarterly ones, else why should the rules be so explicit in regard to these provisions? There is some additional confirmation of this view in the *Orders of Antiquity* of the Gateshead Company where the 16th item provides: "That every Master or fellow upon due warning shall not fail to attend the Assembly upon the General meeting day, if he be within fifty miles of it." If this applied to every meeting of the Lodge, why would it be necessary to make reference to a specific Assembly held upon the general meeting day?

We have seen that the two Lodges above mentioned held their elections on the Chief Meeting day of the year. These chief, head, or general head meetings corresponded with the General Lodge meetings at York, at least so far as work to be done was concerned. There was something to distinguish them from private meetings. Just what this was is very difficult to say. It may have been no more than the election of officers, but why two or four meetings called general if officers were elected only once a year? I think we must come back to Bro. Gould's theory, mentioned some time ago. The general meetings were those held upon stated days, whether once a year or oftener. They had power to perform all the duties of the Craft and attend to any business which might be brought before them. The private meetings, on the other hand, were special, called for some specific purpose, and at these meetings it was not necessary for all members of the Craft to be present. The *General Orders* of the Swalwell-Gateshead Lodge seem to confirm this view when they state:—

"4thly. The Master and Warden shall on any Emergency have power to summons and call together an assembly of the Members nearest at

hand, to consult and determine any dispute or Cause that may Occur: Seaven or more to be psent, and such act or determination shall be as valid as if done by the whole Assembly."

Aside from such special powers as were designated to the private meeting it had no other privilege except making Masons. Even this seems somewhat doubtful in view of the conflicting use of terms between the Gateshead and Alnwick regulations. We are not particularly interested in this phase of the question. It is enough for our purposes to be satisfied that there were two distinct types of meetings, and we will leave it to others to work out the precise duties of each gathering.

It might be interesting, as well as valuable, however, to summarize briefly the duties of both types of gatherings as these are reflected in the citations above given. The General Meeting seems to have had power to transact any business which might come before it. One or two features distinguish it from the private meeting, however. Apprentices could only be made free at a general meeting. The election of officers took place only at such meetings. In some places, if not all, it was necessary to register apprentices upon the records of the Lodge at the first general meeting after his making. Private meetings, on the other hand, were doubtless convened for some specific purpose, either the settling of a dispute, the making of an apprentice, or some other special task designated to such body by the Lodge as a whole. They could be convened at the pleasure of the Master. Wardens, or, as was the case in some localities, by a group of brethren, at any time during the period between general meetings. This statement of duties is certainly not complete, nor is it accurate for all localities. It is a generalization, subject to all of the faults inherent thereto. It is, however, a constructive effort based solely upon fragmentary evidence. Further than this it has no place in this discussion. Our sole interest is to establish the existence of two different kinds of meetings. We are only incidentally interested in the legislative, executive, and judicial functions of either kind of gathering.

We will now return to the references dealing with the election of officers in these three localities. One of the quotations makes mention of the fact that the officers shall be elected by the majority of votes "in the Assembly." The Alnwick Order says by "the most consent of the Fellowship." I think there is nothing to prevent these being considered as equivalent terms. Both documents provide for the election on the chief meeting day. We are not so fortunate in the case of the Lodge at York, and must base any conclusion relative to conditions there largely upon speculation, though there are some indications that will help us to keep speculation within the bounds of reason.

Bro. W. J. Hugnan says:—

"The activity of this new Grand Lodge evidently produced a like spirit in the members of the old Lodge, which had been quietly working in the neighbourhood of York for many years before the Grand Lodges were known, and the result was, that the formation of another organization (having its seat at York) was preceded by a procession to the Merchants' Hall on December 27th, 1725, after which the 'Grand Lodge of all England' was inaugurated, with Charles Bathurst, Esq., as Grand Master." (Hugnan, *Origin of the English Rite*, p. 18.)

In another place the same author says:—

"No record of the appointment and installation of Grand Masters and Grand Officers, or of the existence of a Grand Lodge at York anterior to A.D. 1717 has ever been made public. The list of Grand Masters from A.D. 1705 . . . really refers only to *Presidents* or *Masters*, and not *Grand Masters*, until after A.D. 1724."

Bro. T. B. Whytehead, in a paper read before Lodge Quatuor Coronati, makes the following statement:—

“The first intimation of the assumption of the title of ‘Grand’ by the Lodge at York is found in a Minute dated 27th December, 1725, when at a meeting held at the Merchants’ Hall in York, the ‘Society’ chose Charles Bathurst, Esq., their Grand Master.” (*A.Q.C.* ii., 111.)

This statement, coming with those of Bro. Hugan, points conclusively to the fact that the annual elections, at least as early as 1725, were held on St. John’s Day at Christmas. Bro. Whytehead seems inclined to the opinion that there was no such thing as an annual election in the earlier days of the York Lodge, for he says:—

“The presiding brother is sometimes called ‘President,’ sometimes ‘Deputy President,’ and sometimes ‘Master,’ and I am inclined to think that these were terms applied arbitrarily to the person who stood *pro tempore in loco magistri*.” (See reference above.)

I can hardly agree with this conclusion, although it may be that the evidence I have seen is only partial and other entries in the Minutes would contradict the opinion I am about to express. We find the meeting on March 19th, 1713, presided over by Geo. Bowes, as Deputy President; on June 24th, 1713, by Sir Walter Hawksworth, Knt. and Bart., President: on August 7th, 1713, George Bowes again presides as Deputy President: and on December 18th, 1713, Sir Walter Hawksworth is again in the chair in the official capacity of President. This seems to point conclusively to the fact that Sir Walter Hawksworth was President, at least from June 24th, 1713, to December 18th of the same year. The fact that a deputy president presided at an interim meeting seems to show that, as in the case of Alnwick, and Gateshead, there was a Deputy to take the place of the President in his absence, although in the other two cases cited the presiding officer is designated “Master.” I should not like to make the effort to trace this practice back to a more remote date, at least so far as it pertains to York. There are almost insurmountable difficulties in the way because actual evidence is missing. It would seem, however, that in the event there was some sort of a permanent organization in 1713 and that the election was held on St. John’s Day in Winter, which was a General Meeting Day. The records of the other Lodges seem to permit the assumption that there was a permanent, or at least an annual head of the Lodge. The proviso that Masons may not be made without the consent of the Master and Wardens seems almost conclusive, to say nothing of the specific provision for their election once each year. Alnwick carries us back to 1701, and we really have no valid reason for not assuming that what was common practice in this locality was not also in use at York as well. The Scarborough Roll carries us back to 1705, since it is seen to contain a reference to a presiding officer termed *President*. With a lapse of only eleven years between the Alnwick Orders and the first Minute at York, together with the interim reference to a President already mentioned, it seems that we might almost make a positive assertion that the practice went back into the seventeenth century at York and Alnwick and inferentially, at least, at Swalwell or Gateshead, whichever one of the two places was the seat of the Lodge at the period under discussion.

The fact that the presiding officer was not termed Grand Master until after 1724, St. John’s Day in Winter, 1725, to be precise, would seem to indicate that although the designation of the presiding officer at York was changed at this time, the date of his election was not varied, but continued on the traditional day. This assumption is supported by the fact that the Grand Lodge of England (London) held its elections on June 24th and not December 27th. The York body must have been acquainted with this fact from the Constitutions of 1723, which were, evidently the influence which caused them to change the title of their chief officer. Why did they not change the date of

the election? No solution to this question suggests itself except the very obvious one that there must have been some tradition which caused them to elect on December 27th, and it was decided to adhere to the older practice.

If we are entitled to draw any conclusions from this scattered evidence we are presented with a picture of pre-Grand Lodge Freemasonry, at least so far as a goodly portion of the North of England is concerned, that is somewhat different from any I have heretofore seen. This picture is one of the aims it was our purpose to accomplish. We have taken rather an indirect route, and have not yet clearly established the connection between *private* and *assembly* that was the immediate purpose of the search. It has been shown that these two words were used in conjunction with each other in four of the MS. Constitutions. We have shown that *private* and *general* were both used in describing certain classes of Lodge meetings. To complete adequately the thesis mentioned previously that the error was in changing *diverse* to *private*, we must show some other instance in which the term *private assembly* was used. Unfortunately, no such case has come to my notice. The only evidence that can be produced leads us to the conclusion that it may have been, and probably was, so used.

The term *Lodge* was not in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries the fixed designation for a body of Masons that it has come to be in the twentieth century. There are instances of meetings being called Lodges, assemblies, companies, etc. It will not be denied, even upon the scanty evidence which has been presented, that the terms *Lodge* and *Assembly* were interchangeable. At one time we find the meetings termed *private* or *general* Lodges. In other cases as the general or head meeting. We find in some instances in the Old Charges that the Assembly is referred to as the *general assembly*. I quote a few of these:—

ROBERTS: "and give an Account of all such Acceptions, at every General Assembly.

. . . shall think fit to chuse at every Yearly General Assembly."

GRAND LODGE No. 2: "and give an accompt of all such acceptions att every generall Assembly.

That for y^e future y^e Said Society, Company, and ffraternity of ffree masons shall be regulated and governed by one Master and assembly and Wardens as the said Company shall thinke fitt to chuse at every yearely generall assembly."

HARLEIAN 1942: ". . . to give an acc^t of all such acceptions At every generall Assembly.

. . . as y^e said Company shall think fit to choose, at every yearely generall Assembly."

It may, perhaps, be said that too many of these quotations date after 1716 to be of value. That is true, but at the same time they are sufficiently close to the pre-Grand Lodge era to be either copies of earlier documents, or to follow the custom which I think prevailed prior to 1721. This is an indication of the trend of the argument in a later section of the paper, and must be left only as a suggestion at this time. The Gateshead Minutes prove beyond the shadow of a doubt the fact that *Assembly* and *Lodge* were interchangeable terms. They use the word *Assembly* in practically every instance; on the other hand, York uses *Lodge*. If, to the majority of Masons, *Lodge* and *Assembly* were interchangeable terms, a *private Lodge* would mean precisely the same thing as a *private assembly*. Perhaps those who are equipped to make a more thorough examination of the evidence will find references to *private assemblies* in other portions of the old documents. At any rate, there is sufficient ground for the expression of opinion that the transcription in the Hope, Waistell, and other Constitutions was due as much to a mental association of the words *private* and *assembly* as to any other cause.

On the whole, however, the argument about *private* and *general* Lodge meetings was only incidental to the main thread of our discussion. We set out to furnish a picture of pre-Grand Lodge Freemasonry. We have done so, indirectly to be sure, but as effectively as if we had adopted a more direct method. We are forced to discard the preconception that the Assembly was a national meeting, or that it was a meeting of many Lodges. It may have taken in more than one Lodge in the early days of its history, but during the early portion of the Transition Period we must accept the opinion that it was no more than a meeting of one Lodge. It is no longer an annual affair, though it may be such. It has evolved to such a stage that it may be held annually, semi-annually, or quarterly. With no more evidence than is furnished by these three Lodges, Alnwick, Gateshead-Swalwell, and York, it is clearly seen that statements previously made to the effect that we would naturally expect to find many varying forms in use during this period, which I have termed one of decay, find substantiation in fact. The Assembly seems to exercise jurisdiction over none but the members of one Lodge, and that in much the same way as Lodges do to-day. Of course, it must be borne in mind that attendance at General Meetings was compulsory, but it must also be remembered that it was only compulsory when the member received due notice. We still send out our notices, but we do not compel attendance at meetings. Perhaps that is unfortunate so far as American Lodges are concerned, but that is aside from the purpose of this discussion and we must omit further comment. The stated meeting of to-day has the power to transact any business that may come before it, and there is ample evidence to show that the General Meeting of the early eighteenth and, for that matter, late seventeenth centuries, had the same power. Apprentices were made Masons at such meetings, or at the completion of their term were admitted to fellowship in the Craft. The laws governing the Lodge were passed at these meetings, and disputes arising among the members were settled. As has already been stated, attendance at these meetings was mandatory, and it is in this sense that the meeting was a general one. Doubtless the reason for the designation *general* as applied to these meetings is to be sought in the fact that they were meetings of the Craft as a whole instead of small groups.

The legislative powers of these General Meetings can, I think, be traced back to the latter part of the sixteenth century. To the best of my knowledge, the oldest reference to this law-making aspect appears in the Grand Lodge MS. No. 1 of 1583 previously cited. The clause that certain charges have been made and ordained by the best advice of Masters and Fellows occurs almost uniformly in all Manuscripts after this one. These passages appear to make it clear that legislative power was traditionally vested in the assemblies. We need not mention the Hope and Waistell MSS. which have changed the *diverse* usually found to the word *private*. It is assumed that they are simply erroneous applications of the word *private* brought about by an incorrect reading of the older Manuscripts. The view of the Assembly as a legislative body is further supported by the fact that the Alnwick *Orders* were enacted at a General Head Meeting day (which, as we have seen, may be equated with the older Assembly.

It is more difficult to reach any opinion relative to the powers of the private meetings. There is a widespread variation between the three Lodges under discussion, and the most that can be attempted is to point out these differences and then try to formulate a general rule which would govern the cases. There is a saying to the effect that all generalizations are lies, including this one, which applies to the present attempt with more than usual force. At York it seems likely that the *Private Lodge* had no powers beyond making Masons; at Alnwick they seem to have been able to make Masons free of the Craft; at Gateshead they were able to make Masons, in the sense of acknowledging apprentices, but were prohibited from conferring the freedom of the Craft upon men who had completed their apprenticeship. There is also a provision which enables the private, occasional, or special meetings to settle disputes, etc. Other variations are too numerous to mention, and there is already sufficient evidence to warrant the assertion that practices were anything but uniform.

The only thing upon which we can base any generality is the fact that the Master or Wardens must have been acquainted with the fact that a meeting was to be held. These meetings, I think, must be equated with the special communications of modern Lodges. They were convened as occasion demanded with the consent of the Master, his Deputy, or Wardens as the case might be, and under their order for some special purpose. The business to be transacted must have been confined to the purpose for which the meeting was called, and no other matters could be brought before the Lodge. Anyone who cared could attend these meetings, but there must be a quorum present. No special notice was given as in the case of the general meeting. Aside from the above, very little can be said in attempting to build up a uniform rule for the *Private Lodge* on the basis of the evidence I have been able to see.

The necessity for repeating the statements previously made to the effect that generalizations are difficult and dangerous will, I think, become apparent to anyone who attempts to find variations in practice which would tend to show the above statements incorrect. It must be borne in mind that there was no national organization, and that what might be true in one locality is not necessarily true in another. Where we find such wide divergence of practices between three Lodges in a comparatively restricted area we could not hope to find a uniformity in a more widely distributed group. Neither could we hope to find such a national organization as some scholars would have us believe existed. I cannot too strongly emphasize the point that all evidence to me seems to point to a number of disconnected local organizations, each progressing, or decaying, as the case might be, in its own way, influenced by the others only as the actions of one locality would influence another, but not by any direct organized connection. In plain Americanized English, a national Masonic organization prior to 1716 is clearly 'the bunk.' In further emphasizing this point it might be well to quote from the Dumfries Kilwinning rules. It is there stated that the Officers and Fellows bind themselves "not to enter or pass any persons within twelve miles of ye sd. lodge without the consent of the Master, Wardens & fellows." The implication that entering or passing outside of the restricted area could take place under any conditions, but that something of the nature of a private Lodge must be convened within that area, seems apparent.

It is impossible at this time to enter into any discussion of the Scottish customs into which the last paragraph might naturally lead us. I shall only say, in passing, that there is much in the Scottish Craft which would be of interest, and that I have been unable to find anything which would, in any way, contradict the main trend of this argument. There are many things I would like to mention which would throw some rather interesting lights upon what has gone before. Since anything that could be said would amount to no more than a duplication of evidence, I shall omit them.

We have now shown, and I think conclusively, that the Assembly, in a somewhat modified form, perhaps, but at any rate as a type of meeting which can be easily collated with the Assembly of the Old Charges, did exist in a large portion of the North of England at least as late as 1713. Inferentially these meetings may be carried back to 1693, and it seems to be definitely established that they existed at an earlier date. If the improbable view that such meetings were instituted after 1693 is adopted, we still have a chain of about twenty years in which this practice was followed before the London meeting of 1716. It is hard to believe that an institution of such standing and existing over so large a portion of North England was unknown in the capital after twenty years' time. If the Minutes of York Lodge are studied it is found that private Lodges continued to meet at even later dates, up to 1730 at least. The Minutes I have been able to examine do not show general meetings after 1716, but that is no reason for supposing that they ceased to exist. That an election was held on December 27th, 1725, we know, and we also know of others. The early Minutes of the Grand Lodge of England would point to the fact that General Meetings were not uncommon even at that date. These records during

the first few years always refer to the election as taking place at a general meeting, but we shall have more to say on that score in its proper place. The Gateshead Minutes show that the Assembly continued to exist, and to be called by the name of Assembly as late as December 27th, 1734, and, incidentally, this Minute is confirmatory evidence that the Assembly, Quarterly Meeting, and the General Meeting were one and the same thing. The date, being that of a Quarterly Meeting, is significant:—

“December 27, 1734. It is agreed by the Master and Wardens and the rest of the Society, that if any brother shall appear in the Assembly without gloves and aprons at any time when summoned by Master and Wardens shall for each offence pay one shilling on demand.”

It seems evident that all members were present, and that it was such meetings as these to which the regulation applied. The provision of the Old Charges relative to attending Assemblies *if you have warning* implies a summons of some sort, and since the Assembly seems to be the only formally called meeting, there is no doubt but what this Quarterly Meeting must be equated with the Assembly as has been previously suggested.

Proof that the Assembly existed, either in survival, or revival, in a considerable portion of England during the period immediately preceding and following the organization of the Grand Lodge in London, seems almost conclusive. It now remains for us to show that the Grand Lodge was not an innovation, but a revival of the Assembly. It is not a part of my scheme to show that the Revival was due to any influence York may have had, but only to show that it was an evolution and not an innovation. Perhaps the evidence that has thus far been produced will be taken to mean that York was the impelling motive; for the present I shall not try to correct that impression. I have purposely avoided any reference to London Masonry during the pre-Grand Lodge Era in an effort to show that we do not necessarily have to have a strong Masonic organization in London to make the evolution possible. When we come to discuss London practices in a later portion of this paper we will find confirmation from that source which will be added to the weight of what has here been adduced. If London conditions were not such as to make the evolution possible, conditions in the North of England were. We have two possible sources from which the evolutionary processes may have developed. It makes no difference which was the correct one, or whether both were contributing factors. Though this ending to the discussion may seem abrupt, we must, of necessity, pass on to another phase of the question, returning to this point at a later time when it will be found more convenient to re-construct the whole picture.

II. (A). THE GRAND MASTER.

We must leave the Assembly for a time to enter into a discussion of that earliest period of Grand Lodge history which begins with the meeting of 1717, or more properly, its earlier forerunner of 1716, mentioned by Dr. Anderson in his *1738 Constitutions*, and ends with the first recording of Grand Lodge Minutes in 1723. These limits must not be taken too exactly as we shall have occasion to refer to occurrences outside of these six years of Grand Lodge history. From all that has been said concerning this period one would be inclined to judge that all the resources of the scanty documentary evidence we now possess have long since been exhausted. That definite and conclusive evidence relative to this period is very scanty is a well-known fact. The Minutes of the Grand Lodge now in our possession begin on June 24th, 1723, and it seems unlikely that there are any to be found of an earlier date. If some diligent and patient searcher does succeed in unearthing documents of this nature for the period in question, all of the speculation and thought of Masonic scholars will find therein

either confirmation or denial. It would be interesting to know how near we have come to reaching the correct conclusions concerning the happenings of these six years. The situation remains, however, that we have no records of this period in Grand Lodge archives. Anderson's first *Constitutions* were published in 1723, and in these we have practically the only contemporary document extant; though no little doubt may be cast upon their authenticity. Payne's Regulations adopted by Grand Lodge on 24th June, 1721, are included in this work. For an account of the formation of the Grand Lodge we are indebted to Anderson's *Constitutions* of 1738. On this record is based practically everything we have discovered relative to this period.

The shadow of doubt which lies upon the reproduction of Payne's General Regulations casts its penumbra upon the account of early Grand Lodge history given in the second edition of the *Constitutions*. The arguments that apply to one have equal weight when applied to the other, and for this reason it may be as well to consider them together. The accuracy, or lack of it, of the Reverend James Anderson is well known, and there is no reason for supposing that he was any more precise in one respect than in another. He may have made emendations to the Regulations when they were incorporated in his *Constitutions of the Freemasons*, 1723, just as he did when including them in the 1738 edition, and his account of the first meeting of the Grand Lodge may have been coloured by his imagination. There is evidently some ulterior motive running through both editions of the work. Anderson seems to have been obsessed with the idea that the new organization (as it has come to be styled) needed the authority of the past to enable it to survive. This constitutes another instance of the conservatism of the Craft of which previous mention has been made. I am consciously falling into a mode of expression which has gained popularity in recent years; I wish, however, to enter a reservation which will enable me to change the tenor of these remarks after all of the evidence has been considered. Doubtless Anderson has included names, dates, and events which have no foundation in fact, but which may none the less have some foundation of history to support them. That may sound like a paradoxical statement, but there is a certain subtle distinction between actual fact and some foundation in actual events which is well known among ethnologists, and it is this distinction that it is desired to express.

There is, however, no reason for supposing that Anderson's reproduction of the original regulations and the later account of the formation of the Grand Lodge are not substantially accurate. Scholars have insisted that Anderson is not to be considered a reliable authority, but they have gone on believing certain portions of his account and discarding others, seemingly without system or regard for what may or may not have been true. The reservation in connection with Anderson previously mentioned is now ready for elucidation. I think it absolutely certain that the learned Doctor is not to be relied upon as a scholar meticulously accurate as to his facts, but it is, I believe, equally certain that his errors have some sufficient reason. A study of these errors in the light of what preceded the time of his writing may enable us to come to some conclusions as to his historic accuracy. I shall not attempt to carry this analysis farther than to apply it to his account of the formation of the Grand Lodge, and I shall leave a more detailed statement of my position until the evidence has been considered. The method I choose to follow is something of a cross between Biblical criticism and the comparative method which has been so fruitful when applied to ethnic religions; there are differences, of course, but fundamentally the method is the same.

Even if we grant the accuracy in every respect of Dr. Anderson's accounts, both as relating to the Grand Lodge and Payne's Regulations, we cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, find a basis for considering them contemporaneous with the events. Anderson's account of Payne's Regulations bears the same relation to the original that Dr. Plot's version of the Old Charges bears to the missing original. There is that distinction in each case which the scholar draws between second-hand information and the

original sources. We are, therefore, without anything of a contemporaneous nature during the period from 1716 to 1723, and as a result all of our conclusions are based, not on first-hand information, but on later accounts of the happenings of the period. This is true with only one or two important exceptions, and we shall have to amend the assertion to that extent. Because of our lack of contemporaneous records, additions to the present mass of opinion dealing with the early years of Grand Lodge history may be of some value in throwing the light of knowledge on what is still one of the darkest periods in Masonic history.

It has, for many years, been customary to refer to the Grand Lodge as dating from 1716. There is no reason to change the practice even now, though I am of the opinion that there is ample reason for changing our conception of the term as it is generally used. Continuous existence can be claimed for the Grand Lodge from this well-known date, but instead of thinking of the meeting which preceded the union of the Four Old Lodges as the birth of the Grand Lodge, so styled, I believe we shall have to think of it as the date of the revitalization of the Craft and the inception of the movement in which the old organization evolved into the present Grand Lodge system.

There is one more point which stands in need of clarification before we can discuss the Grand Lodge itself. As the title of this section of the discussion indicates, it has to deal with the early Grand Masters. Anthony Sayer is generally referred to as the first to hold this exalted station. This is one of the cases where Anderson is implicitly believed, and so far as I have been able to discover no one has ever doubted either that Anderson was here to be believed, or that Anthony Sayer was the first Grand Master. In all probability the myth has been promulgated upon the basis of the Second Edition of the *Constitutions*, a few references to the gentleman in the Grand Lodge Minutes, and a preconceived idea that the Grand Lodge itself was an innovation which took shape immediately upon its supposed establishment at the Goose and Gridiron on June 24th, 1717. It may be said, with almost equal force, that there are no contemporary references to Sayer as Grand Master, at least I have been unable to find any. The same situation holds true when we look for evidence in relation to his immediate successors. In spite of this fact, Masonic scholars have been insisting that we should accept Anderson's account of the formation of the Grand Lodge in so far as it applies to a list of the early officers, and disregard it almost in its entirety when it relates the events which took place at that time. As I have indicated, it seems that the time has come when we should endeavour to find just what we are to believe and what we are not to believe in this story of Dr. Anderson. Modern critical methods will, I think, enable us to reach some very definite conclusions on this point.

The earliest reference to the office of Grand Master which I have been able to locate is that found in the Rev. Dr. Stukeley's diary under date of June 24th, 1721, in which he refers to the Duke of Montagu being installed in that office. This reference is one exception I had in mind when I made the reservation to the assertion that there was nothing of a contemporaneous nature dealing with the period from 1716 to 1723. There is one other exception which will be cited in due course. Dr. Stukeley's account is quite brief and to the point:—

“1721. Mar. 10. I waited on S^r. Chr. Wren.

“June 24. The Masons had a dinner at Stationers Hall, present, Duke of Montague, L^d. Herbert, L^d. Stanhope, S^r. And. Fountain, &c. D^r. Desaguliers pronounc'd an oration. The G^d. M^r. Mr. Pain produc'd an old MS. of the Constitutions which he got in the West of England, 500 years old. He read over a new sett of articles to be observ'd. The Duke of Montague chose G^d. M^r. next year. Dr. Beal, Deputy.

“Nov. 30, 1721. Dr. Halley resigning his Place as Secretary to the Royal Society I was solicited by a great many members to stand

Candidate to succeed him, but the President, Halley, Dr. Mead, & the whole Mathematical Party opposed me. ∴ We were outnumbered to the vast satisfaction & rejoycing of our opponents." (*A.Q.C.* vi., 130.)

I have cited the entries both before and after the one dealing particularly with the case in question to establish the date conclusively as 1721. There is no actual mention of Grand Master in this quotation, but I think the abbreviation "G^d." is sufficient to indicate that it is meant to be *Grand* and not *General* as I suspect it actually was prior to this date. It is sufficient reason for Bro. Gould in his *History of Freemasonry*, when he quotes the passage, using the full word instead of the abbreviation. (Gould, *History of Freemasonry* ii., 234.)

In the hope that there might be some mention of the office in the Old Charges, I have examined transcripts or facsimiles of as many of these documents as it has been possible for me to locate, seventy-seven in all. But this search has elicited nothing. There is a reference to a "Deputy Grand Master" in the Harris No. 2 MS., but this must be discarded because of the date of the document, as well as the fact that it is obviously an attempt to adjust the Old Charges to the new Grand Lodge system. (*Q.C.A.* iv.) Since it is such an attempt, one would naturally expect to find some allusion to the order of things as they had changed during the eighteenth century. We find not only the above reference, but also an account of the procedure in case of funerals, a thing lacking, so far as I have been able to discover, from all documents falling into the class of Old Charges or Manuscript Constitutions.

The only thing in the Old Charges which could, by any stretch of the imagination be considered a reference to a Grand Master is the statement in these documents that the son of the King of Tyre was "Master of Geometry and Chief Master Mason," or some variation of this term. All of these references are to be found in that portion of the Manuscripts commonly termed the "Legend of the Craft."

While it may be argued by some that the chief master mentioned was, or may have been, a presiding officer holding jurisdiction over wide reaches of territory, it seems probable that no more was meant than that he was the master in charge of a given piece of work. That such was not actually the case may, in some instances, be true. The point that it is necessary for us to make is that he was not called "*Grand Master*." If he had been so designated there may have been some reason for supposing that the presiding officer at the Union of the Four Old Lodges was actually called *Grand Master*, and that the organization itself was styled a *Grand Lodge*.

On the basis of the available information it cannot be stated with certainty that the results of the above partial investigation are conclusive so far as the remainder of the MSS. are concerned. The case is almost as strong, however, as it would be if the barrier of three thousand miles which separates me from the home of most of these documents could be overcome. If all known versions had been examined, no more could be said than that none of them contained any reference to a *Grand Master*, and this would be of only a little more assistance than the study already made. It could not, in any event, preclude the possibility of such a designation appearing in some as yet undiscovered manuscript.

We may, I think, be fairly confident that the term was not in use prior to 1716. Bro. Lionel Vibert has made a pronouncement on the point which seemingly adds the weight of his opinion to the one I have formed. Speaking of Anderson and the Kings of Scotland as Grand Masters, he says:—

"His Kings as Grand Masters have no existence in fact, and no such terms as Grand Master and Grand Warden were as yet known in Scotland, the highest officer being the General Warden: but it is on record that in 1590 a Warden was appointed over the Masons in Aberdeen, Banff, and Kincardine, and under the General Warden for

Scotland, by James VI., and Anderson may also have been aware of the St. Clair Charter which records the appointment of a Patron and Protector, though the Aberdeen Lodge does not appear to have been a party to this document."

We are forced to recall Bro. Hughan's statement with regard to the list of Grand Masters at York in which he said that there was no such officer as Grand Master in this Lodge until after 1724. It is indeed strange that neither of these scholars thought to investigate this point with reference to London. Bro. Vibert falls into the same error once again when he says:—

"In 1716, or 1717, the brethren meeting at these houses, and with them in all likelihood other individual Freemasons not associated with any particular tavern, seem to have instituted a practice of an annual feast of the whole Fraternity in London and Westminster. This was a custom they were familiar with as an old Gild practice still kept up by the London Companies. They called it the 'Assembly,' which was the old term in use among the Craft centuries earlier, and at the Assembly of 1717 they elected to preside over them a Mr. Anthony Sayer, Gentleman, whom they styled the Grand Master." (Vibert, *The Story of the Craft*, p. 45.)

If Bro. Vibert has any contemporary evidence to produce in support of this assertion I should be very glad to have it brought to light.

The discussion has wandered from the path, and we had best return. If it is true that no such terms as Grand Master and Grand Warden were known in Scotland, and there is no evidence to show that they were known in England, it seems safe to conclude that the title came into being either with the Union of the Four Old Lodges, or after it. It has been generally assumed that it came into existence with the meeting of June 24th, 1717. The authority for this assumption lies doubtless in the following well-known passage:—

"King George I. enter'd *London* most magnificently on 20 *Sept.* 1714, and after the Rebellion was over A.D. 1716, the few *Lodges* at *London* finding themselves neglected by Sir *Christopher Wren*, thought fit to cement under a *Grand Master* as the Center of Union and Harmony. viz. the *Lodges* that met,

1. At the *Goose* and *Gridiron* Ale-house in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*.
2. At the *Crown* Ale-house in *Parker's-lane* near *Drury Lane*.
3. At the *Apple-Tree* Tavern in *Charles-Street*, *Covent Garden*.
4. At the *Rummer* and *Grapes* Tavern in *Channel-Row*, *Westminster*.

"They and some old Brothers met at the said *Apple-Tree*, and having put into the Chair the *oldest Master* (now the *Master* of a *Lodge*) they constituted themselves a GRAND LODGE pro Tempore in *Due Form*, and forthwith revived the Quarterly *Communication* of the *Officers* of Lodges (Call'd the Grand Lodge) resolv'd to hold the *Annual Assembly and Feast*, and then to chuse a Grand Master from among themselves, till they should have the Honour of a *Noble Brother* at their Head.

Accordingly

"On *St. John Baptist's Day*, in the 3rd Year of King George I. A.D. 1717, the ASSEMBLY and *Feast* of the *Free and Accepted Masons* was held at the foresaid *Goose and Gridiron* Alehouse.

"Before Dinner, the *oldest Master* Mason (now the *Master* of a *Lodge*) in the Chair, proposed a list of proper Candidates: and the Brethren by a Majority of Hands elected

"Mr. ANTHONY SAYER, Gentleman, *Grand Master* of *Masons* who being forthwith in- Capt. *Joseph Elliot* } *Grand*
vested with the badges Mr. *Jacob Lamball*, Carpenter } *Wardens*
of Office and Power by the said *oldest Master*, and installed, was

duly congratulated by the Assembly who pay'd him the *Homage*." (*Q.C.A.*, vol. vii., pp. 109-110.)

Although this might, upon its face, seem to be an authoritative though brief account of the actual happenings, it is not contemporaneous. We have every reason for doubting that an account of a happening written twenty years after the actual event was accurately reported. Doubtless the events did take place, but not necessarily as they are recorded. It may be that the convictions which I have come to possess concerning this meeting have coloured my views of the passage above quoted, but I cannot help but feel that the whole fabric is an attempt to project backward the institution of Grand Lodges and Grand Masters. The time is not yet ripe for a more detailed discussion of this point, but after considering the balance of the argument I should like my readers to give some thought to the opinion just expressed.

On the basis of a search of all material available to me I have reached the conclusion that there was no knowledge of the title of *Grand Master* prior to 1717; where, then, did the term originate, and when? The earliest definite mention of the term is found in the previously mentioned citation from Stukeley, and I think this furnishes a key to the difficulty. We may, perhaps, go a bit deeper into the matter before endeavouring to arrive at definite conclusions.

A quotation from the Minutes of Mary's Chapel may throw some more light upon this particular point:—

"Att Maries Chapell the 24th of August 1721 years—James Wattson, present deacon of the Masons of Edinr., Preses. The which day Doctor John Theophilus Desaguliers, fellow of the Royall Societie, and Chaplain in Ordinary to his Grace James Duke of Chandois, late Generall Master of the Mason Lodges in England, being in town and desirous to have a conference with the Deacon, Warden, and Master Masons of Edinr., which was accordingly granted and finding him duly qualified in all points of Masonry, they received him as a Brother into their Societie." (Murray Lyon, *Freemasonry in Scotland*, p. 151.)

Why do the Masons of Edinburgh call Dr. Desaguliers *Generall Master*? The answer to that question is also the answer to the query as to what the first presiding officer of the united Lodges was called.

There is need for more evidence before we can answer any of the problems thus far presented to us. Anderson's *Constitutions*, both the first and second editions, will be of some little assistance.

In the dedication of the work, presumably written shortly before its publication, there are three references to Grand Masters and one to a Deputy Grand Master; the Grand Masters mentioned being the Duke of Wharton, styled the "Right Worshipful Grand Master," and the Duke of Montagu, termed "Grand Master last year." J. T. Desaguliers is the Deputy Grand Master. Since the dedication was written by Desaguliers and signed by him in his official capacity as Deputy Grand Master, the date is firmly established as being between June 24th, 1722, and the publication of the *Constitutions* in 1723. Consequently, this reference to Grand Masters is not quite as old as that contained in Stukeley's Diary.

Coming now to the section of the work headed "The Constitution, History, Laws, Charges, Orders, Regulations, and Usages, of the Right Worshipful Fraternity of Accepted Free Masons: collected from their general Records, and their faithful Traditions of many Ages," which was evidently written by Anderson after his authorization to compile a new Constitution, we find the following interesting references:—Fifteen to Grand Master, and three to General Masters. The following persons are referred to as Grand or General Masters:—Moses, termed both General Master Mason and Grand Master; King Solomon, Grand Master; King Hiram, Grand Master; Nebuchadnezzar, Grand Master

Mason; Zerubbabel, Prince and General Master-Mason; Ptolemeus Philadelphus, General Master-Mason; Augustus Cæsar, Grand Master; Prince Edwin, Grand Master; Kings of Scotland, being often Grand Masters and Grand Wardens; Prince John, Duke of Montague, Grand Master.

"The Charges of a Freemason" have a reference to a General or Grand Lodge, but this has a more direct bearing upon a matter for later discussion, and may be neglected at this time. In the "General Regulations" there is no mention of a General Master or General Lodge.

In the second or 1738 edition of the *Constitutions* those mentioned as General Masters or General Master Masons are referred to as Grand Masters. Was the use of the term *General* a slip of the pen which went uncorrected in the first edition, or was it an intentional use of the word? The fact that it was changed in the second edition would seem to indicate that it was not intentional.

Attention must also be called to the fact that the first section of the 1723 edition was "collected from their general Records," also the Payne Regulations are 'General Regulations.' If the term *Grand* had come down from the old Operative Craft, why would not these records be *grand* records and regulations instead of *General*?

The reason is obvious. The word *Grand* was not in the technical phraseology of the Operative Craft or at least was not in general use among Masons. The word *General* was quite widespread in its distribution, general meetings, general orders, general lodges, etc.

A brief summary of the evidence thus far will possibly clarify the situation and enable us to draw some conclusions. First, there is no contemporary reference to any of the first four officers who presided over the newly united Craft as Grand Masters unless Stukeley's reference to Payne, as such, be accepted. This same Stukeley citation provided the earliest reference we have to a Grand Master. The next reference in chronological order is that cited from Murray Lyon which terms Desaguliers *General Master*. After these two items we have a gap of almost two years before the publication of Anderson's *Constitutions* of 1723, in which both General and Grand Master are used as designations for the presiding officer. We then find that these have been emended in the 1738 edition so that the term General Master becomes Grand Master. It seems certain that there is no reference to such an officer as Grand Master in any copy of the Old Charges earlier than the Harris No. 2 Manuscript.

A fairly logical and not too extravagant inference would be that since there is no evidence of the use of the term *Grand* prior to 1717, it must have come into being after that date. We certainly find no contemporary reference to any of the first three presiding officers as Grand Masters, and the fourth may, perhaps, be included in this list, since Dr. Stukeley's reference to him as Grand Master comes not during his term, but immediately after it. We may safely conclude that the title originated after the terms of office of the first three men, and either immediately upon the retirement of the fourth, or at some time during his term of office. Payne's Regulations, approved June 24th, 1721, as printed by Anderson in his first *Constitutions*, contain no reference to any presiding officer but a Grand Master. Neither does this section of the work refer to a General Lodge or General Master as does the third charge of the Freemasons in the section immediately preceding the Regulations, and the alleged history of the Craft which forms the first portion of the book, both of which were written by Anderson. Does it seem possible that these allusions to officers as *General* instead of *Grand* may have been lapses to the designation which had been habitual to Anderson and which the short space of a year and a half or little more had not entirely erased from his memory? It would seem that such is, in reality, the case, because he frequently uses the designation *General* or *Grand* as though the terms were interchangeable. It is a striking coincidence, if nothing more, that the first documentary reference we have to a Grand Master coincides precisely in date with the approval of Payne's *General Regula-*

tions. Added to this is the fact that only two months later Dr. Desaguliers paid a visit to Mary's Chapel and was received as a former *General Master* of English Masons. Where did the Scotch Masons get this designation? The answer is obvious, either from Dr. Desaguliers in person, or from some other source. In either case this incident seems to be conclusive proof that the title of the earliest presiding officer was not Grand Master, but General Master. If the title was supplied by Dr. Desaguliers he was evidently using the designation familiar to him, a momentary lapse of memory, or perhaps due to the fact that he did not deem himself officially a Grand Master because that term came into official use after his term of office. If the source was other than the former "General Master of English Mason Lodges," it must have been one in common use, else it would not have found its way into Edinburgh. Perhaps some Scotch Masons had visited London during the period from 1717 to 1721 and had brought back this new title, at least new to them, if we are to accept Bro. Vibert's statement. The human intellect has a way of retaining things that are strange to it, and it is almost beyond belief that such a simple phrase as "General Master" could have been incorrectly transmitted. Certainly the Scottish Brethren would not make the mistake of turning the title "Grand Master" into "General Master," particularly since the term *Grand* as applied to a Lodge officer would be more strange than ever. But even if they did, we are still at a loss to account for the synonymous references in Dr. Anderson's work.

If Bro. Vibert's opinion has any weight we must conclude that the use of the term *General* was prevalent in Scotland. The reference to *General Warden* comes to mind at once. We must also note that there seems to be no use of the word *Grand* at York, Alnwick, and Gateshead. This point was stressed in the preceding section of this paper. The widespread use of the word *General* in relation to Lodge and Assembly was also noted. Thus it seems possible that here lies one of the strongest bits of evidence that can be brought to bear upon the subject. If there was no use of the term *Grand* prior to 1717, and a widespread use of the term *General*, would it not be logical to assume that the *General* came over with many other customs? The conservative nature of the Masonic fraternity, to which reference has been made, would certainly be a sufficient reason to advance such an assumption.

I think there can be no doubt but that the first presiding officers were General Masters and not Grand Masters as we have been led to believe.

Since there apparently was a change from the title of *General Master* to that of *Grand Master* in 1721, there must be some reason for its being made. Doubtless the fact that the first "noble brother" was about to occupy Solomon's chair is sufficient to account for such an innovation. The title General Master is not particularly high sounding, and certainly does not smack of nobility. Perhaps Payne in formulating his Regulations had in mind the fact that he was going to propose the Duke as his successor, and felt that a more fitting title for the office should be devised. This presumption is substantiated by the fact that we do not find the term *General Master* used in his Regulations. Neither do we find the term *General Lodge*. To me this indicates that where Anderson was not so scrupulously careful, Payne was meticulous. Payne was proposing the change and incorporating it into his new rules of government. It would be only natural that he would be particularly painstaking to see that the old term did not find its way into the new legal code he was offering for the guidance of the Craft. Aside from this, however, the number of chivalric orders prevailing during the preceding centuries, many of them continuing down to the period under discussion and to the present day, may account, in some measure, for the derivation of the title Grand Master. In glancing over some old books on this subject I have found a list of some thirty to thirty-five such orders governed by Grand Masters. Only one or two have been mentioned as being ruled by an officer of another title. These orders were recruited from the nobility and in most instances some Duke or King acted as Grand Master. The Duke of Montague was the first Grand Master of the revived Order of the Bath in 1725 according to at least one authority, who says:—

“But it (the Order of the Bath) was never established on a solid foundation until it pleased his Majesty, King George the First, to renew and institute it, according to the form, at present subsisting.

“The Duke of Montague was named Grand Master, (since his Death, that Dignity has been reunited to the Crown) and thirty six Knights were installed with much Solemnity, in the Chapel of King Henry the Seventh.” (Hansen, *An Accurate Historical Account of All the Orders of Knighthood at Present Existing in Europe*, vol. ii., p. 18.)

The use of the word *Grand* was not restricted to officers, but was frequently used in reference to Capitularies, Commanderies, etc. Payne doubtless was familiar with this practice, or perhaps he consulted those who were. At any rate, this is a possible source of the designation as it came to be used and I do not offer it as more than a suggestion.

Bro. Wm. L. Boyden, Librarian of the Scottish Rite Library at Washington, D.C., has offered the following interesting comment on this subject:—

“In the early days of Masonry in England, the King was oft times the friend of the Craft, and as the word ‘Grand’ smacked of nobility, might not the masons of those days have felt that to use this word as a title for the presiding officer of their Assembly, tread somewhat on the sensitiveness of the King and incur his displeasure? As time went on and men became more independent and less fearful of the King, they might have thrown off this tendency, and when the Grand Lodge was organized, assumed for their presiding officer the title of ‘Grand Master.’” (A letter to the author dated 20th July, 1927.)

Such a procedure is as possible as any other, and it is here offered as an additional suggestion of the possible derivation of the word in its present Masonic sense.

There is much in connection with the practice of the Assemblies that would contribute to the conclusion that the first presiding officer of the revitalized Craft was not a Grand Master, but a General Master. We shall leave this until we have completed the discussion from the standpoint of the Grand Lodge itself.

(B). THE GRAND LODGE.

The final bit of evidence which might contribute to the preliminary development of the theory I wish to present is to be found in the so-called new organization itself. This phase of the discussion may be passed over quite briefly because in plan it follows very closely the discussion on Grand Masters immediately preceding it, and, secondly, because there is even less evidence than in the case of the presiding officer.

So far as contemporaneous references to the Grand Lodge are concerned, we are in precisely the same position as in the case of the Grand Master, perhaps even worse. Unless we accept Payne's Regulations as reproduced in Anderson's *Constitutions* as being a verbatim reproduction, we have nothing earlier than 1723. It is my opinion that so far as this particular argument is concerned we may take these Regulations for what they purport to be. True as it is that this may seem to be an opinion based upon incomplete evidence, I cannot help but feel that there is more than an accident responsible for the fact that neither a *General* Lodge nor a *General* Master is anywhere mentioned in Payne's Regulations. Mention of both is to be found in the portions of the *Constitutions* avowedly written by Dr. Anderson. Whether or not this opinion is well founded, it remains that we have nothing which could possibly be earlier than 1721. If the acceptance of this view does not meet with general approval, the contemporaneity of the earliest reference is automatically brought down to the publication of the *Book of Constitutions* in 1723.

When the Old Charges are considered we find the same lack of evidence concerning a Grand Lodge as was found in the case of the Grand Master.

Through this occurrence we are led to the conclusion that was reached in relation to the officer. I have been unable to find any expressions upon the part of scholars such as was brought to bear in the case of Grand Masters, but it would not be too extravagant to assume that since the Old Charges do not make mention of a Grand Lodge, and Grand Masters were unknown, that Grand Lodges were also unknown.

As in the preceding case, the evidence suggests one of two alternatives, either the title *Grand Lodge* came into being with the inception of the revival, or at a later date. I am convinced that the latter alternative is the correct one, though inference is practically the only evidence upon which such a conclusion can be based. It is very difficult to understand why the presiding officer of a *Grand Lodge* should be called a *General Master*.

The wide use of the word *General* in relation to meetings of various sorts at Alnwick, Gateshead, and York has been discussed. It has also been shown that the word *Grand* was not used, or if it was, I have been unable to find where. Are we to suppose that in this respect the London Masons were different from those at York? Perhaps the London Masons Company would account in some measure for a change in terminology, but the records would indicate that their customs were similar. We must not lose sight of the peculiar position in which London found itself during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. London was TOWN, and what was done there was the thing to do. It would seem that if there were changes in terms in use in London they would have been adopted in the provinces in time. The force of this assertion is emphasized by the fact that hardly two years had elapsed since the publication of Anderson's *Constitutions* when the old Lodge at York had adopted the title *Grand Master* in preference to the older designation of *President*. A Deputy Grand Master and Grand Wardens apparently came into being at the same time. (Hughan, *Masonic Sketches and Reprints*, p. 57.) Another confirmation lies, perhaps, in the fact that we know of no *Constitutions* being published by the York Grand Lodge. They seem to have accepted those of the London Masons for their guidance.

We are not so fortunate as to find any "Mary's Chapel" Minute in this instance; in fact, the only evidence to confirm the view that the early name was *General Lodge* instead of *Grand Lodge* is to be found in two references to such a body in Anderson's first *Constitutions*:—

"And because such Agreements were made at the *General Lodges*."
(p. 35.)

"And by the Regulations of the *General or Grand Lodge*." (p. 51.)

As would be expected, these references have been carefully erased from the second edition. They point, therefore, to the same conclusions as were reached in connection with the similar mention of *General Masters*.

The second of these two references seems to be conclusive. It specifically mentions a *General or Grand Lodge* as though they were one and the same thing, as I believe they were after 1721.

We can attribute the change to the same cause in both instances and probably trace it to the same source.

The question of Anderson's use of the term *Grand Lodge* as applied to events which are supposed to have taken place at an earlier date is one which naturally arises. This substitution of terms is not inexplicable: there are two quite simple answers—either or both may have contributed to the change. Dr. Anderson may have wanted to attribute an antiquity to the term which was not its just due. This action would be primarily for the purpose of preventing the cry of "innovation" from the conservatives. The other explanation, and doubtless the more important one, was that he was writing for those who understood the situation and would form no misconceptions on account of the confusion of terms. His readers would understand the evolutionary stages through which the Grand Lodge had passed, and they would understand that

the Grand Lodge, General Lodge, and General Assembly were synonymous terms. It would not be necessary to be more explicit.

In relation to the Grand Lodge, Bro. W. L. Boyden has made an interesting comment. He says:—

“There is no doubt in my mind that there were equivalents of a Grand Lodge before 1717, and that the latter was a revival, or, if you will, a new-fashioned continuation of the General Assemblies. In Roberts constitution of 1722, reprinted in Cox—*The Old Constitution*, p. 23, is a plain statement of ‘Additional Orders and constitutions made and agreed upon at a General Assembly, held at ——— on the Eighth Day of December, 1663.’”

This is precisely what I have been trying to prove, though I must take rather strenuous exception to his use of “equivalents of a Grand Lodge” unless we are to accept this use of the term in a sense far different from its modern connotation. The General Assemblies of the transition period bore no resemblance to a Grand Lodge. They were not representative bodies: they were not unions of Lodges. They were, as I have said before, stated or regular communications of one given Lodge.

The General Warden for Scotland, and other indications to be found in Scottish records, would tend to show some governing body of more than local jurisdiction. I still maintain, however, that nothing of the sort existed in England prior to 1716, unless it was the London Company which governed London and the immediate vicinity only. This one exception may account for the formation of the first General Lodge in London. Even this reorganization, however, did not presume to exercise jurisdiction outside of London and Westminster until several years after its inception. The local nature of the reorganization seems to make the position that there was no change of titles in the new plan even more certain. It was simply a revival of a previously existing scheme of government.

III. THE LONDON CRAFT.

It would seem that the most natural procedure in any attempt to show the evolutionary character of the Mother Grand Lodge would be to search for the earlier stages of its development in the particular locality which was responsible for its birth. A part of the plan of this paper has been to refrain from any comment upon the pre-Grand Lodge status of Freemasonry in London and its environs. It has, I think, been fairly conclusively shown that it would not be impossible for the present system of government to have arisen from the decadent London organizations which were, to use Anderson's phrase, neglected by Sir Christopher Wren. When an effort is made to reconstruct the Craft in London as it may have been prior to the formation of the *General Lodge*, many difficulties meet us. The most striking thing is the fact that there seems to be absolutely nothing in the form of records of old Lodges that treats of the period from 1675, or even earlier, to 1717. The only real evidence we possess is to be found in the records of the Masons Company. While it is difficult to believe Anderson's assertion that Sir Christopher Wren had been guilty of neglecting the Craft, it would almost seem that someone had been responsible for the state of decay into which the old Lodges had fallen.

It would be more reasonable, I think, to place the blame upon the members of the Lodges themselves, and not try to single out any one individual. The Masons Company records have come down to us, and in this we find, in my opinion, the reason for the surprising lack of old Lodge documents so far as London is concerned. Bro. Conder's work *The Hole Craft and Fellowship of Masonry* does much to clear up this situation. If we accept the general theme which pervades this book, we find that there was doubtless a Lodge of Masons

connected with, or attached to, the London Company. It is evident that this Lodge had no standing as a body controlling the actions of the Craft at large; it seems to have had no valid legal status. The Masons Company was the body which operated under charter from the King and was responsible for all regulation of the working Masons in London. The Lodge would bear something of the same relation to the Company that is found to exist in many large commercial houses to-day. The business institution takes care of all matters relating to trade and commerce, but frequently there are social clubs for the employees which are identified with the Company, but which are, nevertheless, merely social adjuncts having no power in connection with the affairs of the Corporation.

The entries in the Diary of Elias Ashmole under date of March 10th and March 11th, 1682, seem to confirm this view of the situation:—

“ March 10th. About 5 p.m. I received a summons to appear at a Lodge to be held next day at Masons Hall, London.

“ March 11th. Accordingly I went and about noon were admitted into the Fellowship of Free Masons:

“ Sir William Wilson Knight, Capt. Rich Borthwick, Mr. Will Woodman,* Mr. Wm. Grey,* Mr. Samuel Taylor,* and Mr. William Wise.*

“ I was senior Fellow among them (it being 35 years since I was admitted). There were present besides myself the Fellows after named:

“ Mr. Thos. Wise,* Master of the Masons company this present year. Mr. Thomas Shorthose,* Mr. Thomas Shadbolt,* ——— Wainsford,* Esq., Mr. Rich. Young,* Mr. John Shorthose,* Mr. William Hammon,* Mr. John Thompson,* and Mr. William Stanton.*

“ We all dined at the Halfe Moone Tavern in Cheapside, at a Noble dinner prepared at the charge of the New-accepted Masons.”

Bro. Conder adds the following note in explanation of the asterisk placed after some of the names:—

“ In 1682 Thomas Wise was master of the Company; John Shorthose and William Stanton, wardens; also those names marked with an asterisk were members of the Masons Company. The others were doubtless members of the Masons' Hall Lodge of Freemasons, where the old speculative part of masonry had been kept secretly alive during the troubled state of the country since the Reformation.”

Continuing with the comment of Bro. Conder upon the Diary entries we read that:—

“ From these extracts it will be easily understood why ‘An old Book containing the Constitutions of the accepted Masons’ was in the possession of the Company at the time of the inventory of 1665, and also why the names of the accepted masons were enclosed in a ‘faire frame with a lock and key,’ and also, perhaps, why the Company had ‘One great Bible,’ and ‘one Ivory Hammer.’

“ Before leaving Ashmole and the Masonic meeting at the hall, it is well to note that no mention of any such meeting is made in the books of the Company when they met for the protection of the ancient landmarks of the Society of Free and Accepted Masons. This dual condition certainly existed then, and had done so no doubt from the time when every member of the Company who could set out geometrical details, was also an initiated member of the Society of Free Masons, then possibly embracing the whole of Europe.” (Conder, *The Hole Craft*, pp. 204-206.)

Again referring to this Lodge, Bro. Conder says:—

“How long the speculative division, or accepted members, continued to meet at Masons’ Hall after 1682, we cannot tell, as they no doubt had separate minute and cash-books. Consequently we do not find any further evidence except the entry in the inventory of 1722, when the MS. Constitutions containing the old Masons’ legend were again noted as being still in the possession of the Company.

“It is very probable that at or about this time some of the members joined other Lodges of a more convivial character, such as those which met in the vicinity of St. Paul’s Cathedral, particularly the Lodge held at the Goose and Gridiron, now known as the Lodge of Antiquity.” (Conder, *The Hole Craft*, pp. 229-230.)

The only thing I desire to point out in connection with these rather lengthy excerpts is that there was a distinction between the Lodges of Masons and the Masons Company. These Lodge organizations having no part in the business of the Masons Company, which was the legal entity for overseeing the Craft in London, would have no need of records of the kind kept by the Company. Perhaps they did not keep any records. There is another suggestion which has come into more or less general acceptance and that is Anderson’s account of the burning of many old documents. This feature of the question is so well known that there is no need to repeat it. Either or both of the reasons given may account in some measure for the paucity of contemporary evidence in relation to pre-1717 Masonry in London.

Masonic scholars have been mourning the scarcity of these records for many years. Bro. G. W. Speth has very aptly stated the case in the following words:—

“How these Lodges met, whence they derived their origin and right of existence, and what they did are more or less matters of conjecture. It is equally unknown whether there was any bond uniting them, other than their esoteric secrets and customs or any community of action. But in 1716 the preliminary steps were taken to forge a link, intended at first to affect only London and Westminster, but to which link after link has been added until the resultant chain has put a ‘girdle around the earth.’” (*A.Q.C.* ii., 86.)

The fact that we have so little evidence relating to London doubtless accounts in no small measure for the fact that scholars have been quick to ignore what evidence we do have. They have gone on for years basing hypotheses upon opinions, simply because they could not see that the events which took place after 1716 did fit in with anything that had gone before. The resulting hodge-podge of thought with many blank spaces still remaining to be filled in has brought them no nearer a solution than they were when the argument first started. They have been basing all of their work upon one system of criticism and have entirely lost track of the fact that other methods have borne much fruit in other fields. Where history is lacking, and the data for its formation is not forthcoming, scholars have learned to compare events, that is, known events occurring in one place, with the myths and legends of another and thus piece out a probable scheme of development.

The scattered information that is available to us in relation to London may take on a new significance when we apply the practices at York, Alnwick, and Gateshead to it. The threads are meagre, but, even with the insertion of much material of a hypothetical nature, something worth while may evolve.

In trying to reconstruct the organization of the London Craft we shall, of necessity, rely almost entirely upon Bro. E. Conder’s work for facts, drawing upon the illustrations from Alnwick, York, and Gateshead for substantiation and support. One of the first significant passages is as follows:—

“We have seen in the foregoing pages that the gild of masons was one of importance wherever building in stone was in progress; and we cannot form any other opinion than that, from the earliest times, the city of London had its masons gild.

“According to Stow, ‘The Company of Masons being otherwise termed Free Masons of antient standing and good reconing, by means of affable and kind meetings at divers times; and as a loving brotherhood should use to do; did frequent this mutual assembly in the time of King Henry the fourth in the twelfth year of his most gracious reign.’” (Conder, *The Hole Craft*, p. 53.)

It is not necessary to accept every statement made in this quotation, but it does show that a Craft organization was in existence in London at a very early date. Bro. Conder says, in the paragraph just following the above quotation, that “the evidence that is to be found in the Corporation Records at Guildhall proves very clearly that in 1375 the Masons Company existed and was represented on the court of Common Council.”

The customs of the Masons Company with reference to apprentices would seem to indicate at least one line of similarity with those Lodges we have examined in the North of England. “The regular system of joining the gild was by servitude: that is, a youth was bound apprentice for seven years to a freeman of the Company.

“After signing his indenture, he was ‘presented’ to the Company by his master, who paid a fee of 2s. 6d., and he was then entered in the books of the court; in other words, he became an ‘entered apprentice.’

“After seven years he was entitled to take up the freedom of the Company, when the following fees were payable: a gratuity of one pound, a fine of three shillings and fourpence, and a small fee of sixpence, for clerks’ fees.” (Conder, *The Hole Craft*, p. 139.)

In describing the Masons Hall, Bro. Conder says:—

“In the parlour was the court table and a clerk’s table. The plate belonging to the Company, when not displayed in the hall, was kept here, as was also the rest of the Company’s goods and chattels.

“It was doubtless in this parlour that the members of the Society of Freemasons held from time to time their meetings for the purpose of initiating and passing new members.” (Conder, *The Hole Craft*, p. 182.)

The Society of Freemasons to which Bro. Conder refers is the Lodge connected with Masons’ Hall. It is not difficult to collate the initiatory meetings in the parlour of the hall with the private meetings at York.

We find only two or three other items of particular interest:—

“Fined Thomas Stanley for coming to the Hall on a general quarter day without his gown 0 1 0.” (Conder, *The Hole Craft*, p. 153.)

“Fined John Gardiner for coming late on quarter day and being absent from Pauls Church 0 0 4.” (Conder, *The Hole Craft*, p. 153.)

“Paid in discharge of expenses about the general feast when the Lord Mayor was sworn 28 16 1.” (Conder, *The Hole Craft*, p. 165.)

There are certain modifications in the scheme of organization as we saw it in the North of England which are brought about by the peculiar situation in which the London Craft found itself. During this period it seems almost certain that the London Company controlled the Operative Craft in its entirety. The Lodges, while they may have been composed in large part of operative workmen, had no inconsiderable percentage of speculative members. One of the

Four Old Lodges is often mentioned as being composed of speculative members almost entirely. Further than this they personally were not operative bodies of workmen. They represented the social side of Craft life, though they may also have been the depositories for the secret ritual possessed by the early Brethren.

There were evidently quarterly meeting days of the Company, and these were termed *general* quarter days, not *grand*. There also seems to have been some sort of a *general* feast on Lord Mayor's Day. Bro. Conder is of the opinion that the Lodge government in London was derived from that of the Company, although he makes it quite clear that he does not believe the Company had anything to do with the esoteric side of the Craft. It was for this purpose that the Lodge existed. His argument for similarity is based largely upon the fact that Article 30 in the *New Articles* (as found in some of the Old Charges) bears a striking resemblance to the system of government in use by the Company. I reproduce Article 30 together with Bro. Conder's comment:—

“That for the future the sayd Society, Company, and Fraternity of Free Masons, shalbee regulated and governed by one Master, an Assembly, and Wardens as ye said Company shall think fit to chose at every yearly Assembly.

“Here we have the government of the Masons Company reproduced for the management of the Society. Master, Wardens, and Assembly is merely substituted for Master, Wardens, and Assistants. Surely the one must have had some bearing on the other!” (Conder, *The Hole Craft*, p. 11.)

I am inclined to the opinion that there is more to this question than was seen by Bro. Conder. The Northern Lodges were governed, apparently, by a Master and Deputy, or a President and Deputy. The Wardens are peculiarly gild officials. Of course Scotland had Wardens, but then it must be remembered that the Lodges in that country seem to have functioned more as gilds than they did in England. They seem to have had a corporate standing in Scotland which did not belong to them in England and this would account for the variation. If, as I believe to have been the case, these New Clauses were written in London, and were actually outgrowths of the Masons Company, we can clear up the matter of substitution of Assembly for Assistants. The Lodges were simply holding closely to the Old Charges, and were holding an annual meeting in accordance with the tradition. The London Company had, by this time, outgrown the old Craft Customs, if they ever were practised by it. We must call to mind the statement of Dr. Anderson to the effect that the Brethren decided to *revive* the annual Assembly and Feast.

So far as certainties are concerned, about all that can be said of the London Craft is that it existed during this period. We are sure that there were four Lodges in existence for at least a short period prior to 1717. When we go beyond that, we indulge in speculation, but when consideration is given to the practices in vogue in other portions of England, it seems likely that we may be enabled to reconstruct with more certainty than has hitherto been possible the type of organization which prevailed in London during the transition period.

It is impossible at this time to go into all of the details and discuss them. To do so fully would require a paper in itself. For present purposes it is sufficient to suggest the progress of events which led up to the formation of the Grand Lodge in a purely hypothetical manner, leaving it to others to decide whether such a development is sufficiently probable to warrant further investigation. I have reached some conclusions relative to accounts of this period which I believe will assist in clarifying the haze now surrounding the early years of Grand Lodge history, and will perhaps account, in a manner of speaking, for some of the stories which have been deemed impossible of acceptance. I shall include these theories in the course of my hypothetical illustration without attempting any substantiation. In stating the purpose of the present inquiry it

was clearly mentioned that there was no hope of reaching a positive and definite conclusion. The time has come, I think, to modify that statement somewhat. The only definite conclusion it is possible to draw is to the effect that the Grand Lodge was an evolution and not an innovation. The illustration with which I wish to close shows only a possible application of this theory to the accounts we now possess of this event.

It is necessary to preface any discussion of the events after 1717 with some effort to reconstruct the years immediately preceding. I cannot lay too much stress upon the fact that such a reconstruction is purely hypothetical, though I believe an analysis of such evidence as is available will show that it fits the accounts in a literal sense. It accepts them for what they say, though it does not take into consideration the fact that at the time Anderson's account was written there was no one who could misunderstand the use of the term Grand Lodge as synonymous with General Lodge or General Assembly, whichever it may have been.

If we grant the theory of Bro. Conder relative to a Lodge in connection with the Masons Company, and grant the existence of other Lodges in London and Westminster, we have a basis upon which to build. Let us discard the possibility of six Lodges in London as early as 1693, even though the author of *Multa Paucis* appears to confirm it, and fall back upon the usually accepted four Lodges. No one doubts, seriously, the possibility of there having been more than four, but for our purposes we may as well accept the more conservative figure. The only other thing to be postulated is that these Lodges had a history dating from earlier than 1675. Even this is not absolutely essential, but it makes some things easier to understand, and there is no real reason for doubting it as a possibility.

Continuing this line of thought, we find that conditions in the Craft were somewhat different in London from what they were in the provinces. Instead of one Lodge in a locality, we have several; instead of the Lodge being the operative government, we find the Masons Company occupying that position. The London Lodges, then, instead of being organizations for the control of the operative Craft, are really speculative in character. They have operative Masons as members, of course, but their functions are solely for the preservation of the esoteric material which is the traditional heritage of the Craft. The Lodges, then, occupy the position of a social adjunct to the Craft. Because of the close proximity of the several Lodges, what would be more natural than that they should unite upon the occasion of their Assembly? Instead of each Lodge having its own annual meeting, it would be a gathering of all the Lodges—this would be the Annual Assembly and Feast of Dr. Anderson or, if these Lodges had been derived from the "Accepcion," directly or indirectly, as voluntary associations, the tradition might have always existed, that the Assembly included *all* London Masons.

Let us wander for a moment, and make some mention of Sir Christopher Wren:—

"Memorandum. This day, May the 18th, being Monday, 1691, after Rogation Sunday is a great convention at St. Paul's Church of the Fraternity of the adopted masons, where Sir Christopher Wren is to be adopted a brother, Sir Henry Goodric of the Tower, and divers others. There have been kings that have been of this sodality." (*A.Q.C.* xi., 10.)

The above quotation from Aubrey has been discussed frequently, but I am inclined to agree with Bro. Dr. Chetwode Crawley, when he says:—

"In view of the more recent investigations, the case stands somehow thus. Omitting Aubrey's testimony, we find in the course of the Accepcion, in the stream of family tradition, and in the obituary notice of 1723, such grounds for inferring Sir Christopher Wren, like others of his stamp and day, to have been connected with the Craft,

that we should be justified in feeling the liveliest surprise if it could be shown that the fact was otherwise. Admitting Aubrey's testimony, we find the probability turned into such a certainty as actuates men in the conduct of their daily life. Rebutting evidence there is none. It is for the jury to determine the precise amount of credibility." (*A.Q.C.* xi., 11.)

The famous architect was born in October of 1632. He would, then, be fifty-nine years of age at the time of his acception. He was not apprenticed to the Mason's Craft, and therefore would be a speculative member of a Lodge and the Company, though not an operative Mason. The Craft would be on the decline during this period, and perhaps it was the force of this notable person who kept it together for some years after his admission. The mere fact that he was a member and attended Lodge with some regularity would be sufficient to guarantee a certain number of hero-worshippers following in his footsteps. There would be others, loyal to the Craft, who would come, perhaps as a matter of duty. As Sir Christopher grew older his attendance at Lodge would naturally become less frequent, until finally he did not attend at all. May not this have been the situation that Anderson sought to describe when he related that the Masons found themselves neglected by Sir Christopher Wren? By 1716 Sir Christopher had reached the ripe old age of eighty-four. Doubtless he had given up attendance at Lodge a number of years previous to this time. The Craft, lacking the incentive to attend that his presence afforded, would naturally begin to fall away. The decay seems to have reached such a state that even the annual assemblies had not been held for several years prior to 1716.

Let us glance for a few moments at the organization of the so-called new body itself. Certain members met at the Apple-Tree in 1716. They decided to revive the quarterly communications—not the quarterly communications of the officers, as Anderson puts it with the evident intent of carrying an innvoation which took shape in 1721 back into the olden days—but the quarterly communications, such as we have met in the North of England, and seen evidences of in the Masons' Company. Why did they not revive the Annual Assembly and Feast at the same time? They did not, because Anderson specifically states that they **RESOLVED** to revive it. At the first revival they met at the Goose and Gridiron. Why did they not meet at the Apple-Tree, where the first meeting was held? This question becomes particularly perplexing when the geographical distribution of the four old Lodges is taken into consideration. They stretched along the North bank of the Thames from St. Paul's to Westminster, following the bend of the river which makes its sharpest angle close to Charing Cross. They met at the Goose and Gridiron, the farthest east of the four taverns. It would have been natural for them to have met at one of the two intermediate ones, but there must have been some reason for them bringing their Westminster members to St. Paul's. Remember, too, that the Masons frequently worshipped at St. Paul's. On the whole, it seems likely that the traditional place for holding the Annual Assembly and Feast was the Goose and Gridiron, or in its vicinity, or else that the Lodge there was the "Accepcon" removed from Masons' Hall, and that the Brethren who decided to revive the Craft preferred to have the revival take place in the locality in which they were accustomed to meet.

In the light of what has gone before, let us endeavour to reconstruct the story Anderson tells in his 1738 *Constitutions*. I am modernizing the typography so that it will be clear that all italics are my insertions.

King George I. entered London most magnificently on 20th September, 1714, and after the Rebellion was over, A.D. 1716, the few Lodges at London finding themselves neglected by Sir Christopher Wren thought fit to cement under a [Grand] Master (*or president*) as the Center of Union and Harmony (*perhaps, with the view of forming one Lodge instead of the several then in existence*), viz. the Lodges that met,

1. At the Goose and Gridiron Ale-house in St. Paul's Church-Yard
2. At the Crown Ale-house in Parker's Lane near Drury Lane
3. At the Apple-Tree Tavern in Charles-Street, Covent Garden
4. At the Rummer and Grapes Tavern in Channel-Row, Westminster

(This was, perhaps, no more than an informal meeting at which the possibility of reviving interest in the Craft was discussed. Those present agreeing to meet, as below, and bring with them as many members as possible from their respective Lodges, especially true does this seem since the term prompore is used.)

They and some old Brothers met at the said Apple-Tree, and having put into the Chair the oldest Master Mason (now the Master of a Lodge) they constituted themselves a *General Lodge pro Tempore* in Due Form, and forthwith revived the Quarterly Communication (call'd the *General Lodge*) resolv'd to hold the Annual Assembly and Feast, and then to chuse a [Grand] Master from among themselves, till they should have the Honour of a Noble Brother at their Head.

(I believe that even at this meeting there was no thought of continuing as separate Lodges with a corps of officers for the government of the Craft as a whole. It seems evident that the four Lodges had no intention of subordinating themselves to a central governing body such as the Grand Lodge came to be. This may be no more than speculation, but conditions generally do not seem appropriate for any such development as Anderson implies, though he does not express it.)

Accordingly

On St. John Baptist's Day, in the 3d Year of King George I., A.D. 1717, the Assembly and Feast of the Free and Accepted Masons was held at the foresaid Goose and Gridiron Alehouse.

Before Dinner, the oldest Master Mason (now the Master of a Lodge) in the Chair, proposed a list of proper Candidates; and the Brethren by a Majority of Hands elected Mr. Antony Sayer, Gentleman, *General Master* of Masons.

There must have been some meetings prior to the Goose and Gridiron Assembly for the purpose of making arrangements. I am inclined to the opinion, it must be confessed for no reason at all, that at some of these preliminary meetings it became apparent that there would be a considerable gathering of Masons present at the Assembly and Feast. Someone thought that in view of the fact that interest was becoming aroused it would be a good plan to carry on as four Lodges instead of one and that this idea bore fruit. It was then decided to elect officers to govern the whole Craft in London and Westminster. This was the real innovation and it was this innovation which prompted the actors in the drama to make every effort to conceal the fact that any innovation had been made. It accounts for the use of Grand Lodge and Grand Master in a somewhat different manner than we have been considering it heretofore, and adds its bit in contributing to the confusion of Anderson's account.

We can carry the matter just a step farther and then have done. During the years 1717-18-19-20 the Craft prospered and grew. It became apparent that the quarterly meetings of all the members was becoming unwieldy. Therefore, Payne, in formulating his regulations, decided to make the Grand Lodge a representative body. What would be more natural than that with a Craft grown unwieldy in numbers, and with the example of Parliament staring him in the face he should decide upon such a course? The Annual Assembly and Feast would be maintained as a gathering for the Craft as a whole, but it would gradually lose all of its legislative and governmental functions. Perhaps this idea is borne out by the Installation Festival in the present United Grand Lodge, at any rate it is a possibility worth considering.

Though the subject is far from exhausted at this time, it seems that we have ample evidence presented to enable others to carry the search into other fields. It has been more than two years since first this paper came into being. During that time much material has come to my notice which might have been included in the discussion. Nothing that I have seen has contradicted any portion of the discussion included herein. Everything has been in the nature of confirmation of the theory so that there was really no need for its being included, as it would only multiply evidence.

Before closing, however, I should like to add a word of appreciation for the courtesy shown me by many Brethren who have kindly interested themselves on my behalf. Brothers A. L. Kress, N. W. J. Hayden, and W. L. Boyden have read the manuscript and offered many comments of inestimable value. The staff of the Iowa Masonic Library has been most courteous in placing the resources of that institution at my disposal; Bro. Boyden has also loaned me much material from the Scottish Rite Library at Washington, D.C. In speaking of the Library Staff at Cedar Rapids I should be particularly ungrateful if I did not make mention of the many kindnesses shown me by Bros. C. C. Hunt and J. H. Tatsch. Both of them have read and commented upon the document. The discussions with and co-operation of Bro. R. J. Meekren, who deserves the title of co-author, but modestly declines to share in this production, were of such importance that mere words of appreciation will not suffice to pay the debt of gratitude I owe him.

A hearty vote of thanks was passed to Bro. Thiemeyer on the proposition of Bro. G. Norman, seconded by Bro. H. C. de Lafontaine, supported by Bro. Cecil Powell; comments being offered by or on behalf of Bros. R. H. Baxter, Rev. H. Poole, Sir Alfred Robbins, Geo. W. Bullamore, G. B. Brook, R. J. Meekren, W. J. Songhurst, G. W. Daynes, W. J. Williams, and the Secretary.

Bro. W. J. WILLIAMS *writes*:—

It was with great pleasure I joined in supporting the vote of thanks which was moved in Lodge on the occasion of our Brother's paper being read. It is gratifying to find that the appeal for papers from members of the Correspondence Circle should have elicited from our Brethren in the United States such a thoughtful and thought provoking paper dealing with subjects which are at once most interesting and at the same time sufficiently obscure.

The extensive inductions collected in the paper are in themselves valuable quite apart from the question as to the ultimate value of some of the deductions. As is usual in a paper of this magnitude there are certain *obiter dicta* emitted *en route* which are provocative of dissent although they in no wise affect the argument.

Our author has prefaced his arguments by placing an unusual limitation upon the meaning of "contemporary reference." He lays it down that he means by that "the first mention of a given man as Grand Master during his 'term of office.'"

Such a definition may be helpful to our Brother's argument; but it is not in accordance with the usual practice of historians to predicate such a limited range, and the very fact that our essayist does predicate it appears to indicate that some of his reasoning will not hold good unless we choose to accept his very narrow definition.

For most of us the evidence of intelligent contemporaries who were actively interested and participants in the events under consideration is as good evidence as we may expect in any such enquiry.

The first part of the paper seeks to establish the proposition "that the "Grand Lodge was not an innovation but a revival." Is there any living Masonic student who holds any other theory? As far as I am aware, both from what I have read and from my frequent converse with my teachers in Masonic history, the proposition is universally accepted, and there has never been any reasoned opinion to the contrary. Indeed our Brother says that "common "agreement among Masonic scholars is found to exist on at least one point, "namely that the present system of organized Freemasonry finds its roots in the "Operative Craft which existed for several centuries prior to the meeting at the "Goose & Gridiron Tavern on 24th June 1717 and the preceding one at the "Apple Tree in 1716." Here it may be pardonable to digress in the hope that a little light may be thrown upon the length of the interval between the Apple Tree meeting and the Goose & Gridiron meeting. Preston (Edn. 1781) at p. 218 dates the Apple Tree meeting as February 1717. Now that was the equivalent of February 1716 according to the old style in vogue up to 1752 in respect of the Civil, Ecclesiastical and Legal year. That year began on 25th March, so that the interval between February 1716 and June 1717 was only four months.

Brother Gould's interesting suggestion as to the connection between the Sheriff's Tourn and the Masonic Assembly is perhaps the least convincing of all his contributions to Masonic history.

Our Brother, in commenting on the conflicting theories of Bro. Dring and Bro. Howard, affirms that we must accept either one or the other. I deny the necessity. Both theories may be wrong, but we must not stay to discuss them here.

Later in the paper our essayist says: "We may presume I think that "the Common Law and the Common Assembly are to be taken as referring to "one and the same thing." They are and always have been very distinct things, and it is not easy to see how one can have been mistaken for the other by any scribe. Any such variation in transcription must have been deliberate in its inception and may have been occasioned by local or temporary reasons not now manifest.

In connection with the allegation that the period from 1650 to 1716 was apparently a period of decadence in the Craft, it is to be borne in mind that so far as London is concerned that period covers the year of the Great Fire of 1666 and the noble products of operative masonry consequent thereon.

At a later stage our Brother refers to the MS. Grand Lodge No. 2, and it is probably my duty to intimate a discovery which may account for the peculiar wording of the quoted extract which states "that for y^e future y^e said "Society Company and fraternity of free masons shall be regulated and governed "by one Master and assembly and Wardens as the said Company shall think fitt "to chuse at every yearely generall assembly." It seems to me abundantly clear that this phraseology is in effect a summarized version of the following entry which I have found at the Guildhall of the City of London in Letter Book C.Cf. 235 under date 1607. (The date of Grand Lodge No. 2 is placed by Bro. Poole, our present W.M., as the second half of Cent. XVII.):—

"Touching the companie of Freemasons London It is ordered . . . that from henceforth for ever after the said companie . . . shall or maie yearelie assemble themselves together at y^e summons of y^e Common Officer or beadle at theire Common hall in y^e feaste of the holie trynitie or wthin Tenn daies then next ensuing and there peaceably and quietlie make choyse of one sufficient person enfranchised of the some companie and holdinge howse and householde that hath been oftneft warden of the said Companie for one year then next ensuing who may be a direction to the wardens for the better government thereof and also in like manner make choice of 2 honest hable and discrete persons enfranchised of y^e s^d. Companie and holding house and household to be wardens of y^e said Companie for the same year then next ensuing. And y^t. y^e same 3 persons see peaceablie

elected and chosen shall wthin 20 days then next ensuing by y^e olde M^r. and Wardens with 6 suffic^t. persons at y^e least of y^e clothing or liverie of y^e said Companie be presented in y^e King's Ma^{ties}. Courte to be holden before y^e Lo. Maior and Aldremen of this Cittie" (&c., &c.).

It is submitted for the consideration of students of the Old Charges that the ordinance entered in the City Letter Book gave rise to the article quoted in the paper and that the inference is that Grand Lodge No. 2 MS. was shaped by the Company of the Freemasons and may possibly be the "One book of the Constitutions of the Accepted Masons" referred to in the Inventory of the Company dated July 4, 1676. (See Conder, p. 195.) The MS. is said to have been found in the process of demolition or building operations at a house in London.

The Letter Book entry is important as showing the date when the government of the Company was varied from Wardens to a Master and Wardens and because it ordains a yearly assembly within a fixed period, which assembly was to be convened by summons, and to be followed by a presentation of the Master and Wardens Elect. The fact that there was some connection between the London Company and the various local centres or assemblies seems to be indicated by the Arms of that Company being used in various parts of England; *e.g.*, in the Gateshead or Durham Charter.

Proceeding to Part II., which deals with the title Grand Master, we come to the most interesting section. So convinced is our Brother as to the validity of his argument that he does not hesitate to say:—"I think there can be no doubt but that the first presiding officers were General Masters and not Grand Masters as we have been led to believe."

He arrives at his conclusion by a consideration of an entry in the Minutes of Mary's Chapel dated 24th August 1721, in which Dr. Desaguliers is described as late General Master of the Mason Lodges in England; and of the designation General Master Mason being applied in Anderson's 1723 Book of Constitutions to Moses, to Zerubbabel and to Ptolomeus Philadelphus. He suggests that the use of the term "General" may be an uncorrected slip of the pen. This, however, can hardly be the case, because Moses is termed *both* General Master Mason and Grand Master. Seeing that, as our Brother informs us on the authority of Bro. Vibert (whose statement on this occasion he adopts), the highest Masonic office in Scotland was General Warden, the natural inference would seem to be that the Minute writer in Scotland and our Scottish Brother, Dr. Anderson, both used designations to which they were accustomed. It has been a common-place of Masonic comment that Dr. Anderson imported into the English Craft certain undoubted Scotticisms, such as Fellow Craft and Entered Apprentice, and I see no reason for limiting him to those two instances. He, in fact, binds them together by dubbing Moses with both titles.

There is no shred of evidence to show that the phrase General Master was actually used by Desaguliers himself.

Having said (with but small apparent reason) that we are without anything of a contemporaneous nature during the period from 1716 to 1723, our essayist then admits one or two important exceptions from his sweeping assertion, and proceeds to describe as a myth the allegation that Anthony Sayer was the first Grand Master. Yet the references in the Grand Lodge Minutes to Anthony Sayer as Grand Master were entered up in the lifetime of Anthony Sayer, and a grant was actually made to him on account of his having been Grand Master. (1730. 21 April.)

There is not from start to finish during the lives of those who were members of the Craft in the early days of Grand Lodge (or indeed at any subsequent period) the least reference to so striking an event as the change of the designation of the head of the Craft from General Master to Grand Master.

The satirists of the period make no reference to such a change. It would have been fair game for them. The author of the Briscoe pamphlet also ignores

it though it would have been a good point for him to make. The Author of the Ode to the Grand Khaibar (pub. 1720) seems to have been unaware of it.

The truly Masonic candour of our Author has led him to bring in two items of evidence which seem to decide the case against his theory, namely:— (1) The item dated 24 June 1721 in Dr. Stukeley's diary, and (2) the General Regulations embodied in the 1723 Constitutions.

As to the first the Doctor records: "The G^d. M^r. M^r. Pain produced an "old MS. . . . He read over a new sett of articles to be observ'd. The "Duke of Montague chose G^d. M^r. next year." The method in which our Brother approaches evidence which conflicts with his view is indicated by his remarks:—"There is no actual mention of Grand Master in this quotation but "I think the abbreviation 'G^d.' is sufficient to indicate that it is meant to be "Grand and not General as I suspect it actually was prior to this date. It is "sufficient reason for Bro. Gould in his History of Freemasonry, when he quotes "the passage using the full word instead of the abbreviation."

So Brother Gould is to be excused.

I submit that the case for the title Grand Master is all the stronger because of the abbreviation. Men do not start abbreviating until a word or a phrase has by continued usage become "familiar in their mouths as household words." The fact, then, that Stukeley writes G^d. M^r. indicates that the title Grand Master had for a sufficiently long time passed into the current coinage of Masonic speech to warrant the abbreviation.

Turning to the General Regulations, it is to be remembered that these were compiled first by Mr. George Payne, Anno 1720, when he was Grand Master, and approved by the Grand Lodge on St. John Baptist's Day Anno 1721. Bro. Thiemeyer says that we have nothing which could possibly be earlier than 1721, and, as far as I have observed, omits all reference to the fact that Bro. Payne's Regulations were compiled in 1720, some time before they were approved in June, 1721; but he does point out that the said Regulations are constant in the use of the term Grand Master, so constant indeed that our Brother finds Bro. Payne to be meticulous on the subject.

The dedication by Eugenius Philaethes to *Long Livers* is dated March 1st, 1721 (no doubt=1722), and is interesting as emanating from one who may not have been a Mason. That dedication is made to the Grand Master, Masters, Wardens and Brethren of the Most Ancient and most Honourable Fraternity of the Free Masons of Great Britain and Ireland. This certainly does not sound as though the term Grand Master had only just been invented.

Furthermore, the term Grand Master was a perfectly natural term to apply to the head of such an organization as that into which speculative Masonry had developed. Our Brother refers to the various Societies whose head was so designated. Aubrey, in his memorandum of 1691, says: "There have been Kings that have been of this sodality." The Entered Apprentices' Song takes up the strain and says:—

Great Kings Dukes and Lords
Have laid by their Swords
Our Myst'ry to put a good Grace on
And ne'er been asham'd
To hear themselves nam'd
With a Free and an Accepted Mason.

The Brother who wrote this was Matthew Birkhead, who died before the 1723 *Constitutions* were published (his Will was proved 11th March, 1722/3). The song may have been written some little time before his death. It did not need the appointment of a Noble Master to incite the Masons of the revival to call their Lodge a Grand Lodge or their head a Grand Master.

As there are in the *Constitutions* several references to a particular Lodge, it was only natural that the Lodge comprising a number of Lodges should occasionally be called a General Lodge, although the title of that combination of Lodges was Grand Lodge, and in like manner the term Grand Master might

aptly be explained, if occasion arose, as meaning a General Master. The term Grand does not really imply Grandiose or Magnificent any more than when we speak of a Grandfather.

Although Dr. Anderson has been subjected to censure on the ground that he conferred the title of Grand Master upon persons (up to and including Sir Ch^r. Wren) who seem never to have heard that such title was theirs, there seems no good reason for doubting the substantial accuracy of his account of the meetings in 1716 and 1717 resulting in the formation of a Grand Lodge and the election of Anthony Sayer as Grand Master.

BRO. GILBERT W. DAYNES *writes*:—

The Transitional period of Freemasonry is of great importance, and any light that can be thrown upon one or more of the many obscurities which surround those years is of the utmost value. Even reviewing the ascertained facts of that period from fresh view-points has its advantages, for by so doing the basis for criticism is widened and a firmer and more complete superstructure becomes possible.

Now Bro. Thiemeyer has given us an interesting paper upon a phase of Masonry which possesses great attractions for most students of Freemasonry. However widely read a student may be it is always useful to have brought into focus any particular portion of Masonic history. It is also useful to have the views of a Brother who has come fresh to the subject matter and the problems involved therein. But this does not mean that it was necessary for Bro. Thiemeyer to deal with each piece of known evidence as if it was entirely unknown to all except himself. Many of his quotations at length could have been left out. This would have shortened his paper very materially and enabled the points that lie scattered throughout its many pages to have been brought out far more clearly.

I cannot agree with Bro. Thiemeyer that he approaches the subject from a new view-point. Bro. Speth had previously made suggestions—although not perhaps in the same words—which Bro. Thiemeyer considers novel and startling. I doubt if many who have read this paper were startled, except perhaps at the optimism of its author. Personally I have every sympathy with the optimism of youth, but I may remind Bro. Thiemeyer that this soon gives way to a steadier judgment, and matters which to him at present appear to be so startlingly clear or abundantly proved may after further years study assume a less certain aspect.

Bro. Thiemeyer could have saved himself a great deal of time and trouble if he had realized how much of his paper dealt with well-known facts. The descent of the Grand Lodge of England from the Operative Masons is I believe generally admitted, and the crux of one part of the paper is, whether the 1717 Organization was a General or Grand Lodge and the ruler of that organization a General or Grand Master.

Considering how much attention has been given by Bro. Thiemeyer to the Assembly, and particularly to controverting the theory put forward many years ago by Bro. R. F. Gould in vol. v. of *A.Q.C.*, it is more than a little strange that he has not made himself familiar with the criticism which that theory evoked from Brethren at the time. Apparently Bro. Thiemeyer has not read the two excellent papers upon the Assembly by Bros. Begemann and Speth respectively, together with the approving comments thereon by Bro. Rylands, all of which appeared in vol. vi. of *A.Q.C.* Bro. Gould's theory was sufficiently strongly attacked by these three stalwarts to have enabled Bro. Thiemeyer to have accepted their opinions and so shortened his paper with advantage.

Now is Bro. Thiemeyer correct in saying that by almost universal consent Anderson's account of the early years of Grand Lodge has been discarded in its entirety? Although it has been found that Anderson is not very reliable, I do not think that any Masonic student has gone to the length of condemning the

account *in toto*. To do so would be to ignore the MS. List of the Grand Masters, &c., contained in the first Minute Book of Grand Lodge, as well as the contemporary Press and other notices concerning the Craft which appeared between 1721 and 1723. Although this MS. List is too late in date to decide anything as to the term "Grand Master" which is used therein, it does give us an early authentic List of the Officers of the 1717 organization, and confirms that Anthony Sayer was its first ruler. With regard to the contemporary Press notices, these have been collected by Bro. Sir Alfred Robbins and appear in *A.Q.C.* xxiii. At present I see no reason to doubt that if earlier contemporary evidence could be found it would show that the term "Grand" was used in relation to the ruler of the 1717 organization from the first, though perhaps the meetings were not specifically termed Grand Lodges. Anderson termed these meetings "Assembly and Feast."

Bro. Thiemeyer refers to the change of tense by Anderson in his accounts of Grand Lodge and states that throughout he uses the past tense in reference to the event. That is not correct. Anderson stated that on the 17th January, 1723, he produced "the new Book of Constitutions now in Print." This clearly refers to the year 1723 and not to the time of writing the 1738 Constitutions. I would refer Bro. Thiemeyer to my comments on Bro. Vibert's paper on "The Second Degree: a Theory," which appeared in *A.Q.C.*, vol. xxxix., in which I have set out my reasons for believing that the word "now," used by Anderson, was used in the sense of "then." To make the matter even clearer I would point to Regulation XIV. of the 1723 Constitutions. Here, obviously, is a Regulation which Payne must have evolved from some previous Regulations, or from the practice of 1717 onwards, namely, that the Master of a Lodge who had been a Freemason the longest was to preside on certain occasions.

Bro. RODK. H. BAXTER writes:—

I have read with much interest and pleasure the paper of Bro. E. E. Thiemeyer, of St. Louis. I think our Brother has to be congratulated on contributing one of the best papers we have had from any of our American friends for quite a long time. Nevertheless, it seems to me Bro. Thiemeyer has gone to an enormous amount of trouble and research to prove that when the Revival of 1717 took place the body was not at first called a Grand Lodge nor the presiding officer a Grand Master.

I cannot, of course, speak of what our great Masonic students actually thought on these points, but my own mind has always been quite clear. I never imagined that it was decided to bring a Grand Lodge, *by that name*, into existence nor that the president was elected *as a Grand Master*. But the revived body did in a short time come to be called a Grand Lodge, and therefore its presidents were entitled to be called Grand Masters even if they had not been so designated during the occupancy of the chair.

My own position can perhaps be made clear by a quotation from my Prestonian Lecture for the current year, which was prepared for reading at Brighton on the 28th of February last, but which, owing to a breakdown in my health, was not delivered until the 29th of April:—

"For the time being I am not concerned with the date of the creation of Grand Lodge, which is generally assumed in the authority of the Rev. James Anderson—the author of the two earliest editions of the 'Book of Constitutions'—to have taken place in 1717, but which need not have been the beginning of regularly organized Freemasonry. Anderson, although I do not doubt his sincerity and honesty, was never very reliable and in fairness to him it must be remembered that he describes the events of 1716 and 1717, as a revival."

Bro. H. POOLE writes:—

I am sorry I shall not be present to hear Bro. Thiemeyer's paper read, as I thereby lose my opportunity of being the first to congratulate him formally on the able way in which he has handled a very interesting subject.

My own interest in Craft History belongs very largely to just the question which he has tackled—the precise relationship between our operative past and our speculative present; and I think he has, on the whole, at any rate, proved his case, and shown that there was probably considerably more of continuity in organization than we have been apt to think.

I do not debate the general position which Bro. Thiemeyer is attempting to establish, and the time at my disposal is too short to allow me to turn the whole paper over in my mind as I would have to do in order to express any opinion as to detail. But I want to comment shortly on one or two of his conclusions drawn from the Old Charges.

First, as regards the *Hope* Branch MSS. I have put in more work on the Sloane Family than on any other group of these MSS.; and I have, of course, noticed the reference to 'private' assemblies many times: but it never occurred to me to ask myself how it got there. I am not inclined to accept Bro. Thiemeyer's first explanation of it, as a mis-reading, as I find considerable difficulty in rewriting the word 'divers' in seventeenth century script in such a way as to make it a likely one. Much more reasonable, I think, is the alternative—that it was deliberate. There can, I think, be no doubt at all that the word (whichever it was) was in the original of the *Hope* Branch, as it appears in the *David Ramsey* MS.: and the fact that it does not appear in the *York No. 4* MS. is accounted for as Bro. Thiemeyer suggests by the probability that the copyist of that MS. had another MS. beside him—a conclusion which is forced on the critic by a large number of variations throughout the text.

There is one consideration which might suggest that the variation 'private' was due to a mis-reading; in the *Thistle* MS. the reading is "at private assemblies, there hath been private Charges added." Some years ago (A.Q.C. xxxv.) I tried to show that the *Thistle* and *Dumfries No. 4* MSS. were largely influenced by a contact in late seventeenth century with the *Hope Branch Original*. Thus, although the *Dumfries 4* in the same passage has the normal 'divers' in the second case, it might still be argued that the *Hope Branch Original* was written in such a way as to allow of the mis-reading in the second case, and therefore also in the first.

But, as Bro. Thiemeyer points out, it makes very little difference: the appearance of the word 'private' retains its significance however it got there. And I do not think Bro. Thiemeyer has realized that its significance is enhanced by the fact that the *Hope* Branch is definitely a Yorkshire group of MSS.

Another matter on which I would like to comment is the "New Articles" of the *Roberts Family*. Bro. Thiemeyer quotes from the *Roberts* print and the *Grand Lodge No. 2* and *Harleian 1942* MSS. He adds a remark calculated to discount the value of their evidence, because some appeared after 1716. But we must not forget that the value of such evidence is vested entirely in the *Family Original*, which in this case can have been very little later than mid-seventeenth century. According to Hughan (O.C., 1895), experts have placed the *Harleian 1942* at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and the *Grand Lodge 2* at about the middle; but, in the former case he adds, "but from internal evidence several of us are inclined to fix the period of its transcription about 1650, or rather later." I am inclined to doubt the weight of the 'internal evidence,' whatever it was: but this is beside the point, which is, that the *Original* of the whole group must belong to a date earlier than any of its family, and thus can be, at the latest, very little later than 1650. This makes the custom pointed to quite definitely one of the pre-Grand Lodge period. As to the locality, we may perhaps hazard more than a mere guess. Of the *Roberts Family*, neither of the earliest texts can be associated with any locality: the *Roberts* itself is a London print; the *Rawlinson* is a late compilation largely

from printed sources; but both *Macnab* (of 1722) and the earlier *Drinkwater 2* come from South Lancashire, the latter having a definite association there. That the "New Articles" may very well belong to that part of N.W. England is rendered by no means unlikely by their association in the *Roberts Family* with the "Apprentice Charge," which I have grounds for believing to have had its origin in that neighbourhood.

I am surprised that Bro. Thiemeyer makes no allusion to the first of these "New Articles":—

"That no person, of what Degree soever, be accepted a Free Mason, unless he shall have a Lodge of five Free Masons at the least, whereof one to be a Master or Warden of that Limit or Division where such Lodge shall be kept, and another (to be a workman) of the Trade of Free Masonry." (Composite version.)

No doubt he has seen something of the further problem to which this regulation leads the way—to what extent the local Assemblies had jurisdiction over wide areas, and so on; or, to put it in more or less modern terms, to what extent the 'local' Lodge also carried out the functions of a Provincial Grand Lodge. I raise this point because it struck me when reading this paper that the contrast between 'private' and 'general' assemblies might be one rather of 'scope' than of 'function'—a suggestion implied rather than explicitly stated by the writer. I do not, however, propose to pursue this matter at present: it will be time enough for that when we have assimilated the material which Bro. Thiemeyer has placed before us.

In conclusion, may I congratulate him on his refusal to take the traditional view for granted, and on the convincing way in which he has used the material available?

BRO. GEO. W. BULLAMORE writes:—

I am glad to see this paper. I believe that advance in our knowledge of Masonic history must depend on the full and free discussion of hypotheses based on the material at our disposal. Some of the arguments used to discredit this material are very weak.

It has been urged against the Athelstan tradition that Athelstan was never married and therefore had no son Edwin. But Athelstan, an illegitimate son, succeeded his father on the throne instead of a younger son born of another mother in Christian wedlock. It could be urged, therefore, on somewhat similar grounds, that Athelstan's father had no son Athelstan.

The polygot nature of the charges standardised by Athelstan was such as would arise from the re-conversion of the Saxons by foreign missionaries who proceeded to erect churches. The rules of the guild or fraternity of church builders would be brought with them and would be all that was necessary to establish a branch of the fraternity. It appears to have been the method of forming a branch of a mediæval guild and the members were sometimes admitted on a copy of the Charges.

A similar standardization to that of Athelstan seems to have brought about the Strasburg Brother-book in Germany and the Schaw Statutes in Scotland, but just as the English Old Charges came to Scotland and replaced the Schaw Statutes, so at an earlier date the French and Italian Masons and Freemasons invaded the territory of the Athelstan Charges and eventually amalgamated with the English fraternity. The Old Charges suggest that the mystery of stone preparation remained for a time distinct from the mystery of laying and setting, but in 1356 they were authoritatively declared to be one mystery.

The last invasion was probably at the re-building of Westminster by King Henry III., when a branch of an Italian fraternity of church builders was established.

The three degrees I regard as the ceremonies of the London Company of Freemasons (1537-1655) and to represent the membership of the Fraternity of Yeomen, the Fellowship of Masons and the Guild of Freemasons.

Attempts to control the Yeomen of London in other trades took the form of supplying their guild with a master from among the fellows, and for this reason I believe that the Anderson-Payne Regulations were framed to control a movement among the journeymen or yeomen. This movement gradually absorbed the higher degrees which could not be transmitted *through* them but were passed on by the Fellowship and Masters' Lodges. Control by the Company took the form of authorizing the issue of copies of the Old Charges carrying the power to form a Lodge of Journeymen, or, when held by a warden or assistant, the power to admit to the fellowship. The great innovation was the change of organization so that the Master with power to form a Lodge was replaced by a Lodge with power to elect a Master. Following this, three distinct Lodges of Modern Masons, Fellows, and Masters were replaced by a Lodge of three degrees. The Masters' Lodge appears to have had the power always to confer the lower degrees but was usually content under the Moderns to work in unison with a Fellowcraft Lodge.

The multiplication of Masters' Lodges was another innovation. The masters of the craft were originally the master, wardens and court of assistants of the Company of Freemasons of the City of London. Members of their livery or fellowship would have power to preside over a lodge of journeymen and such lodges I assume to have had the power to admit to the fraternity of the journeymen. But the call to the fellowship and election to the Court of Assistants was the special privilege of the assistants themselves. With a loss of the operative basis came a loss of this method of control and the Payne-Anderson Regulations were an attempt to regain it. They contemplated one body only with power to make masters or fellows.

The term Grand Master was perhaps an old term without grandiose meaning and signified the master of the masters' guild just as the sons of sons and parents of parents are called grandsons and grandparents. He would be the general master of the craft governing through his wardens, assistants and fellows those who were accepted masons by the journeymen lodges.

Bro. R. J. MEEKREN writes:—

While I am naturally very closely in accord with the conclusions reached by Bro. Thiemeyer, yet there are a few minor points upon which I am inclined to disagree with him, and some others which I should have expressed differently.

The thesis might seem to have been better divided into two, one dealing with the question of the persistence or survival of the Assembly, and its transformation into the present Grand Lodge form of organization, and the other dealing with the origin of the term "Grand," as part of the style of the chief official of the Fraternity and of its supreme legislative and executive organ. Really the chief interest and importance of the latter question appears to me to be its bearing upon the former, which I should regard as the main one.

There is one source of confusion that presents itself at once in any attempt to interpret the evidence, and that is the multiplicity of loosely used terms and phrases. As I understand him, Bro. Thiemeyer is not primarily concerned with these names but with the thing or things designated by them. In order to follow the course of events we evidently have to get below the surface of verbal expressions. The institution spoken of most frequently as the Assembly was, I believe, precisely the same thing as the General Lodge of York and the General Head Meeting of Alnwick: and it might just as well have been described as, congregation, conventicle, coven, or any other term of like import. In other words, there was no fixed universal name for it. It was a traditional institution, or organ, of the Craft, essentially the same everywhere, but everywhere marked by local variations and with local designations.

I would suggest that in every instance where we have a record of corporate Masonic activity of the pre-Grand Lodge type, it can be best interpreted as an organization that in embryo is of the same kind as that existing to-day. The difference is mainly one of size, and fixation or standardization of procedure. The old Scottish Lodges, as also those of York and Alnwick, were to all intents and purposes tiny Grand Lodges. Their territory was limited, their membership small, but they were sovereign and independent. Their members formed themselves into "private" Lodges, at their convenience, to enter and make Masons, and this by an acknowledged right, limited only by the traditional requirements, and the duty of transmitting fees and reporting the names of those "made" to the "general" Lodge. So far as indications remain, the Masons made in such private (and temporary) Lodges were normally "passed," or "made free," or "accepted," only at the *general* meeting, or assembly, or Lodge. Our machinery of dispensations, warrants, charters, and so on, does nothing more. The private, particular or (in America) subordinate Lodge has itself become permanent: but all the changes are the natural and inevitable result of increase in numbers, and the consolidation and expansion of territorial units into a "Jurisdiction," "Constitution" or "Obedience," as it is variously called in different parts of the Masonic World. Indeed, I should go further than to say that the first Grand Lodge *replaced* the Assembly. I should prefer to say that the Grand Lodge, so-called by Anderson, of the period between 1716 and 1720, *was* the Assembly, whatever term may actually have been used during those years to designate it. Whether it had survived, or was revived, cannot be definitely determined. Anderson's account suggests revival. But, if so, it was revival in one circumscribed locality of what was a living usage elsewhere; and probably (I should think) one that had only fallen into desuetude within the Masonic lives of the senior among those concerned in its revival.

Bro. Thiemeyer's analysis of the phraseology in the first and second editions of the *Book of Constitutions*, to my mind, shows conclusively that a definite and fixed usage of the word "Grand" in 1738 had only been a wavering and uncertain one in 1723. I cannot bring myself to think that this change or progression was a deliberate, or even a conscious one. New words and phrases seldom come that way. Witness, for example, the history of the term "Modernism." It has quite definitely changed and crystallized in meaning since, not many years ago, it was first used in the Papal condemnation of liberal scholars in the Roman Church.

The term "Grand" was evidently in use in 1721: Dr. Stukeley's Diary proves that. The dedication of the *Long Livers* of Eugenius Philalethes published in 1722 is an additional indication; but Anderson in 1723 proves that it was not yet fixed or exclusive, though it would appear that it was even then fast becoming so.

While it is tempting to think that the election of the Duke of Montagu as head of the Fraternity may have been the occasion for the change, yet it was very probably in use before that; it may even have been used, alternatively with the term "General," as early as 1717. We cannot say, for there is nothing to show definitely. It is always safe to assume that the first recorded instance of the use of a term is subsequent to its introduction. I should, therefore, feel the safest conclusion would be that "Grand" may have been used occasionally in the period 1716-1721, and that "General" had become obsolete by 1738. As I have said, there is not the least need to assume any conscious intention to drop the older epithet on anyone's part. The careful deletion of the term in the second edition of the *Constitutions* meant no more than that Anderson revised his phraseology in accordance with what had by then come to be the general usage: a most natural thing to do, especially as the work was a Code, and not a source book for history.

When the earliest Minutes of Grand Lodge are considered in the light of these conclusions there emerge a number of indications that changes in organic structure were taking place at the same time, and these are confirmed by Anderson's account of the first years of the revived institution. We are forced

to the conclusion that not only was the term Grand Lodge used as synonymous with General Lodge, but that it received a second meaning, in which it was applied to a sort of Executive Committee (or Board of General Purposes) composed of the Masters and Wardens of the private Lodges. It is this that we are definitely told is the Grand Lodge in Regulation XII., and this use is consistently followed throughout the subsequent articles.

If this was all we had to go upon, and if we could feel assured that they were printed exactly as Payne proposed them, it would have to be admitted that a Grand Lodge, constituted as we know them now, was in existence by 1721. But the inconsistencies found elsewhere in the *Constitutions* make this highly doubtful, and in any case Regulation XXXIX. makes it clear that the final court of appeal was still the Assembly, the Congregation of the whole Craft, Apprentices and Fellows as well as the officers of particular Lodges. The conclusion is, therefore, indicated that what is now a Grand Lodge, exercising the "sovereign" power of the old Assembly, was originally what I have just called it, an executive committee, responsible to the Assembly, even though it was from the first inclined to arrogate all power to itself.

The transition state appears in the guarded account of the difference of opinion in the first entry in the Grand Lodge Minute Book. The Grand Lodge, in the restricted sense of the Regulations, strongly favoured the publication of the *Book of Constitutions*, while a majority in the Assembly evidently did not. There may, with this particular cause of dispute, have also been a dislike of the growing power of the active Executive Committee of officers on the part of the Craft at large. But the development was inevitable, and the conservatives had to make the best of it.

I should hardly describe the alternative use of the word "General" in the 1723 *Constitutions* as a "slip of the pen." The two terms, as I should take it, both being in common use, it was perfectly natural that this should be reflected in the new Masonic Code. The older term having fallen into disuse later on quite satisfactorily accounts for the revision of these passages in the second edition.

Equally I am doubtful if Payne had any intention of changing the terminology of the Craft. If we assume that the Regulations as printed are substantially as he presented them, we could suppose that he intended to erect a definite executive body responsible to the Assembly, in something the same way that the Cabinet was related to Parliament, or perhaps as the House of Lords was related to the Commons. It might then have been possible that he did use the term Grand Lodge to distinguish this new organ from the General Lodge (or Assembly). And the similarity of the two terms would then have operated as a powerful reason for the disuse of the latter term, merely for the sake of avoiding confusion. The new executive body could not properly be called a General Lodge in the old sense, and if the term Grand Lodge had previously been alternatively used to designate the Assembly, then its being adopted for the meetings of Masters and Wardens would be an added motive for dropping the other term, especially if we supposed it had not been much used in the London area. The London Masons may have been quite able to understand what the Brethren at York, for example, meant by a General Lodge, while yet seldom or never using the term themselves. We are all familiar with many words and phrases we hardly ever employ.

The really exceptional feature of London Masonry was the fact that there were at least four permanent Lodges instead of only one. This may be ascribed partly to the size and population of the place, and partly to the great influx of operative craftsmen after the Great Fire. It seems probable that not only would this have led to the entrance of many operative apprentices, but also to the affiliation of an abnormal number of gentlemen or honorary Masons, too. But whatever was the actual course of events, it is plausible to assume that the tradition would persist that the government of the Craft in the area belonged to a general assembly of all Masons. The preliminary meeting of 1716 was held at the most central locality, but that of 1717 was held at the meeting place

of that Lodge, which was either the original one of London or the one which by its locality was held in some sense to represent it.

The whole discussion brings out the important thing, sometimes forgotten it would seem, that Masons have always been conservative, and that no more than they would to-day, did they break out into a course of innovations two centuries ago. The organization evolved; and while at some periods evolution was possibly much accelerated, the process was always so gradual, relative to the life of individuals, that no break of continuity was felt. And in this case we would have only another instance of a normal law in constitutional development, by which a smaller executive body, through sheer convenience and practicality, supersedes a larger and more unwieldy one. The process has not stopped at the second stage, in which the "Grand Lodge" of Regulation XII., usurped the powers and functions of the Assembly, but in every part of the world smaller and more compact bodies still have (as we all know) practically usurped the real power of the Grand Lodge. The only difference being that the Grand Lodge still continues to exist as a check, whereas the Assembly simply had to cease with the growth and centralization of the Craft.

Bro. W. J. SONGHURST writes:—

While admitting that an Author must be deemed the best judge of the manner of presenting his own work, I cannot help thinking that it would have been more convenient for his critics if Bro. Thiemeyer had given us in *three* papers the *three* subjects with which he has dealt. They are not necessarily related to one another, though each is of definite interest, and is based upon the tradition of general Masonic Assemblies or meetings for purposes connected with the trade or craft.

The only direct evidence we possess of these Assemblies of Masons—whether National or Local—is that which is contained in the various copies of the *Old Charges*, and we may include the *Regius* and *Cooke* MSS., for although their form differs in several respects from that of other MSS., it is evident that all are derived from a common but unknown original, though doubtless through different lines of descent. The multiplication of copies must not be taken as increasing the evidential value of any one, but allowance may be made for the possible adaptation of the text to local conditions. These documents state that Assemblies of Masons were first ordained by Euclid, and were afterwards confirmed by Patrons of Masonry or employers of labour, such as Solomon, Nimrod, Charles Martel, Athelstan, and St. Alban. It was also ordered that every Mason should attend the Assembly if he was within a certain distance of the place of meeting, and had received proper notice. Bro. Gould made diligent search amongst the many original official records that exist dealing with English life and customs in Mediæval times, and he found no reference whatever to any Assemblies having been held, nor, in fact, to any special privileges or immunities granted to Masons.

Furthermore, in a paper printed in the *Transactions* of the Humber Installed Masters Lodge No. 2494 in 1895, Bro. Gould said:—

" . . . the 15th Century, the date which has been attached to the earliest group of the MS. Constitutions, is about the most unlikely period in late mediæval times for a General Meeting of the Masons, or indeed of any English artisans, to have taken place. Such a meeting would have been, I won't say less improbable, but less miraculous during the first half of the 14th Century. Afterwards came the 100 years war with France, the Black Death, the Statutes of Labourers, and the long and sanguinary Wars of the Roses. During the reign of Henry VI. (15th Century) the bulwarks of social order seemed crumbling away, private wars, riots, open highway robbery, murder, abduction, armed resistance to the law, prevailed on

a scale that had been unknown since the troublous times of Edward II., one might almost say since the evil days of Stephen. About the time of Edward IV.'s accession to the throne in 1461, a date which may be regarded as a little later than the *Regius* and a little earlier than the *Cooke MSS.*, there were ruined villages, uncultivated fields, and decayed towns and cities. The population of Britain had sunk to 2,000,000 of all ages, and all men from 16 to 60, the Clergy not excepted, were every moment liable to be called into the field.

"That at such a period the Masons employed at the cathedrals, abbeys, castles, cities, towns, and villages throughout the country, abandoned their work and repaired to some very mysterious rendezvous in order to settle differences connected with their handicraft, no one will credit for an instant, and whether in the more tranquil times which prevailed prior to the 100 years war, the black death, and the other convulsions I have referred to, the holding of such a meeting would have been, let me say, less impossible, will become the subject of [further] enquiry."

I have quoted from this paper of Bro. Gould because it is somewhat later in date than those to which Bro. Thiemeyer has referred. It shows that after further consideration of the subject Bro. Gould saw no reason to alter the opinions which he had earlier expressed. But, of course, it will be realized that this evidence is entirely negative—no mention of meetings has been found, and the social conditions of the period seem to make such meetings impracticable. We can, however, date a considerable amount of work on the reconstruction or restoration of ecclesiastical buildings in England as between, say, 1380 and 1450.

Bro. Thiemeyer is not inclined to accept Bro. Gould's conclusions, and would appear to treat the mythical history contained in the *Old Charges* as being absolute fact, or perhaps one should rather say, as *founded* on fact. He calls to his aid the testimony of Plot in his *Natural History of Staffordshire*, 1686, and, by the way, the accuracy of the statements therein contained is not in any way increased "because this learned man was a friend of Elias Ashmole." But what did Plot say? He derived all his information from a copy of the *Old Charges* to which he had access, and held the legendary history up to ridicule. He had heard of meetings or Lodges being held all over the country, of course including Staffordshire, as otherwise he would have had no excuse for dragging the Masons into his History of that County. He was evidently under the impression that these Lodges, of which he had heard, were the Congregations or Confederacies against which the Act of Parliament was passed in the reign of Henry VI. And so he advised that they should be examined to see if they might not be doing such mischief as would warrant action against them.

Bro. Thiemeyer argues that Assemblies must have been held, otherwise Acts of Parliament would not have been needed in order—as he assumes—to suppress them. But Bro. Gould has shown that these Acts were passed for the purpose of preventing the holding of illegal meetings in contravention of the Statutes of Labourers. They seem to have been directed in the first instance against the Building Trades generally, and not against Masons in particular, and it is curious that they do not mention the word *assembly* or its equivalent in their original Latin or Norman French, but speak of covins or conventicles or chapters or congregations. There seems to be a suggestion of something underground or secret in such meetings, while if the *Old Charges* are to be accepted, the Assemblies were perfectly legal, and, in fact, enjoined by proper authority.

When we can say with certainty why, when, and by whom, the original legend of the *Old Charges* was compiled, and for what purpose the various copies were made, we may be able to answer many questions that at present are a puzzle to us.

And yet I do feel that some of these documents need further close examination in connection with this particular subject. There is, for example, the *William Watson MS.* (dated 1687), with its statement that the "charges

have been seen and perused by our late Sovereign King Henry the Sixth and the Lords of the Honourable Council and they have allowed them well and said they were right good and reasonable." Henry VI. reigned from 1422 to 1461. If this is a record of actual fact, the Act of 1425 against Congregations yet remained on the Statute Book. Then there is the *Cooke MS.* (written *circa* 1450), which mentions the word 'Assembly' (*semblé*), as does the *Regius MS.* (written *circa* 1390). But the Cooke text is followed by the Book of Charges, which is admittedly a compilation of earlier date than the Cooke original, and in this Book of Charges the word 'Assembly' does not appear, but 'Congregation' takes its place. We would like to know the reason for this change. I do not think that any argument can properly be based upon the *Roberts Print* of 1722. It is true that we do not know the actual manuscript from which the print was made, but none of the known members of the Roberts family (they possibly date from 1650 to 1670), which contain the New Articles, mention a General Assembly at which these were agreed upon. The Print says that it was held on the 8 December, 1663, but it is remarkable that the place of meeting is left blank. Anderson—if he copied from the print—has with his usual perversity made the date 27 December, but even he thought it better not to suggest the locality of the Assembly. Still, for what they are worth, we have these Additional or New Articles, which, by whomsoever compiled, seem to have been based on conditions which permitted non-operative Masons to be associated with operatives in the Assemblies of which they speak, and there appears to be the distinction between Society and Company, to which I will refer later. If the distinction is as I suggest, then one might imagine London as the place of compilation of the *Roberts* original.

My own particular difficulty is in trying to imagine what organization or governing body existed which could issue summonses to a general meeting of Masons. The Assembly must have been something beyond the meeting of a particular Lodge, for it is not to be suggested that the Master would have been unable to call his men together without special regulations being drawn up for the purpose. In the City of London there was the Masons Company or Guild, which could deal with its own members. But outside London separate Guilds of Masons were practically non-existent, the Masons being frequently associated with other trades not necessarily connected with building construction, and in some places 'Hammermen' were grouped together. I should therefore be interested to know what theory Bro. Thiemeyer has to put forward about a governing body which at any time or at any place could give the Masons notice about an Assembly then to be held. Further evidence may be forthcoming, but at present I am unable to accept Bro. Thiemeyer's view that Masons were actually called together in the manner suggested by the *Old Charges*.

To some extent Bro. Thiemeyer has expressed his opinions on the point in the third part of his paper, though this deals mainly with what he designates "The London Craft." That a Lodge or Society of Freemasons was in existence within, but distinct from, the London Masons Company or Guild, from the beginning of the seventeenth century, and inferentially from an earlier date, has been well known to Masonic students since the History of the Company was written and published by Bro. Conder in 1894, and evidence of one meeting of this Lodge (in 1682) is furnished by Ashmole in his Diary. There is other evidence of a *Society* as distinguished from the *Company* in the *Antiquity MS.* of the *Old Charges* which was written in 1686 by "Robert Padgett Clearke to the Worshipful Society of the Free Masons of the City of London." On this Bro. Conder writes: "The Padgett family belonged to the Masons Company, but Robert Padgett's name I cannot find." This clear distinction between the Society of Freemasons and the Masons Company or Guild is important, and does not seem to have been noted by Bro. Thiemeyer, although he realizes that "there was a distinction between the Lodges of Masons and the Masons Company."

Bro. Thiemeyer is quite aware that "conditions in the Craft were somewhat different in London from what they were in the Provinces," but he goes

on to say: "Instead of one Lodge in a locality we have several; instead of the Lodge being the operative government, we find the Masons Company occupying that position. The London Lodges, then, instead of being organizations for the control of the operative craft, are really speculative in character. They have operative Masons as members, of course, but their functions are solely for the preservation of the esoteric material which is the traditional heritage of the Craft."

This train of thought would lead to the conclusion that "speculative" or non-operative Lodges existed only in London, while we know, for example, that of the recorded members of the Lodge at Warrington in 1646, not one was an operative Mason. We may be entitled to assume that possibly the London Company exercised some kind of control over the Lodge or Society which met on its premises, although of this there is no evidence; and we do not know of any other Lodge or Society which existed in the City of London. Such Lodges may, however, have been formed amongst the Masons engaged on any large building operations, and, in fact, Anderson mentions (*Constitutions*, 1738, p. 107) one other Lodge within the City limits—on Tower Hill—in 1693.

It seems almost a pity that Bro. Thiemeyer has dragged into his paper the oft-discussed question of Sir Christopher Wren's connection with the Craft. Anderson states quite clearly that Wren was appointed Grand Warden in 1663, that in "1685 the Lodges met and elected Sir Christopher Wren Grand Master," that a few years afterwards—perhaps 1693—King William III. "approved of their choice of G. Master Wren," and that in 1695 the Duke of Richmond "was chosen Grand Master and approv'd by the King. Sir Christopher Wren was his D.G. Master, who acted as before at the head of the Craft, and was again chosen Grand Master, A.D. 1698." So Anderson states that Wren was first appointed Grand Master in 1685, after acting as Grand Warden in 1663, while Aubrey says that he was to be "adopted a brother" in 1691. Which of these statements is to be discarded if both refer to the same organization? Aubrey's book was not printed until 1844. One wonders how Anderson would have described Wren if he had known of the reference. Bro. Thiemeyer speaks of "the fact that [Wren] was a member and attended Lodge with some regularity." Where does he find any evidence of such membership and attendance? The Lodge of Antiquity claims to be the present representative of what has been termed the Old Lodge of St. Pauls, but it has no records contemporary with Wren. Notes which purport to date from 1721 were evidently written not earlier than 1768, and "all that can be said is that historically they are of no value whatever." (Rylands, *Records of the Lodge Original No. 1.*)

Bro. Thiemeyer raises a novel and very curious point in regard to the actual description made use of in 1716-7 by the founders of the central governing body for London and Westminster. It is, of course, quite within the bounds of possibility that they desired to extend the jurisdiction of an existing organization by including under its powers the three (or more) Lodges that were meeting outside the boundaries of the City of London. But of this there is no evidence. The question is—what did they call the new Body? Was it from the first called a 'Grand Lodge' with the almost certain 'Grand Master,' or were the terms 'General Lodge' and 'General Master'? I do not think any argument can be based upon the use of 'General Assembly' in some versions of the *Old Charges*, nor upon the 'General Lodge' in York and elsewhere. If the word 'general' was intended to have any particular meaning, it was probably used to differentiate between the Annual or stated and the ordinary or casual meetings.

The old Lodge at York undoubtedly copied London in adopting the term 'Grand' in 1725. In Ireland the word was in use in that same year, though we know nothing about the earlier period of organization there. In Scotland the Grand Lodge was formed in 1736, evidently on the lines of England. But these are all after the publication of Anderson's *Constitutions* of 1723, wherein the word had become crystallized, and it is necessary to look for earlier evidence. Even if we disregard the testimony of Stukeley—and I see no reason to doubt that by 'G^d,' he really meant 'Grand'—we can refer to the dedication of *Long*

Livers (dated 1 March, 1721) which is "To the Grand Master, Masters, Wardens, and Brethren," etc. This is actually nearly four months earlier than Stukeley's reference if we assume that the writer was using the Civil or Legal date of the period. We may, at all events, take it that the term was well established in 1721, and yet in that very year Desaguliers on a visit (24 August) to the old Lodge of Mary's Chapel in Edinburgh, is described in the Minutes as "late Generall Master of the Mason Lodges in England," and so Bro. Thiemeyer is inclined to believe that Desaguliers was appointed *General* Master of the *General* Lodge on 24 June 1719, and that Payne, who succeeded him in the Chair on 24 June 1720, was called *Grand* Master of the *Grand* Lodge. Though not impossible, this does not sound quite reasonable. The entry in the Minute Book in Edinburgh has certainly one mistake when it describes Desaguliers as General Master of *England*. Is it going too far to suggest that in an attendance book he wrote after his name 'late G.M.' and that the Scribe, not having heard of a Grand Master, used a word which seemed to him to express the idea he had formed of his position?

I am really quite sorry that at present I am not able to accept Bro. Thiemeyer's theories. He has evidently given a considerable amount of time to the study of the various points which he has placed before us, and it is a great advantage that they have been presented from a fresh point of view. For myself I shall certainly look with keener interest for any scraps of evidence which may help to a definite conclusion in regard to the events that culminated in the formation of a governing body for the Craft in 1716-7, even though I may still continue to call that organization the *Grand Lodge*.

Bro. L. VIBERT writes:—

Bro. Thiemeyer has been able to bring to the consideration of a familiar series of facts an entirely open mind, and he has succeeded in regrouping them in a very interesting manner. I do not think that his suggestions involve us in any structural changes in our theories of the general question of the descent of the modern Craft, but he has, as it appears to me, invited us to make modifications of detail which deserve careful consideration.

The paper really deals with three distinct subjects. There is first the question of the Assembly and the possibility that it actually had a continuous existence but with an altered function, and subsequently a change of name. There is next the question of the change of terminology from General Lodge and General Master to Grand Lodge and Grand Master, and Bro. Thiemeyer makes quite a new suggestion, which is that these latter terms were not in use till Payne's second term of office. These two questions are to some extent connected. Finally there is the question of the London Company, which is quite a distinct matter and really requires to be treated more fully in a separate paper.

With regard to the Assembly, at the very outset we are confronted by the fact that of any actual meeting of the Craft, whether local or for a larger area, before the middle of the seventeenth century, there is no evidence. That is not to say that the existence of the practice is to be denied. We have the rules for it—in several forms—but of the practice itself no record whatever.

Bro. Thiemeyer lays great stress on the general agreement of the later texts in saying that Edwin held an assembly at York. But this merely means that this statement occurs in the original from which they all derive. That original can hardly be of earlier date than the sixteenth century, and the most probable explanation of the assertion about York was put forward as long ago as 1891 by Bro. W. H. Rylands. (*A.Q.C.* iv., 214.) It is that the compiler, who found Edwin in his original, confused him with Edwin of York who did in fact hold a parliament near there: but that was in A.D. 627. And Begemann says that while an explanation that will satisfy everyone is not easy to give, yet one thing is certain and that is that the statement does not

represent any contemporary tradition: these documents were put together simply to glorify the Craft and support its claims to antiquity, and the question of their historical accuracy was one that it would occur to no one to raise.

He does not allude to the three texts of the Lansdown Branch which speak of Edwin as being made a mason "at Windsor." However, as was pointed out long ago, this is merely a scribe's error for the word "himself," and it can be disregarded. The statement of the Roberts, itself a print of 1722, that the Additional Orders, the New Articles as they are usually called, were agreed upon "AT a General Assembly held at ——— on the eighth December 1663" is one on which it is not safe to base any deductions, until the actual text which the Roberts editor was reproducing turns up. Possibly this date was given in his original, with a place-name which was illegible; in that case there was a General Assembly held, somewhere, in 1663, of which no other record exists. But all one can safely say at this stage is that in 1722 Roberts was familiar with the term General Assembly.

Bro. Thiemeyer endeavours to take his assemblies back altogether too far, and really so extreme an antiquity is not needed for his thesis. Assemblies of the Fraternity, whether general or local, cannot antedate that Fraternity itself, still less go back to a time before there was any sort of organization in any craft whatever in this country. And notwithstanding the statement that it was Athelstan who reformed the Craft in England, it is most unlikely that there was anything in the nature of a gild or fraternity among the building trades until the art itself had become one requiring special technical skill, which is equivalent to saying until the masons were building Gothic.

And since it is clear, I think, that the Charges General and Special continued to be reproduced and indeed enjoined long after they had ceased to have any real relation to existing Craft custom, we are left without any indication of when the custom fell out of use, and are wholly unable to say to what extent it in fact functioned at any given time. That it rose and fell with the Gothic architecture to which it was ancillary is, I imagine, on general principles a fairly safe assumption. That it was, as a trade custom, already being put to improper uses by the early part of the fifteenth century by the Craftsmen themselves, we have the evidence of the Statutes and of the Norwich Gilds (*A.Q.C.* xv., 197), as well as that of Wycklif as quoted by G. G. Coulton (*Social Life in Britain*, p. 490), and more fully in *Misc. Lat.* (XIII., 31) by our late Bro. E. H. Dring. But Bro. Thiemeyer's suggestion is that it was a regular incident of Craft life and that it never in fact fell into complete desuetude.

The political machinery of the nation itself had originally included a General Assembly. This was an inheritance from tribal days when it was a practical proposal. It very soon became an affair of representation, but for the local assemblies of the town or leet the attendance of every freeman who had not got an exemption was still technically obligatory as late as the days of Henry III. The Gilds being almost without exception local bodies, had no difficulty in perpetuating the custom. The Freemasons, from their very inception—whenever that may have been—were a body of men not confined to any one locality. They can only, therefore, have reproduced the custom in some modified form. There are instances of members of Gilds travelling fairly long distances to attend annual meetings, or rather, it would be more exact to say, there are gild-laws which contemplate that they should do so. One reference, for which I am indebted to Bro. Douglas Knoop, will be found at p. 134 of Lambert's *Two Thousand Years of Gild Life*. The Gild of the Beverley Minstrels comprised all minstrels between Trent and Tweed, and they were all "accustomed yerey to resort unto this town and borough of Beverley, at the Rogation Days" to choose the officers of the year and conduct the other business of the Gild. Then according to the regulations of the Peltiers of Norwich, as printed by Toulmin Smith (*E.E.T.S.* xl., 30), no man shall be excused of absence at the yearly mass but it be for (among other causes) twenty mile dwelling from this site. So that we here have in East Anglia twenty miles and in Yorkshire anything up to 120 as the distance within which attendance was considered to

be a duty. The *Old Charges* mostly give fifty miles as the distance, but it would be quite unsafe to make any assertion as to what the original distance was when they were first compiled. Still, in view of the instances just given this does not seem to be an excessive mileage for the members of a Fraternity which was undoubtedly widespread and accustomed to travel. It would, in most dioceses, more than cover the whole area. They would travel on foot and the distances that craftsmen were prepared so to travel in those days are certainly surprising to our modern notions. The Compagnon who wished to complete the Tour de France, a task that was still being frequently accomplished as late as the beginning of last century, had to travel in all 1,500 miles. (*A.Q.C.* xxxiii., 200.) But I quite agree that for any gathering of the craftsmen over a wider area than a diocese there was, apart from practical difficulties, no need; a diocese would be the natural area for which a craft so closely associated with the Church would tend to arrange its organization. But once more there is no evidence anywhere of anything of the kind. Indeed, the fact that the Fabric Rolls at York and Exeter have no reference to any absence of the Masters and Fellows for the purpose of attending Craft meetings is to some extent evidence in the opposite direction.

All we have is the descriptions of the *Regius* and *Cooke*, which may be taken as fifteenth century accounts of an institution perhaps already in its decline, accounts which are themselves transcripts of, or at least based on, much earlier records. We can understand that the Craft, while ready to recognise the official connection with the Sheriff and "Mayor of that cite" (however that came into existence), when it served their purpose, would always tend to keep their Craft gatherings and the discussion of their Craft concerns in their own hands, and as their own organization developed would drop the association with the law officers of the Crown entirely. There must have been some form of internal discipline, as also some organization for the communication of the discoveries in architecture—a rapidly developing science—but just what form these took we cannot glean from the texts, and there is practically no other evidence.

Bro. Thiemeyer has, I think, failed to notice an important indication of development between the date of the Book of Charges and that of the Grand Lodge form of the Charges. The Book of Charges is definite that the first business of the Assembly (or rather the Congregation) is to admit new men and charge them. In the later form we are merely told that the brethren must come to the Assembly and there stand to the award of their fellows, and we get a wholly new provision, the Fifth Special Charge, which indicates that suitable persons can be made masons at any time or place provided a quorum is present and consents. This means that the admitting of masons is now being done in the Lodges. The tendency would be for the Lodges, especially those of a more or less permanent character at the larger cathedrals, to get all this business into their own hands and to be in fact independent societies, but with full recognition one of another.

That there ever was a General Assembly of masons of the whole nation we will surely be safe in denying; such a meeting could not have escaped the notice of the chroniclers. Bro. Thiemeyer devotes a good deal of space to this point, but I do not think anyone will disagree with his conclusion that whatever meetings there were can only have been local. Nevertheless, as he has pointed out, we get the clear statement that the Charges were agreed on at divers Assemblies, and these Charges are accepted as binding by the whole Fraternity, and, notwithstanding differences in wording between one text and another, they are all clearly derived from a single original. In the absence of any evidence of a central organization or a governing body, it is very difficult to understand how the Charges General and Special came to be enacted, how they were promulgated, and why they should command general acceptance, as it would seem that they did. It must be remembered that they were not put into shape until Gothic architecture had almost ceased to develop and had become formalized and largely stereotyped.

Bro. Thiemeyer bases some of his arguments on mere clerical errors in certain texts, clerical errors which naturally all the texts of one Branch repeat, since their occurrence in a series of texts was precisely the ground for making those texts a Branch. Probably the masons, like the gilds, had general meeting days on fixed dates, and occasional private meetings, convened *ad hoc*, although it would be unsafe to assume that the terminology in this respect was always strictly adhered to; and in the absence of sufficient evidence we cannot be certain as to what exactly the distinction in function was; it no doubt varied in different localities. But the distinction that he draws between the meeting prescribed by law,—whatever its title—which met on a fixed day, and the meeting summoned whenever the occasion required one, is probably valid; it is supported by Gild analogy. A Gild or Fraternity that had no Gild-hall would necessarily require to notify its members of the place of meeting, even if the date was fixed beforehand. The Freemasons would probably often be in this predicament.

In the case of the ordinary Craft Gild it is obvious that when the trade disappeared the organization would all go too. But the view is held by many that the Freemasons were not an ordinary Craft Gild and that our Freemasonry to-day derives from them in unbroken descent, because they had the special feature of an esoteric element, independent of trade affairs, and able to continue, when the trade itself was extinct. This is after all no more than a hypothesis, but there is a continuity in respect of the text of the *Old Charges* which appears to bridge the interval. Bro. Thiemeyer seeks to make out a continuity for the annual meeting. His review of the evidence leads him to the conclusion that when Freemasonry reappears in the seventeenth century it is following the custom, familiar in the Gilds, of annual meetings. In the absence of evidence as to the conditions in the days of the building Fraternity this does not amount to continuity. But so far as it goes it may be considered as evidence in favour of the unbroken descent hypothesis. But all terminology at the period was so loosely used that any discussion as to what exactly these various meetings were called, and what the names meant, is bound to be somewhat sterile.

The most that Bro. Thiemeyer's marshalling of the evidence amounts to, as it appears to me, is that the documents preserve the traces of a time when there were Craft Assemblies, or Congregations, and the individual Lodges had, in common with all Gilds and the Companies that were their successors, the custom of an annual meeting, which had now become a meeting restricted purely to the individual Lodge, with the possible exception of York. Gild custom is itself a sufficient explanation for the adoption by the Craft of the system originally, without there being any necessity to derive it from Norman or pre-Norman builders, and ultimately from foreign sources. Moreover the developments that took place in and after 1717 are quite independent phenomena, and are not at all affected by the question of how the Craft at that time came by its Assembly, except in so far as tradition, or actual survival determined the terminology that was found to be in use. In any case the word Assembly had within a very few years dropped out altogether.

At the commencement of his second section Bro. Thiemeyer suggests that there is no reason for supposing that Anderson's reproduction of the original Regulations is not substantially accurate. I hold an exactly contrary opinion, as he will see if he looks at the Bicentenary reproduction of the 1723 *Constitutions* (*vide* also *A.Q.C.* xxxvi., 56; xxxix., 249); and I have given what I think are valid reasons for that opinion. Later on he asks me if I have any evidence to support the statement that they styled Anthony Sayer the Grand Master, other than Anderson himself. The question is, I think, only rhetorical; Bro. Thiemeyer knows quite well that there is none. At the same time he has, I suggest, hardly given sufficient attention to the contemporary evidence for this whole period brought together by Bro. Sir Alfred Robbins and others and reproduced at various times in *A.Q.C.*, for instance, in vols. xviii., xxii. and xxiii., which really does add to our knowledge and incidentally serves as a check on Anderson.

Bro. Thiemeyer calls the statement that Anthony Sayer was the first Grand Master a myth. But by this he can, I think, only mean, not that Sayer did not preside over the new body, but merely that his designation was not Grand Master. His phrase is ambiguous, but surely Sayer's position cannot be doubted, although what the contemporary designation of it may have been is, as Bro. Thiemeyer has shown us, a matter for which we have in fact no contemporary evidence. But it is too soon to speak of his title of Grand Master as a myth.

The question of the assumption of the title Grand by the new body was referred to at *A.Q.C.* xxxix., 240, and a reason for it suggested to which he has no allusion. And he overlooks one point, which is that, as he himself has shown, the term *general meeting* or *assembly* was in use in the private Lodges at the time, or in some of them. When, therefore, the Lodges in London and Westminster came together to form a joint organization, whatever may have been its precise nature, they would be almost bound to give the meetings of the united body a new designation, and the president would have a title to correspond.

That Grand Master does not occur before 1721 (Samber and Stukeley) is true. But neither does General Master occur, with the single exception of the Edinburgh Minute, and that that is susceptible of more than one explanation Bro. Thiemeyer has himself admitted. The confusion in Anderson's terminology as to his alleged earlier General or Grand Masters is precisely characteristic of a transition period. If it is the case that previously there was such a title as General Master, then there was no doubt a change made, which by 1721 was well-established. But that the designation Grand Master was unheard of before 1721 is by no means clear, and it is at least as likely that the change was made quite early in the history of the new Grand Lodge, but did not become common knowledge or gain general acceptance till that body for the first time was associated with a quasi-official publication in 1723. Anderson in 1738 was concerned, as Bro. Thiemeyer says, to make out the antiquity of everything connected with the Craft, and all his statements are vitiated by that bias. In 1723 he knew much less about things. But Bro. Thiemeyer has very usefully reminded us that nothing in Anderson can be taken on trust, that even his most familiar assertions as to the origin of Grand Lodge remain entirely uncorroborated, and are liable at any time to be contradicted by the discovery of contemporary evidence.

I have elsewhere suggested that the meetings of 1716 and 1717 may have had as their object the formation of a society in imitation of a City Company, but with a wider territorial jurisdiction, and that the movement was due to the fact that the actual Masons Company had discarded its speculative inner circle. Whatever the original motive it is fairly certain that it was the unexpectedly rapid development in Payne's second year as Grand Master that led to the formation of New Lodges, the framing of the Regulations—in their original form—and the development of Grand Lodge as an actual controlling body and not as merely the Lodges met in assembly. But the evidence is not as yet sufficient to enable us to work out the process in detail, or to establish its chronology.

But it is all to the good that Brethren like Bro. Thiemeyer should make their own estimates of such evidence as there is, evidence which is so familiar to some of us that we have, no doubt, got into a habit of taking it always in one way and are liable to forget how very little we can be absolutely confident about when discussing this very obscure transition period.

Bro. THIEMEYER writes, in reply:—

The patience of my Brethren in Quatuor Coronati Lodge must have been sorely tried by the length of my paper. At least, those who have forwarded criticisms have commented upon this point with such unanimity that it gives this

impression, and if this is correct my debt of gratitude to those who heard the paper is even greater than it would otherwise have been. But I might retort that those who thus prefaced a more detailed criticism did not show quite as much perspicacity as one would expect of the members of the most august body of Masonic students that the world at present knows. The length of the paper is so self-evident that it might seem that much valuable time and space is wasted in commenting upon that fact, especially when it is known that the author himself considered it in much the same light. Nevertheless, I am willing to add to the reader's burden by commenting briefly upon this point because it is about the only one raised in which I find it possible to concur with my critics. However that may be, I am inclined to take refuge in the remark made by Bro. Songhurst, "that an author must be deemed the best judge of the manner of presenting his own work."

But, jesting aside, and getting down to real business, much as I am tempted to respond in detail to all of the criticisms raised, I feel that I would only be repeating what I have already said, thus adding still more to the length of the paper with no commensurate gain. Besides, everyone seems to agree with the main points of the discussion, and it is only on matters of detail or personal opinion that differences appear. Then, too, I am not now in a position to re-examine all the evidence I had before me nearly three years ago, when this paper was first being written. We in America are not so fortunate as our English Brethren in having material readily accessible. The nearest worth-while Masonic Library is 370 miles from St. Louis, and the next nearest almost 1,000 miles away.

To only one of the comments am I going to make any specific reply, and that is to Bro. Daynes. In the first place this erudite scholar says that I have not approached the matter from a new point of view. He says that Bro. Speth had previously made similar suggestions. I might add that so had Bros. Vibert, Gould, Rylands and others; but, in my opinion, none of them quite followed their suggestions through to their logical conclusions. That my paper dealt with well-known facts is perfectly true—I said so in the paper—but those facts were, I thought, brought together in a somewhat different connection than had ever been done previously, so far as I have been able to discover. When Bro. Daynes intimates that I might well have been satisfied with the treatment of the subject by Bro. Rylands, Begeman and Speth in controverting the theory of Bro. Gould regarding the Assemblies, I am inclined to agree, I might have done so with profit to all concerned, only I have noticed that other authors have been very frequently criticized for a similar reliance on the work of their predecessors, and I felt it better to make my own estimates of the evidence. But more important than this, perhaps, is the fact that these earlier discussions of the subject are in a volume of the *Transactions* which is probably inaccessible to three-quarters of the members of the Correspondence Circle. The wisdom of the course I adopted is clearly shown by the comments of Bro. Songhurst. It must be said in justice to the former Secretary of the Lodge that he does not in any place state positively that he agrees with the conclusions of Bro. Gould, but only that Bro. Gould had seen no reason to change his views, which is quite a different matter.

I have, of course, read the comments by the three Brethren above-mentioned in vol. vi. of *A.Q.C.*, but I found nothing in them which would cause me to change my views in the least, and what is more important I also find that while they have gone along the path a certain distance they stopped short. I have endeavoured to follow the trail more nearly to its end than they did.


In regard to the valuable material collected by Bro. Robbins in vol. xxiii. of the *Transactions*, I can only say that the earliest reference there given is too late to have any bearing upon the question. I did not want to still further lengthen my paper by bringing it in.

Perhaps some of those who so kindly responded are ignorant of the fact that my paper was in the hands of the Secretary for nearly a year before it


was read, and it was written more than a year before that. As for Bro. Daynes's comments upon Bro. Vibert's paper on the Second Degree, I could not have referred to them for the simple reason that they had not been published at the time.

In conclusion I would offer a defence of the length of the quotations given in the paper. I have so often met with brief quotations whose divorce from their context tends to give a wrong impression that I felt it better to err on the side of length rather than brevity. Further than that, however, is the fact that members of the Lodge may not quite realize the difficulties that many members of the Correspondence Circle, especially in America, labour under in regard to obtaining first-hand information. It is because so many students on this side of the Atlantic might value the added material that I quoted so freely.

In reviewing the criticisms, I cannot see that any really new point has been raised. What has been brought forward are things that have all, or nearly all, been treated in the paper. So far as there is difference of opinion, it is a basic one of our understanding the evidence. The plaintiff rests and the case may go to the jury.



NOTES AND QUERIES.

**CONSTITUTIONS OF 1723 WITH AN INSCRIPTION BY ANDERSON.**

—Recently, at Messrs. Sotheby's, there was sold the copy of the 1723 *Constitutions* presented by Anderson to the Duke of Richmond in March, 1724. It was a magnificent copy, handsomely bound and in perfect condition, and it fetched an appropriate price. Its most interesting feature was a dedicatory inscription taking up a whole page, and through the courtesy of the present owners of the book, Messrs.

Tregaskis, we are able to reproduce this for *A.Q.C.* The Duke was not made Grand Master till June, 1724, being put in nomination at the meeting of 28th April. No doubt those in touch with Grand Lodge, or the Duke himself, would be able to anticipate the nomination. At this time the Duke was Master of the Lodge at the Horn, Westminster, of which Anderson was a member. The good Doctor's Latin is somewhat pedantic and involved, but the sense of it seems to be as follows:—

To the most illustrious Prince, Charles Duke of Richmond, descendant of kingly ancestors, holding the first place among the brethren at Westminster of the select society of free masons and stone-cutters, most worthy to be regarded by all Masters, Wardens, Fellow-Crafts, and Apprentices of the renowned and most ancient Fraternity, the delight and ornament of the human race, its most skilful and prudent Master, at all times furthering its interests, in token of gratitude, its Author most humbly presents this book.

L.V.

The Rev. William Dodd (from a Paper by the Rev. Canon J. W. Horsley, *A.Q.C.* xix., p. 182).—The Rev. William Dodd was born at Bourne, Lincs., in 1729, and took his degree of B.A. at Cambridge in 1750, and became M.A. in 1759 and LL.D. in 1766. He was ordained in 1751 (while still under the age legally required), and at once commenced his clerical work as a Curate at West Ham, where he acquired some reputation as a popular preacher. In 1758 he was one of the founders of the Magdalen Home at Streatham for fallen women. For some reason not very easy to understand, in 1763 he was appointed Chaplain in Ordinary to the King (Geo. III.), and in 1764 he was made a Prebendary of Brecon. Two years later he was inhabiting a town house in Southampton Row, with a country residence at Ealing, and running two proprietary chapels in London; but his assiduity in cultivating aristocratic and fashionable society led to extravagance and the folly of living beyond his means. In 1772 he was made Rector of Hockcliffe and Vicar of Chalgrave, both in Bedfordshire. An unsuccessful attempt to secure by bribery the presentation to a third living—that of St. George's, Hanover Square—in 1774 procured for him an unenviable notoriety in the public Press and even on the stage. At the end of the same year or early in 1775 he was in the Bankruptcy Court, and his name was removed from the list of Royal Chaplains. He now sought the aid of his friend and former pupil, Lord Chesterfield, who presented him to a third living, namely, Wing, in Bucks, to which he was duly instituted, but there is no record that he ever officiated at the Church.

It is somewhat remarkable that he was Initiated into Freemasonry (St. Alban's Lodge, 3rd April) in 1775, after the trouble about St. George's,

Illustrissimo
 Principi
 Carolo Duci de Richmond
 Alacris edito Regibus
 In Lapidearum et Amentariorum Immunitum
 Societate solida
 apud Westmonasterienses Primas tenenti
 et
 ab omnibus Inceptis, ac perantiquis Fraternitatis
 Magistris, Guardianis, Soveroys, Typomibus
 dignissimo observantia,
 Generis humani Delicijs, Decori,
 Magistro suo perquam Perito, Prudenti, ac perpetuum
 colendo
 In Gratitudinis Letteram
 Hunc Librum
 Humillimis sicut Eundem auctor
 Jacobus Anderson
 VIII.ºº Calendas Aprilis
 Anno Regis Christiani
 Juliano MDCCXXIV.

Hanover Square, and it is certainly surprising that only one month after his entrance into our Order he was chosen to be Grand Chaplain of England, the first to hold that office. The appointment was made at the Grand Lodge held on 1st May, 1775, in the face of the notoriety of the ventilation of the scandal in the Press and on the stage and the removal of the offender from the list of the King's Chaplains. The Minutes record that the appointment met with "the unanimous approbation of the Brethren present." And Dr. Dodd was reappointed to the same high office at the Grand Lodge on 3rd June, 1776. The Oration he delivered at the Dedication of Freemasons' Hall (23rd May, 1776) was "published by general request, under sanction of the Grand Lodge" and is well known.

But in the month of February, 1777, he was arrested and brought to trial, and on 26th May convicted and sentenced to death for forging a bond for £4,200 from his patron, Lord Chesterfield; and on the 7th April, 1777, he was expelled from the Order at an "Extraordinary Grand Lodge," and his name obliterated from all contemporary copies of the *Book of Constitutions*.

Efforts to obtain a reprieve, led by the celebrated Dr. Samuel Johnson, failed, although more than 30,000 persons signed the Petition. It does not appear that his Masonic Brethren did very much, if anything, to help their unhappy ex-Grand Chaplain in his hour of need, and this seems to discount the truth of the statement which has from time to time been made that the reprieve would have been granted but for a fear entertained by the authorities that it would have been popularly construed as a special favour shown to the Masonic body. The Privy Council on 15th June ordered the execution, and Dr. Dodd was hanged at Tyburn on 27th June, 1777.

A sensational story that after the execution he was cut down, revived and hurried out of the country is not credited.

Dr. Dodd was a man with great gifts and a kind and generous disposition and the power to charm others; worldly, extravagant, dissipated, unworthy of his high vocation, but still a man who was not really bad at heart. A man to be blamed, but even more to be pitied.

The printed pamphlet (*vide* p. 138), although perhaps not quite a 'rarity,' is certainly scarce, especially if complete and in good state.

In *A.Q.C.* xix. (p. 182) there is an excellent and exhaustive account of the unfortunate Dr. Dodd, from which most of the information in this short note has been taken. The account occurs in our late Bro. Canon J. W. Horsley's paper, "The Grand Chaplains of England." J.E.S.T.

James Gib.—I have read with great interest the Lecture entitled "A Masonic Pilgrimage through London," by Bro. W. J. Williams, in Part I. of volume xlii. of the *Transactions*, and my attention was arrested by the reference to James Gib on pages 80 and 81. I had met this name in reading the history of the noble family of the Erskines of Mar. With the object of securing further information, I solicited an interview with the present Earl of Mar and Kellie, whose seat is at Alloa House in the County of Clackmannan. I was received most graciously, and was shown an Oil Painting of James Gibbs, Architect, which hangs in the Gallery. I was also privileged to inspect a printed Book of double foolscap folios, entitled "A Book of Architecture containing Designs of Buildings and Ornaments by James Gibbs 1728." I had not time to make more than a cursory examination. However, the library and book were placed at my disposal. The book is dedicated to John, Duke of Argyll, and contains the names of some 500 subscribers, all high placed persons. There are 150 plates of varied designs of Pavilions, Country Houses, Monuments and Churches. I was not able to discover any mark or reference which would determine Gibbs' connection with the Craft. I found the designs for the two churches, St. Martins-in-the-Fields and St. Mary-le-Strand, mentioned in the *Transactions*. Concerning St. Martins-in-the-Fields, James Gibbs writes in his introduction as follows:—

"The Church of St. Martins-in-the-Fields Westminster being much decayed and in danger of falling, the parishioners obtained an Act of Parliament for rebuilding it at their own charges. The Commissioners appointed therein were pleased to make choice of me for surveyor of that work; and several plans of different forms being prepared and laid before them, they fixed upon the following as most proper for that site. There were two designs made for a Round Church which were approved by the Commissioners but were laid aside upon account of the expense of executing them, though they were more capacious and convenient than what they pitched upon. The Commissioners having signed the plan agreed upon, gave me orders to begin the work and everything being ready His Majesty was pleased to direct the Right Rev. Bishop of Salisbury, then Lord Almoner, attended by Sir Thomas Heyst, then Surveyor General, to lay the first stone of this fabric upon which was fixed the following inscription."

(Here follows the inscription printed on page 81 of *Transactions*, but therein "Hewet" appears for "Heyst" above.)

The Introduction continues:—

"This ceremony being over I proceeded with the building and finished it in five years, which, notwithstanding the great economy of the Commissioners, cost the Parish upwards of 32,000 Pounds."

I asked the Earl of Mar and Kellie, who is himself a member of the Lodge of Alloa No. 69, whether he had any Masonic records of the time 1690 to 1730. He told me he had now no Masonic records of his family, because in a disastrous fire in 1800 the Old Alloa House was burnt to the ground, destroying many precious relics, amongst them priceless mementos of the Stuart Sovereigns. The Erskines of Mar were, of course, custodians of the Royal children of the Stuarts. King James I., Prince Henry and the tragic King Charles I. were educated under their care. It is interesting to note that it was through the patronage of the first and second Earls of Mar that William Schaw of Schawpark (just two miles from Alloa Tower) was introduced to the Royal Household, afterwards to become Master of Works to King James VI. and author of the famous Schaw Statutes of 1598 and 1599. The Erskines are a noted Masonic family of which the Earls of Kellie, Earls of Buchan and Earls of Rosslyn are cadet branches. All of these have provided holders of the Chair of Grand Master Mason of Scotland. It is interesting to speculate whether their interest in Masonry was aroused or stimulated by association with William Schaw and James Gib.

To return to James Gib, I find the name severally spelt Gib, Gibb and Gibbs. I am assured that Gib with one 'b' is correct. He was undoubtedly one of the most famous architects of his time, and the Bodleian Library at Oxford is his work. On completing his studies at Marischal College, Aberdeen, Gib solicited the interest, and was taken under the patronage, of John, sixth Earl of Mar. This Earl in earlier history is described as the eleventh Earl of his line, but after the Mar Peerage case was decided in Parliament in 1885, the Alloa Branch of the Erskines were ordered to count from the creation by Mary Queen of Scots only. Thus John (1695 to 1732) is now styled sixth Earl. At that time the district of Mar or Braemar in Aberdeenshire was attached to the title, and this would bring Gib in contact with the Earl. The sixth Earl of Mar was one of the most powerful and far-seeing statesmen of the reign of Queen Anne. He was one of the Commissioners appointed to treat for the Union of the Scottish and English Parliaments. He spent much time in Edinburgh, where he had a town house. He brought Gib there and introduced him to business. On the consummation of the Union the Earl of Mar was appointed Secretary of State for Scotland and a Privy Councillor to Queen Anne.

He saw unrivalled opportunities for building ventures in London and he induced James Gib to come hither. He set him in the way of his many public commissions and introduced him to the Court party and nobility generally. Gib had the ability to profit by his opportunity.

This is the Earl of Mar who, on the death of Queen Anne and the decline of the Tory party, made offer, along with other Scots Highland Chiefs, of loyalty and service to King George I. (invited from Hanover to assume the throne) only to be coldly repulsed by the King, on the advice of jealous Whig enemies, commanded to deliver up his seals of office and informed that His gracious Majesty had no further use for his services. Mar felt the rebuff keenly, and, smarting under the indignity of his dismissal, allowed himself to be persuaded into leading that ill-fated venture, the Rebellion of 1715. He was attainted, deprived of his estate and title, and died in exile—see Murray Lyon's *History of the Lodge of Edinburgh No. 1*, page 177. The title was not restored to the family until 1824. James Gib was sorely distressed at the misfortunes which had befallen the Mar Family, and it is said that out of gratitude he left his fortune to Thomas Lord Erskine, son of the attainted Earl. However that may be it is undoubted that Lord Erskine and Gib were close acquaintances. The fact is referred to in letters from the exiled Earl to his son. It is natural to assume that both would be interested in Masonry.

Now about this time Dr. Desaguliers was at the zenith of his fame, and in 1721 he made his visit to Edinburgh. Freemasonry in Edinburgh received a notable impetus on the speculative side, and one result was the formation of Lodge Kilwinning Scots Arms in 1729. According to Murray Lyon, page 190, Lord Erskine was a member of this Lodge. He became Grand Master Mason of Scotland in 1749. With his friends and patrons so closely interested it is inconceivable that James Gib could have remained outside the Craft, though whether to look in the London or Edinburgh Lodges for his connection is uncertain. Personally, I incline to a Scottish connection before he proceeded to London, mainly because he practised his profession in Edinburgh, and would be brought into contact with the members of the Lodges there. Of four possible Lodges in Edinburgh, two are now dormant, viz., Kilwinning Scots Arms and Leith Kilwinning, leaving Mary's Chapel No. 1 and Canongate Kilwinning No. 7, but Aberdeen No. 1 ter, must not be ruled out of count.

JAMES W. SAUNDERS.

OBITUARY.



It is with much regret that we have to record the death of the following Brethren:—

Gerald Arthur Augustine Bradnack, of Barton-on-Humber, in 1929. Our Brother was a member of St. Matthew Lodge No. 1447, and was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in 1924.

G. A. Carter, of Port Elizabeth, S. Africa, on 11th May, 1926. Bro. Carter held the rank of P.Dis.G.W., and P.Dis.G.H. He was one of the early members of our Correspondence Circle, having joined in October, 1888.

John Edward Danes, of Hawthorn, Victoria, in 1929. Our Brother was a member of Lodge No. 300 and of Chapter No. 9. He was a Life Member of our Correspondence Circle which he joined in 1923.

Ernest Davidson, of Liverpool, on 6th May, 1929, at the age of 58 years. Bro. Davidson held office as Grand Inspector, Gold Coast, and attained the rank of Past Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies and Past Grand Standard Bearer (R.A.). He was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in March, 1922.

Dr. **John Howe**, of Manchester, in 1929. Our Brother was 59 years of age. He was a P.M. of Lord Stanley Lodge No. 2891, and had been a member of our Correspondence Circle since 1924.

Andrew Jackson Jordan, of Sheffield, on 3rd June, 1929, at St. Louis, Mo., U.S.A. Bro. Jordan was a P.M. of Royal Brunswick Lodge No. 296. He joined our Correspondence Circle in March, 1905.

Charles Edward Keyser, M.A., F.S.A., of Reading, on 23rd May, 1929. Bro. Keyser was Pr.G.M. of Hertfordshire, and Dep.Pr.G.M. of Berkshire. He was also Past Grand Warden, and Past Grand Scribe N. He was a generous supporter of the Charities, and also a distinguished archaeologist, having been President of the British Archaeological Association and Vice-President of the Royal Archaeological Institute. He joined our Correspondence Circle as far back as January, 1893.

Herbert Pledger, of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, in May, 1929. Our Brother held the rank of P.Pr.G.D., and was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in May, 1928.

Edwin James Reid, of Bexley Heath, on 17th May, 1929. Bro. Reid held office as Assistant Grand Superintendent of Works and attained the rank of P.Pr.G.D., Middlesex. He had been a member of our Correspondence Circle since October, 1910.

Henry Thomas Smith, of Toronto, on 29th May, 1929, in his 70th year. Our Brother was Past Grand Registrar, Past Grand Superintendent and Grand Scribe E. He was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in October, 1909.

Alfred Solomons, of London, N., on 1st April, 1929. Our Brother was a P.M. of Thornhill Lodge No. 3163, and had attained L.R. He joined our Correspondence Circle in May, 1910.

Walter Stubbings, of London, S.W., in April, 1929. He was a member of Bolingbroke Lodge No. 2417, and of the Rose of Denmark Chapter No. 975. Our Brother was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in 1924.

Frederick Robert Charles Surplice, of Worthing, on 6th June, 1929. Bro. Surplice held the rank of P.Dis.G.St.B., Hong Kong, and he became a member of our Correspondence Circle in January, 1928.

Robert Corser Montfort Symns, I.C.S., of London, W., on 6th April, 1929. Our Brother held the rank of P.Dis.G.W., and P.Dis.G.J., Burma. He was a Life Member of our Correspondence Circle which he joined in March, 1901.

Quatuor Coronati Lodge, No. 2076, London.

PUBLICATIONS.

ARS QUATUOR CORONATORUM.

COMPLETE SETS OF THE *TRANSACTIONS*.—A few complete Sets of *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, Vols. i. to xli., have been made up for sale. Prices may be obtained on application to the Secretary. Each volume will be accompanied as far as possible, with the St. John's Card of the corresponding year.

ODD VOLUMES.—Such copies of Volumes as remain over after completing sets, are on sale to members.

MASONIC REPRINTS.

QUATUOR CORONATORUM ANTIGRAPHA.

COMPLETE SETS OF *MASONIC REPRINTS*.—A few complete Sets of *Quatuor Coronatorum Antigrapha*, Vols. i. to x., consisting mainly of exquisite facsimiles, can be supplied. Prices may be obtained on application to the Secretary.

ODD VOLUMES.—Vols. vi., vii., ix., and x. are on sale to members, price 30/- per volume.

FACSIMILES OF THE OLD CHARGES.—Four Rolls, viz., Grand Lodge Nos. 1 and 2 MS., Scarborough MS., and the Buchanan MS. Lithographed on vegetable vellum, in the original Roll form. Price, One Guinea each.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS.

	£	s.	d.
The Masonic Genius of Robert Burns, by <i>Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson</i> , Drawing-room edition, extra illustrations		5	0
Caementaria Hibernica, by <i>Dr. W. J. Chetwode Crawley</i> , Fasciculus I., Fasciculus II., and Fasciculus III. A few complete sets only for sale. Prices may be obtained on application to the Secretary.			
Caementaria Hibernica, Fasciculus III., a few copies available	1	1	0
The Orientation of Temples, by <i>Bro. W. Simpson</i> , uniform in size to bind with the <i>Transactions</i> ...	2	6	
British Masonic Medals, with twelve plates of illustrations	1	1	0

BINDING.

Members returning their parts of the *Transactions*, to the Secretary, can have them bound in dark blue Canvas, lettered gold, for 6/- per volume. Cases can be supplied at 3/- per volume, date or number of volume should be specified.

MEMBERSHIP MEDAL.

Brethren of the Correspondence Circle are entitled to wear a membership Medal, to be procured of the Secretary only. In Silver Gilt, engraved with the owner's name, with bar, pin and ribbon, as a breast jewel. 10/6 each.

Quatuor Coronati Lodge,

NO. 2076, LONDON.



SECRETARY:

LIONEL VIBERT, P.A.G.D.C.

OFFICE, LIBRARY AND READING ROOM:

27, GREAT QUEEN STREET, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.2.

≡: Ars :≡ Quatuor Coronatorum

BEING THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE
QUATUOR CORONATI LODGE NO. 2076, LONDON.



EDITED FOR THE COMMITTEE BY W. J. SONGHURST, P.G.D.,
AND LIONEL VIBERT, P.A.G.D.C.

VOLUME XLII. PART 3.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Proceedings, 4th October 1929 ...	257	Exhibits	292
Exhibits	258	Inaugural Address	293
Gild Resemblances in the Old MS.		Reviews	310
Charges	259	Note	313
Proceedings, 8th November, 1929 ...	291	Obituary	314
		St. John's Card	316

W. J. PARRETT, LTD., PRINTERS, MARGATE.

1931

THE QUATUOR CORONATI LODGE No. 2076, LONDON

was warranted on the 28th November, 1884, in order

- 1.—To provide a centre and bond of union for Masonic Students.
- 2.—To attract intelligent Masons to its meetings, in order to imbue them with a love for Masonic research.
- 3.—To submit the discoveries or conclusions of students to the judgment and criticism of their fellows by means of papers read in Lodge.
- 4.—To submit these communications and the discussions arising therefrom to the general body of the Craft by publishing, at proper intervals, the Transactions of the Lodge in their entirety.
- 5.—To tabulate concisely, in the printed Transactions of the Lodge, the progress of the Craft throughout the World.
- 6.—To make the English-speaking Craft acquainted with the progress of Masonic study abroad, by translations (in whole or part) of foreign works.
- 7.—To reprint scarce and valuable works on Freemasonry, and to publish Manuscripts, &c.
- 8.—To form a Masonic Library and Museum.
- 9.—To acquire permanent London premises, and open a reading-room for the members.

The membership is limited to forty, in order to prevent the Lodge from becoming unwieldy.

No members are admitted without a high literary, artistic, or scientific qualification.

The annual subscription is two guineas, and the fees for initiation and joining are twenty guineas and five guineas respectively.

The funds are wholly devoted to Lodge and literary purposes, and no portion is spent in refreshment. The members usually dine together after the meetings, but at their own individual cost. Visitors, who are cordially welcome, enjoy the option of partaking—on the same terms—of a meal at the common table.

The stated meetings are the first Friday in January, March, May, and October, St. John's Day (in Harvest), and the 8th November (Feast of the Quatuor Coronati).

At every meeting an original paper is read, which is followed by a discussion.

The *Transactions* of the Lodge, *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, are published towards the end of April, July, and December in each year. They contain a summary of the business of the Lodge, the full text of the papers read in Lodge together with the discussions, many essays communicated by the brethren but for which no time can be found at the meetings, biographies, historical notes, reviews of Masonic publications, notes and queries, obituary, and other matter. They are profusely illustrated and handsomely printed.

The Antiquarian Reprints of the Lodge, *Quatuor Coronatorum Antigrapha*, appear at undefined intervals, and consist of facsimiles of documents of Masonic interest with commentaries or introductions by brothers well informed on the subjects treated of.

The Library has now been arranged at No. 27, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, where Members of both Circles may consult the books on application to the Secretary.

To the Lodge is attached an outer or

CORRESPONDENCE CIRCLE.

This was inaugurated in January, 1887, and now numbers about 3500 members, comprising many of the most distinguished brethren of the Craft, such as Masonic Students and Writers, Grand Masters, Grand Secretaries, and nearly 300 Grand Lodges, Supreme Councils, Private Lodges, Libraries and other corporate bodies.

The members of our Correspondence Circle are placed on the following footing:—

1.—The summonses convoking the meeting are posted to them regularly. They are entitled to attend all the meetings of the Lodge whenever convenient to themselves, but, unlike the members of the Inner Circle, their attendance is not even morally obligatory. When present they are entitled to take part in the discussions on the papers read before the Lodge, and to introduce their personal friends. They are not visitors at our Lodge meetings, but rather associates of the Lodge.

2.—The printed *Transactions* of the Lodge are posted to them as issued.

3.—They are, equally with the full members, entitled to subscribe for the other publications of the Lodge, such as those mentioned under No. 7 above.

4.—Papers from Correspondence Members are gratefully accepted, and as far as possible, recorded in the *Transactions*.

5.—They are accorded free admittance to our Library and Reading Rooms.

A Candidate for Membership in the Correspondence Circle is subject to no literary, artistic, or scientific qualification. His election takes place at the Lodge-meeting following the receipt of his application.

Brethren elected to the Correspondence Circle pay a joining fee of twenty-one shillings, which includes the subscription to the following 30th November.


The annual subscription is only half-a-guinea (10s. 6d.), and is renewable each December for the following year. Brethren joining us late in the year suffer no disadvantage, as they receive all the *Transactions* previously issued in the same year.

It will thus be seen that for only a quarter of the annual subscription, the members of the Correspondence Circle enjoy all the advantages of the full members, except the right of voting in Lodge matters and holding office.

Members of both Circles are requested to favour the Secretary with communications to be read in Lodge and subsequently printed. Members of foreign jurisdictions will, we trust, keep us posted from time to time in the current Masonic history of their districts. Foreign members can render still further assistance by furnishing us at intervals with the names of new Masonic Works published abroad, together with any printed reviews of such publications.

Members should also bear in mind that every additional member increases our power of doing good by publishing matter of interest to them. Those, therefore, who have already experienced the advantage of association with us, are urged to advocate our cause to their personal friends, and to induce them to join us. Were each member annually to send us one new member, we should soon be in a position to offer them many more advantages than we already provide. Those who can help us in no other way, can do so in this.

Every Master Mason in good standing throughout the Universe, and all Lodges, Chapters, and Masonic Libraries or other corporate bodies are eligible as Members of the Correspondence Circle.





Photogravure by Annan

From a Photograph by Lafayette

J. C. de Lafontaine

—: Ars :—
Quatuor Coronatorum

BEING THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE
QUATUOR CORONATI LODGE NO. 2076, LONDON.



EDITED FOR THE COMMITTEE BY W. J. SONGHURST, P.G.D.,
AND LIONEL VIBERT, P.A.G.D.C.

—
VOLUME XLII.
—

W. J. PARRETT, LTD., PRINTERS, MARGATE.
1931.

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

TABLE OF CONTENTS.



LODGE PROCEEDINGS.

	PAGE.
Friday, 4th January, 1929	1
Friday, 1st March, 1929	68
Friday, 3rd May, 1929	137
Thursday, 20th June, to Sunday, 23rd June, 1929. Summer Outing: Leeds.	164
Monday, 24th June, 1929	186
Friday, 4th October, 1929	257
Friday, 8th November, 1929	291

NOTES AND QUERIES.

Matthew Birkhead, Author of the Apprentice's Song	130
Oddfellows	131
Engravings of the Portrait of Anthony Sayer	132
A Possible Identification of Warrant No. 45, I.C.	132
Provincial Warrants	133
<i>Constitutions</i> of 1723 with an Inscription by Anderson	251
The Rev. William Dodd	251
James Gib	253
Randle Holme and Freemasonry	313

OBITUARY.

Allen, B. H. B.	135
Armitage, Edward	135
Baildon, James Owen	135
Barrow, Henry	135
Bradnock, G. A. A.	255
Brooking, Wm.	135
Burfield, Thos.	135
Burrell, Lionel C.	135
Campbell, Guy Marshall	135
Carter, C. A.	255
Caslon, Harold Arthur	135
Cockburn, <i>Sir</i> John	314
Cockey, F. G.	135
Coulson, J. W.	314
Councell. <i>Dr.</i> R. W.	135
Danes, John Edward	255
Davidson, Ernest	256
Dobson, A. E.	135
Dowson, J. J.	314
Drummond, C. J.	135
Frost, Joseph	315
Gurr, Caleb George	315
Hewitt, David L.	136
Higgs, Charles James	136
Hobbs. Joseph Walter	136
Howe, <i>Dr.</i> John	256

OBITUARY.—*Continued.*

	PAGE.
James, F. Hubert	315
Jordon, Andrew Jackson	256
Keyser, Charles Edward	256
Lyall, <i>Major</i> Edward	315
Martin, J. F. Glenfield	136
Matheson, Henry A.	136
Mawson, George Thomas	136
Nelson, Horace	315
Noar, Charles Percy	315
Osborne, H. J.	136
Pledger, Herbert	236
Protheroe, James Smith	315
Ray, Arthur Robert	315
Reid, Edwin James	256
Reinganum, Percy E.	315
Scott, Thomas Edward	136
Simpson, Wm. George	136
Smith, Henry Thomas	256
Smith, Joseph Collett	136
Solomons, Alfred	256
Stubbings, Walter	256
Surplice, F. R. C.	256
Sutherland, George	136
Swannack, John	136
Symns, R. C. M.	256
Tappenden, Sydney	315
Turnbull, Charles E.	136
Walter, A. C.	136
White, <i>Dr.</i> Herbert	315
Wienand, F. W. A. J.	136
Wildy, <i>Capt.</i> Edmund	136
Williams, John Richard	315
Wilmot, Henry	315

PAPERS AND ESSAYS.

Provincial Warrants (Part II.). By T. M. Carter	4
---	---

Provinces in particular, 4; No Provincial Constitutions in four groups of Counties. 4; The remainder can be classified as (a) miscellaneous, (b) the Dunckerley Provinces, (c) Lancashire, (d) Yorkshire, (e) Cheshire, 5; Norfolk, Lincolnshire, Suffolk, 6; Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, 13; Warwickshire, Shropshire, Staffordshire, Flintshire and Denbighshire, 13; South Wales, 15; Kent, Surrey, Sussex, 16; Devonshire, Cornwall and Scilly Isles, Channel Islands, 18; The Dunckerley Provinces, Hampshire (and Isle of Wight), Essex, Wiltshire, Dorset, Somerset, Gloucestershire (and Bristol), and Herefordshire, 22; Lancashire, 34; Yorkshire, 42; Cheshire, 52; Conclusion, 60. Comments by Ivor Grantham, 61; Geo. W. Bullamore, 62; J. O. Manton, 63.

Gild of Masons at Lincoln. By W. J. Williams	64
--	----

Canon Westlake's work, 64; Certificate of the Gild of 1313, 65; Translation, 66.

PAPERS AND ESSAYS.—*Continued.*

A Masonic Pilgrimage through London. By W. J. Williams	...	PAGE. 70
British Museum, 71; Lambeth Church, 72; Westminster Abbey, 76; Sir Robert Moray, 77; John Woodward, 77; Martin Folkes, 77; St. Margarets, Westminster, 79; St. James's, Piccadilly, 79; The Strand Churches, 80; St. Paul's, Covent Garden, 83; The Savoy, 84; Temple Church, 84; St. Dunstan in the West, 85; St. Bartholomew the Great, 87; St. Paul's Cathedral, 88; St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, 90; St. Olave, Hart Street, 91; Bunhill Fields and Dr. James Anderson, 91; St. Magnus and Henry Yevle, 92; The Monument, 95; The Mason's Company, 96; Meeting Places of the early Lodges, 97; St. John's, Clerkenwell, 99; The Record Office, 100; Kensal Green Cemetery, 101; The Soane Museum, 103; Conclusion, 105. Comments by Gordon P. G. Hills, 106; Gilbert W. Daynes, 108; Geo. Elkington, 110. Reply by W. J. Williams, 112.		
Some Notes on the "Freemasons' Magazine or General and Complete Library." By George Elkington	140
Titles and Title-pages, 140; Proprietors and Editors, 141; Association with Preston, 142; Patriotic Sentiments, 143; Vol. I., includes Institution of Royal Cumberland School, Life of Dunckerley, etc., 145; II., Ceremony at Funerals, 147; III., Sketchley Tokens, 148; IV., Note on Preston, and Anniversary Meeting of the School, 148; V., Plans of Girls' School, 149; VI., Provincial G.L. of Kent, 150; VII., The Cipriani Jewels, 150; VIII., Prestonian Lectures, 150; IX., Oration by Dr. Perfect, 151; X., Symbolic Masonry, 151; XI., Thomas Bradshaw, 151; Miscellaneous non-Masonic items, 152; The Temeraire, 155. Comments by H. Poole, 155; W. J. Williams, 157; Gordon P. G. Hills, 157; Lewis Edwards, 158; W. Jenkinson, 159; B. Telepneff, 160; J. Stokes, 161. Reply by G. Elkington, 162.		
Summer Outing: Leeds. By E. Hawkesworth	164
St. John's Church, 165; Temple Newsam, 167; Reception by Installed Master's Association, 168; Kirkstall Abbey, 169; Adel Church, address by Col. Kitson Clark, 170; Bolton Priory and Ilkley, 172; Knaresborough, 174; Isurium, 175; Fountains Abbey, address by C. H. Moody, 176; Address by H. Poole, 177; Service in Parish Church, 182; Appendix, Prov. G. Library, 183.		
The Transition. Some Reflections on Early Grand Lodge History. By E. E. Thiemeyer	188
I. The Assembly, 188; Grand Lodge not an innovation, but a Revival, 189; The Nature of the Assembly, 190; Not National, 192; The Early Organisation of the Building Trade, 195; Assemblies still held in seventeenth century, 197; Their functions, 200; General and Private Lodges, 203; Presiding Officers, 207; York and Alnwick, 207; Probability of actual survival, 210.		
II. The Grand Master, 211; The first appearance of the phrase, 213; Sayers not so styled at his election, 215; The earlier term was General, 217; The Change made in 1721, 218; The Grand Lodge, 219; The Nomenclature similar, 220.		

PAPERS AND ESSAYS.—*Continued.*

	PAGE.
III. The London Craft, 221; Lodges of Masons distinct, 223; Sir Christopher Wren, 227; Conclusion, 229.	
Comments by W. J. Williams, 229; Gilbert W. Daynes, 233; Rodb. H. Baxter, 234; H. Poole, 235; Geo. W. Bullamore, 236; R. J. Meekren, 237; W. J. Songhurst, 240; L. Vibert, 244. Reply by E. E. Thiemeyer, 248.	
Gild Resemblances in the old MS. Charges. By Douglas Knoop ...	259
Comparison of the Charges with Gild Ordinances, 259; Reading the Charges and taking the Oath, 260; The General Charges considered <i>seriatim</i> , 261; The Charges Singular, 263; Rules as to Apprentices, 265; Piece Work and Day Work, 266; Quarrels, 267; Attendance at the Assembly, 268; Going to Law, 269; Strange Fellows, 270; Gild Rules with no Counterparts in the Charges, 271; Residence, False Work, Marks, and Charity, 273. Comments by H. Poole, 275; T. M. Carter, 277; W. J. Williams, 280; L. Vibert, 281; C. F. Sykes, 284; Geo. W. Bullamore, 285; Gilbert W. Daynes, 287. Reply by Douglas Knoop, 289.	
Inaugural Address. By H. Cart de Lafontaine ...	293
The Toast of the W.M. By Rev. H. Poole ...	308

REVIEWS.

The Transactions of the Lodge Research, No. 200, I.C., for the year 1923 ...	J. Heron Lepper ...	115
Freemasonry in the Thirteen Colonies. By J. Hugo Tatsch ...	J. Heron Lepper ...	121
Two Hundred Years of Freemasonry; a History of the Britannic Lodge, No. 33. By William Sanderson ...	W. J. Songhurst ...	121
The Law and Custom of Freemasonry. By Lewis Edwards ...	Lionel Vibert ...	125
Cagliostro and his Egyptian Rite of Free- masonry. By Henry Ridgely Evans ...	B. Ivanoff ...	310
Some Thoughts on Masonic Symbolism. By C. C. Hunt ...	Lionel Vibert ...	311

INDEX.

	PAGE.
<i>Academie of Armory</i> ...	313
Adel Church ...	170
Aldborough (<i>Isurium</i>) ...	175
Alnwick Orders ...	205
Anderson, Autograph Inscription by ...	251
Anderson, Funeral of <i>Dr.</i> ...	92
Apple Tree Tavern ...	97, 105
Ashmole, Tomb of Elias ...	72
Assemblies in the Gilds ...	268
Assembly, The ...	191
Audit Committee Report ...	2
Barden Tower ...	173
Batalha Abbey ...	294
Beverley Minstrels ...	275
Birkhead, Will of Matthew ...	130
Bolton Priory ...	172
Bookplate of Dunckerley ...	184
British Museum ...	706
Cæsar, Monument to Sir J. ...	107
Chaloner, Will of Daniel ...	314
Channel Row ...	97
Chapel of the Savoy ...	84
Chapters referred to:—	
Fidelity, Leeds, No. 289... ..	181
Junior Engineers, No. 2913 ...	69
St. James, No. 2	113
St. Mary, Balham, No. 3661 ...	69
Zion, Hanover	160
"Cloathing" of Consecrating Officers	8
Common Assembly	197
Constitutions, MS.:—	
At Leeds	183
Boyden	177
Cooke	71, 240
David Ramsey	235
Dumfries, No. 4	199, 235
G.L. No. 1	105
G.L. No. 2	208, 235
Haddon	258
Harleian No. 1942	72, 208, 235
Harleian No. 2054	72
Harris No. 2	214
Hope	197
Newcastle College Roll ...	192
Rawlinson	235
Regius	71, 240
Roberts	208, 235
Scarborough	201
Sloane No. 3323	72
Sloane No. 3848	72
Thistle	199, 235
Waistell	197
York No. 4	197, 235
Cox, Tablet to Rev. J. E. ...	113
Crown, Parkers Lane	97

Degrees:—	PAGE.
Babylonian Pass ...	116
Installed Master ...	117
Jordan Pass ...	116
Knight of the E. & W. ...	116
Knight of the Sword ...	116
Knights Templar ...	145
Knights Templar at Sheffield (1797) ...	162
Mark at Sheffield (1797) ...	162
Prince Mason ...	116
Prussian Blue ...	116
Red Cross of Babylon ...	116, 292
Rose Croix (Ireland) ...	292
R.A. (Ireland) ...	116, 292
R.A. in Germany ...	160
Royal Order (Ireland) ...	118
Scotch Knight of St. Andrew ...	139
Scots Maître Elu ...	187
Deputations issued to form Lodges ...	8
Desaguliers at Edinburgh ...	216
Dispensation as Lodge Warrant ...	23, 49
Dodd: Biographical notice of <i>Dr.</i> ...	253
Exhibits:—	
Apron, Gardeners ...	258
Apron and Sash, R.A. ...	292
Ireland	292
Certificates:	
Craft, Lodge on board <i>Aimable Victoire</i> ...	139
French R.A. ...	139
Scotch Knight of St. Andrew ...	139
Scots Maître Elu ...	187
Clothing: Grand Warden ...	292
Collar and Jewel, Irish Rose Croix ...	292
Crests, Collection of Masonic ...	187
Embroidery, Armenian Mitre ...	292
Engravings, Lambert de Lintot ...	258
<i>Freemason's Magazine</i> , 1793-1798 ...	138
Goblet, engraved glass ...	292
<i>Irish Masonic Magazine</i> ...	138
Jewel, Centenary, G.M.'s Lodge, Ireland ...	292
,, John Gale, No. 184, Craft, pierced silver ...	258
,, Mark, metal gilt ...	258
,, M.M. ...	292
,, Master's, by Romer ...	258
,, Master's, by Batson ...	258
,, P.M.'s ...	139
,, Red Cross of Babylon ...	292
,, R.A., pierced metal gilt ...	258

Exhibits:—	PAGE.	Lodges referred to:—	PAGE.
Pamphlet, Dying Words of Dr. Dodd ...	138	Bristol ...	33
Watchcock with Masonic emblems ...	3	Britannic, No. 33, London ...	121
Forty-seventh Problem ...	312	Brixham ...	18
Fountains Abbey ...	176	Burnley ...	34
Freemason's Hall, London ...	104	Bury ...	38
General Assembly ...	200, 246	Cambridge ...	137
Lodge ...	203	Carlisle ...	37
Warden ...	218	Chard ...	31
Gibbs, Tablet to James ...	81	Chelmsford ...	25, 145
Gild admission customs ...	260	Cheshire Militia ...	52
Certificates ...	64	Chester ...	52
regulations ...	262	Chesterfield ...	12
restrictions as to residence ...	272	Chichester ...	17
Gilkes, Monument to Peter ...	80	City of London National Guard, No. 3757 ...	308
Goose and Gridiron ...	97	Cockermouth ...	181
Graceman of a Gild ...	66	Colchester ...	25, 145
Grand Lodge, Membership of ...	128	Colne ...	34
Grand Lodge of Portugal ...	298	Congleton ...	52
Grand Master, The title ...	211	Cork ...	115
Grant as Architect of Windsor Castle to Joshua Marshall ...	100	Cowbridge ...	15
Harodim, Order of ...	145	Crown, Parker's Lane ...	97
Ilkley, prehistoric markings at ...	173	Crusaders, No. 1677, London ...	99
Irish Masons in London ...	115	Dante, No. 3707, London ...	308
Jones, Monument to Inigo ...	111	Dartford ...	16
Kirkstall Abbey ...	169	Dartmouth ...	18
Kirwin, Tomb of William ...	90	Denton ...	41
Knaresborough ...	174	Derby ...	142
Knights Templar device: Dunckerley's use of ...	34	Devon Militia, Second ...	18
Lambeth Church ...	72	Devonport ...	19
Landmarks ...	125	Diss ...	6
Leathley Church ...	172	Dominica ...	28
Library, West Yorkshire ...	183	Doncaster ...	45, 47
Lodge, meaning of term ...	208	Dorchester ...	29
Lodge, <i>Private</i> ...	210	Dublin ...	115, 118, 159
Lodges of Instruction ...	127	Dukinfield ...	34
Lodges referred to:—		Edinburgh ...	255
Aberdeen ...	255	Exeter ...	18
Aberystwith ...	15	Fakenham ...	6
Alcester ...	13, 148	Faversham ...	134
Alloa ...	254	Fazely ...	14
Almonbury ...	51	Fortitude and Old Cumber- land, No. 12, London ...	97
Antiquity, No. 2, London ...	86, 97, 142, 151, 308	Foundation (1795), London ...	149
Ashford ...	16	French Prisoners, Leeds... ..	178
Ashton-under-Lyne ...	41	Friendship, No. 6, London ...	83
Barnsley ...	185	Frame ...	30
Barnstaple ...	18	Garston ...	41
Batley ...	181	Glanford Brigg ...	11
Bath ...	18, 29	Gloucester ...	32
Beccles ...	12	Gosport ...	24
Beverley ...	44, 49	Gray's ...	26
Bideford ...	19	Great Yarmouth ...	6, 9, 134
Birmingham ...	145, 258	Grimsby ...	11
Birr ...	115	Halesworth ...	11
Blackburn ...	41	Halifax ...	42, 48, 51, 183, 185
Blandford ...	29	Handsworth ...	15
Bolton ...	41	Haslingden ...	41
Bournemouth ...	23	Hastings ...	17
Bradford-on-Avon ...	27	Haworth ...	51
Bradford, Yorks. ...	49, 183	Helston ...	20, 21
Braintree ...	25, 145	Henley-in-Arden ...	13
Brecon ...	15, 156	Keptonstall ...	51
Bridgenorth ...	15	Highbridge ...	31
Brighton ...	17	High Town, Yorks. ...	19
		Holywell ...	15
		Horn, Westminster ...	97
		Huddersfield ...	49, 185
		Hull ...	46
		Ilford ...	145
		Inverness ...	132
		Ipswich ...	11
		Isle of Wight ...	25
		Jersey ...	21
		Jerusalem, No. 197, London ...	99, 149

	PAGE.
Lodges referred to:—	
Keighley	48, 49
Kilwinning	201
Kingston, Herefordshire ..	34
Kingston-on-Hill	44
Knarborough	47, 174, 185
Lancaster	39
Leeds	49, 50, 51, 174, 178, 179, 180, 181
Leicester	13
Leigh	38, 41
Leith	255
Leominster	34
Lewes	17, 61
Lisbon (1735)	294
Liverpool	38, 41
Longford	115
Louth	11
Lymington	23
Lynn Regis	6, 9
Macclesfield	39, 53, 57
Madeira	307
Manchester	36, 38
Margate	16
Melford	11
Middleham	44, 46
Mottram in Longdendale ...	55, 58
Nantwich	57
Newcastle-under-Lyme ...	15
Newfoundland	28
Newport	26
New (Royal), London ...	124
Nine Muses, London ...	146
Norwich	6, 8, 10, 133
Nottingham	63
Oldham	41
Old King's Arms, London ...	98
Ormskirk	39
Oxford	18
Paris	302
Patery Bridge	51
Penryn	21
Piccadilly, No. 2550, ...	
London	69
Playgoers, No. 2705, ...	
London	308
Poole	29
Portsmouth	24
Portugal	297, 300, 304
Prescot	34
Ramsgate	16
Richmond, Surrey	16
Richmond, Yorks	43
Ringwood	23
Ripon	44
Rotteram	185
Royal Lancs. Fusiliers ...	11
Royal Somerset House and Inverness, No. 4, ...	
London	42, 97
Salford	34, 38, 139
St. Albans, No. 29, London ...	251
St. Margarets, Westminster ...	142
St. Mary Balham, London ...	69
Salisbury	26
Scilly	20
Selby	51
Shaftesbury	29
Sheffield	43, 49, 161, 185
Shepton Mallett	24, 31
Sherborne	29
Ship behind the Royal Exchange	
... ..	115
Shrewsbury	15
Skipton	44, 48
Southampton	24
Staindrop	148
Stewards, London	146

	PAGE.
Lodges referred to:—	
Stockport	56
Stockton	148
Stonehouse	14, 19
Stratford-on-Avon	13, 144
Strong Man, No. 45, ...	
London	99
Swaffham	6
Swalwell	204
Tamworth	14
Taunton	30
Tavistock	19
Teignmouth	10
Thirtieth Foot, No. 535 (I.C.)	
... ..	119
Todmorden	41
Truro	20
Union of Freedom and Ease, London	
... ..	141
United Strength, London ...	99
United Traders, London ...	99
Urban, No. 1196, London ...	99
Wakefield	43, 185
Waltham Abbey	145
Warrington	36
Warwick	8
Wellington (Salop)	15
Wells	30
Westminster and Keystone, No. 10, London	
... ..	142
Wetherby	45, 181
Weymouth	29
Whitby	39, 41
Whitchurch	51
Wigan	39, 41
Wincanton	31
Witham	11
Wynnstay	15
York	43, 44, 80, 201
<i>Lusiad</i> , The	303
Marks of Craftsmen	274
Marshall, Monument of Ed. ...	85
Mason's Company	96, 221
Master's Lodge in 1814 ...	125
Meeting Places of Grand Lodge	98
Monument, The London ...	95
Monuments to:—	
Sir Julius Cæsar	107
Peter Gilkes	80
Inigo Jones	111
Edward Marshall	85
Nicholas Stone	82
John Woodward	77
Monuments in Westminster Abbey by:—	
James Gibbs	78
Roubiliac	78
Nicholas Stone	78
Nelson Banner at York ...	89
Nelsonic Crimson Oakes medal ..	89
Night work in the Gilds ...	273
Oddfellows' Rules of Admission	131
Persecutions of Masons in Portugal	
... ..	295
Persons referred to:—	
Aberdour, Lord	35
Adams, Major C. C.	258
Alcock, Thomas	313
Alexander, Dom	169

Persons referred to:—	PAGE.
Allen, B. H. B. ...	135
Allen, John ...	34, 124
Allerton, <i>Lord</i> ...	174
Alley, Lewis ...	118
Anderson, <i>Dr</i> James ...	80, 91, 122, 188, 212, 251
Andrieux, B. ...	296
Apps, Fredk. ...	2
Arbuthnott, <i>Dr.</i> ...	80
Argyll, John, <i>Duke of</i> ...	253
Armitage, Ed., M.A. ...	135, 137
Arnold, Lea ...	174
Ashmole, Elias ...	72, 96, 197
Ashworth, John ...	39
Astley, <i>Sir</i> Edwd. ...	8
Athelstan ...	236
Athol, <i>Duke of</i> ...	27
Atkinson, Thos. ...	179
Attwell Small, <i>Rev.</i> J. ...	33
Aubrey, John ...	72, 226
Bacon, Edward, P.G.M. ...	6
Norfolk ...	152
Baddeley ...	135
Baildon, J. O. ...	294
Bailey, Nathaniel ...	61
Bain, E. ...	300
Bajazet ...	2
Baker, E. ...	3
Balcon, P. C. ...	164
Ball, W. E. ...	311
Balsamo ...	18
Bampfylde <i>Sir</i> C. W. ...	18
Bampfylde, <i>Sir</i> Richard ...	202
Barker, <i>Rev.</i> Robt. ...	75
Barnes, Henry ...	11
Barnett, Matthew ...	135
Barrow, Henry ...	149
Bartolozzi ...	206
Bathurst, Charles ...	38, 51, 61, 234
Baxter, R. H. ...	112
Beadles, Robert ...	213
Beal, <i>Dr.</i> ...	164
Bean, W. H. ...	30, 36
Beaufort, <i>Duke of</i> ...	174, 285
Beckett, Thos. <i>Abp.</i> ...	44
Beckwith, M. ...	303
Bell, Aubrey ...	21
Bell, Stephen ...	107, 113
Belzoni, G. B. ...	76
Benson, <i>Archbp.</i> ...	300
Beresford, <i>Major-Gen.</i> ...	28
Berkeley, Rowland ...	201
Bingley, <i>Lord</i> ...	131
Birkenhead, John ...	83, 130, 232
Birkhead, Matthew ...	26
Biss, Richard ...	145
Bisset, James ...	83
Blackerby, Nathaniel ...	52
Blackett, Wm. ...	124
Blackman, George ...	292
Bladon, Harry ...	33
Blake, Richard ...	33
Blake, <i>Rev.</i> Wm. ...	43
Blaney, <i>Lord</i> ...	167
Bodley, G. F. ...	25
Boggis, Thos. ...	54
Bolton, Wm. ...	76
Bolton, <i>Prior</i> William ...	59
Bond, Joseph ...	202
Boreham, James ...	96, 222
Borthwick, <i>Capt.</i> R. ...	202, 207
Bowes, Geo. ...	96
Bowles, John ...	9
Boyce, James ...	219, 229
Boyden, Wm. L. ...	54
Bradbock, Chas. ...	255
Bradnaek, G. A. A. ...	

Persons referred to:—	PAGE.
Bradshaw, Thos. ...	151
Brady, John ...	52
Bretland, Joel ...	39
Brewer, ——— ...	105
Bridgwater, <i>Earl of</i> ...	14
Brock, W. ...	35
Brook, G. B. ...	229
Brooking, Wm. ...	135
Broome, John ...	39
Brothers, Richard ...	153, 157
Brown, Jas. ...	33
Brown, Mather ...	144
Brown, Patrick ...	295
Brunswick, <i>Duke of</i> ...	150
Bruslé, J. T. ...	295
Bryan, William ...	158
Buchan, <i>Earls of</i> ...	254
Buck, Samuel ...	202
Buckley, John ...	54
Bullamore, Geo. W. ...	62, 106, 236, 285
Bunney, J. W. ...	140
Bunyan, John ...	92, 107
Burfield, Thos. ...	135
Burghwas, <i>Bishop</i> ...	65
Burns, Robt. ...	148
Burrell, L. C. ...	135
Butterworth, <i>Bro.</i> ...	185
Buttivant, Jas. ...	8
Byrkhede, John ...	130
Bys, William ...	95
Cabreira, <i>General</i> ...	300
Cæsar, <i>Sir</i> Julius ...	91, 107
Cagliostro ...	310
Caie, W. J. ...	147
Calvert, A. F. ...	132
Camoens ...	303
Camidge, John ...	45
Campbell, <i>Dr.</i> Alex. ...	28
Campbell, G. M. ...	135
Carden, <i>Rev.</i> Cornelius ...	21
Cardigan, <i>Earl of</i> ...	169
Carisford, <i>Lord</i> ...	22
Carleton, Dudley ...	78
Carlile, Richd. ...	132
Caroll, Charles ...	295
Carter, C. A. ...	255
Carter, T. M., <i>Dr.</i> ...	4, 133, 277
Carvalho, Silva ...	301
Carysfort, <i>Lord</i> ...	123
Casaubon, <i>Dr.</i> Isaac ...	78
Caslon, H. A. ...	135
Cataneo, Horace ...	179
Cavendish, <i>Lord</i> Fredk. ...	173
Cawthorn, J. Elston ...	164
Chadwick, John ...	38
Challoner, Thos. ...	202
Chaloner, Daniel ...	314
Chaloner, Jacob ...	313
Chaloner, Thomas ...	313
Chandois, <i>Duke of</i> ...	216
Chantrell, R. D. ...	182
Chesterfield, <i>Earl of</i> ...	98, 251
Chicheley, <i>Abp.</i> ...	131
Cibber, Gabriel ...	95
Clansey, Jno. ...	105
Clarence, <i>Duke of</i> ...	147
Claudius, <i>Emperor</i> ...	175
Clifford, John ...	92
Clifford, Henry <i>Lord</i> ...	173
Clutterbuck, Thomas ...	21
Cockburn, <i>Sir</i> John ...	314
Cockey, F. G. ...	135
Cocksholt, <i>Major</i> A. M. ...	187
Codrington, John ...	18
Coello, Juan ...	302
Coleclough, Daniel ...	52

Persons referred to:—	PAGE.
Colborne, Samuel	24
Collins, John	15
Columbine, Col. Francis	52
Combermere, Lord	89
Compton, Lord	296
Conder, Ed.	96, 106, 222
Conder, John	11
Cook, Bro.	145
Cooke, Matthew	71, 157
Cookson, Oliver E.	169
Cope, Enos	54
Cordley, John	44
Corvo, J. de A.	300
Costa-Santos, ———	307
Cotton, Sir R. Salusbury	52
Coulson, J. W.	314
Coulton, G. G.	245
Coustos, Jean	295
Councell, Dr. R. W.	135
Coutanche, Charles	22
Covey-Crump, Rev. W. W.	61, 157, 166
Cowley, Thos.	57
Cox, Bro.	29
Cox, Dr. J. E.	107, 113
Coxe, Sir Richard	78
Craggs, James	78
Crane, Thomas	54
Cranfield, Lionel	78
Crawley, Dr. Chetwode	7, 118, 226
Crooke, James	39
Crosslé, Philip	115
Crowley, Sir Ambrose	205
Cumberland, Duchess of	145
Cumberland, Duke of	13, 38, 124, 148
Cure, Cornelius	101
Cure, William	101
da Costa, H. J.	298
da Silva, Joseph	301
Dagge, Henry	23, 104
Dagge, James	21
Dalton, Rev. C. B.	74
Danes, J. E.	255
Darcy, Sir John	166
Darnley, Lord	166
Dassigny	118
Davey, Robert	13
Davey, Thomas	7
Davidson, E.	256
Daynes, Gilbert W.	61, 108, 132, 134, 150, 189, 283, 287
d'Alinecourt, F.	296
de Andrade, General G. F.	300
de Cantuaria, T.	297
de Castro, Dr. Joseph	304
de Charmilly, Marquis	294
de Cobeham, John	111
de Havilland, John	22
de Hedonville, Sieur	142
de Cornwall, Sir Robt.	32
de Jerumenha, Vicomtesse	300
de Labely, Charles	29
de Lacy, Henry	169
de Lacy, Ilbert	166
de Lafontaine, H. Cart	106, 155, 229, 275, 292, 308
de Loulé, Marquis	297, 302
de Macedo, Abbé J.	300
de Mendonça, Abbé J. F.	298
de Mendonça, Hippolyte	305
de Mombray, Abra	105
d'Origny, Jean	297
de Paraty, Comte	303
Desaguliers, Rev. J. T.	84, 91, 147, 213, 216, 255
De Saint Eloy	139

Persons referred to:—	PAGE.
de Saldanha, J. C.	302
de Salo, Denis	142
de Sampajo, S. J.	298
de Sá Pereira, J. A.	296
Demignot	139
Denham, Rev. J. F.	85
Dent, John	147
Dermott, Laurence	27, 55, 72, 99, 117
Devon, Michael	42
Devonshire, Duke of	172
Dickey, Wm.	55
Dillon, Charles	23
Dobree, Thomas	21
Dobson, A. E.	135
Dobson, Joseph	174
Dodd, Rev. Wm.	103, 138, 251
Donne, Dr. John	87
Douglas, James	106
Downing, George	25
Downs, Stanley	173
Dowson, J. J.	314
Dring, E. H.	2, 137, 190, 245, 295
Drummond, C. J.	135
Drummond, Wm.	148
Duncan, Philip Bury	74
Dunckerley, Thos.	23, 146, 156, 184
Dunning, John	31
Dye, ———	278
Earwaker, J. P.	313
Eccles, Rev. M. H.	86
Edmonds, Thos.	146
Edward VII.	105
Edward, Prince, G.M.	147
Edwards, Lewis	125, 158
Edwin of York	245
Effingham, Lord	14, 124
Egerton, Rev. F. Hy.	14
Elkington, Geo.	110, 139
Ellames, Pattison	52
Elliott, Capt. Joseph	215
Elliott, Canon W. Thompson	183
Ellis, James	35
Entwhistle, Edward	36
Epps, Wm.	16
Errington, John	152
Erskine, Thomas, Lord	255
Estevam, Joseph	304
Eugenius Philalethes	232
Evans, H. R.	310
Excestre, Martin	94
Evre, John	180
Fairfax, Charles	203
Fairfax, Robert	202
Farbrace, George	16
Fenton, Wm.	11
Ferrers, Lord	6
Ferriar, John	146
Figg, James	81
Figueira, A. F.	297
Firminger, Rev. W. K.	257
Fitzjohn, Eustace	174
Flather, David	61, 162, 186
Fleming, Major-General James	79
Fludd, Dr. Robt.	138, 146
Folkes, Martin	77
Forrester, Lord	294
Fountain, Sir A.	213
Fowkes, Sir Thos.	63
Fox, C. J.	149
Frank, Frs.	7
Franklin, Benjamin	87
Frazer, Sir J. G.	197
Frederick, Capt. Chas.	18, 42

Persons referred to:—	PAGE.
Freind, <i>Dr.</i> John	78
Freire, F. R. d'A.	299
French, Geo.	57
French, Thomas	295
Frost, John	54
Frost, Joseph	315
Gallaway, James	17
Gardiner, John	224
Garland, Richard	43
Gatrell, John	130
Gautric, L.	139
George, John	86
George, <i>Prince of Wales</i>	148
George III.	143
Gibbs (Gib). James	78, 103, 109, 253
Gibbons, Grinling	84
Gibbs, Richard	24
Gibson, Anthony	75
Gibson, James	55
Gilburt, ———	278
Giles, Godfrey	202
Gilkes, Peter	79
Gill, Richard	168
Gilles, François	297
Girdler, Thomas	47
Glover, D. R.	174
Godbold, <i>Bro.</i>	153
Goddard, Edward	39
Godfrey, Page	57
Gofridus	279
Gold, William	75
Gomes, <i>General</i>	300
Goodric, <i>Sir</i> Henry	226
Goodridge, Thos.	112
Goodwin, Richard	36
Gordon, George	294
Gordon, James	297
Gordon, John	87
Gould, R. F.	191
Gott, Robert	75
Graefe, <i>Count</i> August	160
Graham, <i>Lord</i> George	294
Grainha, E. B.	295
Grantham, Ivor	61
Graves, Charles	54
Gray, Sam.	105
Greaves, Wm.	174
Greenbury, Caleb	202
Gregory, William	39
Grev, Wm.	96, 222
Griffith, John	52
Gurr, Caleb G.	315
Gustavus Adolphus	105
Hacquet	139
Halifax, <i>Viscount</i>	166
Hall, Geo.	105
Hall, <i>Dr.</i> John	282
Hall, Wm.	40
Hallett, H. Hiram	3
Halley, <i>Dr.</i>	213
Halliday, R. T.	258
Halliwell, J. O.	71
Hamilton, A.	77
Hamilton, Charles	58
Hammon, Wm.	222
Hammond, William	278
Hancock, William	97
Handel, G. F.	79
Hardcastle, M. G.	75
Hardwick, Philip	74
Hardwick, Thos.	202
Hargrave, <i>Lieut.-Genl.</i>	
William	79
Hargreaves, John	35
Harrison, George	123
Harnage, <i>Sir</i> G.	124

Persons referred to:—	PAGE.
Harrington, <i>Lord</i>	296
Harrison, John	165
Haswell, Charles	52
Hatch, John	104
Haverfield, <i>Prof.</i>	175
Hawkesworth, E.	164
Hawkesworth, <i>Sir</i> Walter	178, 201, 207
Hayden, N. W. J.	229
Heiron, Arthur	257
Hemp, W. J.	313
Henchman, C. D.	58
Henry of Reyns	76
Henry III.	236
Hepworth, <i>Bro.</i>	43
Herbert, <i>Lord</i>	213
Herlond, Hugh	94
Heseltine, James	28, 43, 124, 146, 179
Hewet, <i>Sir</i> Thomas	81
Hewitt, D. L.	136
Heyst, <i>Sir</i> Thos.	254
Higgs, C. J.	136
Hillersdon, <i>Rev.</i> F. H.	106
Hills, Gordon P. G.	61, 106, 157
Hippolyte, <i>Bro.</i>	300
Hobbs, J. Walter	69, 76, 136
Hodgson, Wm.	51, 181
Hogan, Denis	295
Hogarth, W.	81, 87, 103
Holland, David	132
Holles, Francis	78
Holles, <i>Sir</i> George	78
Holloway, William	25
Holme, Randle	313
Holstein, <i>Dom.</i> A.	298
Holt, Rowland	11, 104
Hooker, <i>Sir</i> Wm. J.	74
Hooper, C. F.	2
Horsley, <i>Canon</i> J. W.	251
Hossack, Colin	25
Houlding, W. F.	164
Howard, C. C.	194
Howe, <i>Dr.</i> J.	256
Howlett, E. Holcombe	3
Howley, <i>Archbp.</i>	34
Hudson, Richd.	202
Hughan, W. J.	31, 157, 191, 206, 235, 259, 294
Hunt, C. C.	229, 311
Hulse, <i>General</i> Sir Saml.	17, 62
Ingram, <i>Sir</i> Arthur	166
Innes, J. C.	164
Ireland, Geo.	51
Irwin, <i>Lord</i>	166
Ivanoff, B.	311
Ives, Chapman	133
Jackson, Nathan	53
Jackson, W. Lawies	174
James, F. Hubert	315
Jears, Thomas	25
Jenins, Robert	76
Jenkins, Tobias	202
Jenkinson, W.	138, 159
Jenner, <i>Dr.</i>	145
Jocelyn, <i>Col.</i>	292
John of Gaunt	174
John of Gloucester	76
John of Reading	76
John V. of Portugal	294
John VI. of Portugal	300
Johnson, Edward	54
Johnson, Robt.	202
Johnson, <i>Dr.</i> Samuel	252
Johnson, Wm.	47
Jones, Inigo	82, 103, 111, 122
Jones, <i>Lieut.-Col.</i> Inigo	111

Persons referred to:—

PAGE.

Jones, Richard	...	33
Jones, Stephen	...	148
Jones, Theophilus	...	156
Jones, Thos.	...	33
Jones, Timothy	...	53
Jonson, Ben	...	78
Jordon, A. J.	...	256
Josephus	...	312
Jowett, Albert	...	168
Junot, Marshall	...	299
Kellie, <i>Earls of</i>	...	254
Kelly, <i>Earl of</i>	...	55
Kelly, Christopher	...	107
Kelly, H.	...	52
Kelly, Wm.	...	63
Kemplay, John	...	51
Kent, <i>Duke of</i>	...	101
Kerney, Charles	...	52
Kershaw, James	...	58
Keyser, C. E.	...	256
Kingston, <i>Lord</i>	...	98
Kipling, Henry	...	183
Kirwin, William	...	90
Kitchener, <i>Lord</i>	...	89
Kitson, Clark, <i>Lieut.-Col.</i>	...	
E.	...	169, 183
Knoop, Douglas	...	245, 259
Korff	...	139
Kramer, Stella	...	277
Kress, A. L.	...	229
La Rude, <i>Madame</i>	...	296
Labelye, Charles	...	83
Lakenhethe, William	...	94
Lamball, Jacob	...	215
Langridge, Balcombe	...	62
Langwith, John	...	202
Lankford, Samuel	...	53
Larden, John	...	54
Lascelles, <i>Viscount</i>	...	168
Latour Mauburg	...	139
Land, <i>Abp.</i>	...	131
Laughton, <i>Bro.</i>	...	185
Lawrence, <i>Rev. J. T.</i>	...	125
Lawson, Andrew G.	...	175
Lawson-Tancred, <i>Lady</i>	...	175
Laycock, Joseph	...	156
Le Strange, Hamon	...	6, 88, 133
Leake, <i>Rev. W. M.</i>	...	25
Lebons, John	...	76
Lee, Chas.	...	174
Lee, G. Trevelyan	...	61
Lee, <i>Dr. Samuel</i>	...	107
Lee, William	...	17, 61
Legh, John	...	53
Lennox, <i>Lord</i>	...	166
Lepper, J. Heron	...	77, 120
Lethaby, W. R.	...	109
Lewis, J. Carteret	...	32
Lewis, John M.	...	115
Leynan, <i>Father</i>	...	295
Liberato, Joseph	...	300
Lily, <i>Bro.</i>	...	123
Lima, Magalhaes	...	304
Lisle, <i>Bro.</i>	...	29
Lister, Thos.	...	202
Londeneys, William	...	93
Lorance, Jos.	...	179
Loubet, <i>President</i>	...	304
Lovell, Humfrid	...	101
Lovell, Thos. <i>Lord</i>	...	123
Low, William	...	26
Lowe, Isaac	...	54
Lowther, J. A.	...	164
Lukis, <i>Rev. W. C.</i>	...	71
Lyall, <i>Major</i> Edward	...	315
MacClure, Robt.	...	105
Mackey, <i>Dr.</i>	...	126

Persons referred to:—

PAGE.

McDonald, Patrick	...	56
Mackworth, <i>Sir H.</i>	...	15
Maier, Cunha	...	301
Marcos, <i>Abbé</i>	...	303
Mardell, Charles	...	295
Maria I. of Portugal	...	296
Makins, W. R.	...	177
Malcolm, J. P.	...	130
Malden, H. E.	...	191
Manchester, <i>Duke of</i>	...	124
Manningham, <i>Dr.</i>	...	6
Manique, Pina	...	297
Manton, J. O.	...	63
Mar, <i>Earl of</i>	...	253
March, Chas.	...	42
Marks, Thos.	...	7, 12
Marshall, Edward	...	85, 95, 100
Marshall, Joshua	...	76, 85, 100
Marshall, Katharine	...	86
Marson, E. W.	...	106
Martin, J. F. G.	...	136
Martin, Stephen	...	24
Mary, <i>Queen of Scots</i>	...	166
Matheson, H. A.	...	136
Mawson, G. T.	...	136
Maxwell, Wm.	...	109
Mayhew, John	...	95
Mayler, William	...	31
Mead, <i>Dr.</i>	...	214
Mecklenburgh-Strelitz, <i>Duke of</i>	...	150, 160
Meekren, R. J.	...	191, 229, 237
Mennell, M.	...	181
Merlaw, Richard	...	110
Mexborough, <i>Earl of</i>	...	174
Meyrick, W.	...	145
Middleton, Wm.	...	11
Miguel, <i>Infante Dom.</i>	...	302
Milman, <i>Dean</i>	...	87
Milnes, Richard Slater	...	46
Milnes, Robert Pemberton	...	49
Mines, Charles	...	31
Minskull, Francis	...	42
Moir, <i>Earl of</i>	...	20, 147, 149
Montagu, John, <i>Duke of</i>	...	70, 98, 213, 216
Montagu, Ralph, <i>Duke of</i>	...	70
Monteiro, <i>Abbé</i>	...	297
Monteiro, J. M. de S.	...	304
Moody, <i>Dr. C. H.</i>	...	175
Moray, <i>Sir Robert</i>	...	77, 109
Mouton, Jacques	...	295
Mullineaux, Edward	...	36
Murray, Alexander	...	90
Myllu, John	...	77
Napoleon	...	143, 298
Neie, <i>Abp.</i>	...	165
Nelson, Horace	...	315
Nelson, <i>Lord</i>	...	85, 106, 109
Newbald, G.	...	38, 51
Newbery, Thos.	...	110
Newman, John	...	92
Nichols, J. G.	...	92
Nicol, <i>Bro.</i>	...	307
Nightingale, J. G.	...	79
Noar, C. P.	...	315
Norfolk, <i>Duke of</i>	...	104, 122
Norman, <i>Dr. George</i>	...	2, 29, 34, 229
Norrison, Francis	...	202
Norrison, Jno.	...	202
North, Col. J. T.	...	169
Northouck, J.	...	149
Nuthall, Benjamin	...	6
O'Kelly, <i>Father</i> Patrick	...	295
O'Kelly, Charles	...	295
O'Kelly, Hugo	...	295
O'Kelly, James	...	295

Persons referred to:—

	PAGE.
O'Kelly, Michael	295
Okes, Thomas	19
Oldroyd, J. H.	164
Oliver, ———	88
Oliver, Dr. Geo.	11
Ordway, Hen.	130
Oré, Capt. Paul	139
Orme, Edward	52
Ormerod, Dr.	131
Osborne, H. J.	136
Osborne, Thos.	26
Osborn, Wm.	55
Oxford, Rev. A. W.	187
Padgett, Robert	242
Page, John	52
Palmella, Duke of	305
Papworth, Wyatt	91
Parker, Sir Peter	14, 22, 144
Parker, Thomas	16, 42
Parkinson, Alexander	56
Parkyns, Thos. B.	13, 63
Parmentier, James	84
Partridge, Robert	8
Passos, Manuel da S.	302
Payne, Geo.	71, 79, 97, 122, 213
Pearson, Dr.	145
Peckitt, H.	174
Pedro, Dom	296, 302
Peck, Rev. Richd.	92
Penn. Springett	115
Pennell, Joseph	117
Pennington, Thos.	54
Pennington, Rev. Bickford	83
Pepys, Samuel	91
Perfect, Dr. Wm.	16, 150, 156
Periera, F. da Silva	303
Peters, Rev. Wm.	11, 124, 140
Petre, Lord	38, 43, 104
Phillot, Charles	30
Pierce, ———	88
Pillans, ———	109
Pine, J.	105
Pius IX.	305
Pledger, H.	256
Plot, Dr.	197
Plummer, Charles	47
Pollington, Viscount	174
Pombal, Marquis de	296
Pomfret, Earl	147
Poole, Rev. H.	61, 155, 174, 177, 230, 235, 275, 308
Postlethwaite, John	59
Postlethwaite, Canon	170
Poutrain, Max.	314
Powell, Cecil	138, 229
Précourt, C. L. N. L.	139
Preston, William	87, 99, 142, 148
Price, Henry	123
Prior, Matthew	78
Protheroe, J. S.	315
Pryce, William	21
Pue, W.	7
Rahere	87
Rand, C.	17
Rawdon, Lord	14, 144
Ray, A. R.	315
Rayment, Bro.	19
Ready, J.	54
Redman, Henry	76
Redman, Thomas	76
Reid, E. J.	256
Reinganum, Percy E.	315
Renkin, François	167
Revis, John	6, 42
Ribbons, T. B.	15
Rice, ———	295

Persons referred to:—

	PAGE.
Richard de Stow.	64
Richard, J. B.	296
Richardson, James	180
Richmond, Duke of	251
Richmond, A. E.	61, 134
Rickard, Col.	131
Rivers, Earl of	84
Robbins, Sir A.	92, 229
Robert of Beverley	76
Robinson, Sir Wm.	201
Roe, Charles	53
Rogers, Rev. R.	172
Rosa, Dona	296
Rosewarne, Henry	20
Rosslyn, Earls of	254
Roubiliac, L. F.	78
Rowley, W.	162
Rowsell, E. W.	54
Rudd, Rev. D'Arcy S.	165
Ruspini, Chevalier	146
Russe, John	95
Russell, George	44
Russell, Jno.	202
Ryan, Thomas	136
Rylands, W. H.	90, 103, 157, 193, 244
Rysbrach	81
Sadleir, R. J.	258
Sadler, Henry	134
Sadler, W.	113
St. John, Rev. H. F.	71
Salt, Henry	108
Salter, John	43
Samber, Robert	138
Samajo, Luis	298
Sandby, Thos.	42, 104, 124
Sanderson, Wm.	121
Sargaison, Walter	115
Saunders, James W.	255
Sawbridge, Col. Jacob	16
Sawyer, Chris.	33
Sayer, Anthony	84, 97, 132, 215
Schaw, William	254
Schwanfelder, C. H.	185
Scott, T. E.	136
Seaman, Bro.	173
Seman, Martin	92
Seti I.	103
Shadbolt, Thomas	222
Shepherd, Julius	6
Shipton, Thos.	202
Shirreff, Major C.	14, 46
Shorbridge, Rev. H.	19
Shorthose, John	222
Shorthose, Thomas	222
Shrewsbury, Earl of	162
Sidebotham, Peter	56
Silva, Bro.	303
Silverston, B.	3
Simpson, Thomas	7
Simpson, John	51
Simpson, W. G.	136
Sitwell, N. S. H.	139
Sketchley, James	13, 148
Smith, Benjamin Wild	37
Smith, Cornwell	3
Smith, F. W. F.	59
Smith, Capt. George	16
Smith, H. T.	256
Smith, Dr. James	84
Smith, James	182
Smith, Sir John	78
Smith, John, M.P.	29, 35
Smith, John	76
Smith, Joseph	37
Smith, J. C.	136
Smith, Richard	32

Persons referred to:—		PAGE.	Persons referred to:—		PAGE.
Smith, Robt.	...	54	Thompson, ———	...	88
Smith, Toulmin	...	204	Thompson, Ed.	...	202
Smith, William	...	91	Thompson, John	...	222
Smith, William	...	122	Thompson, Jonas	...	49
Smithson, John	...	181	Thompson, Thomas	...	13
Soane, <i>Sir</i> John	...	103, 108	Thompson, William	...	201
Solomons, Alfred	...	256	Thorp, J. T.	...	187
Songhurst, W. J.	2, 61, 117, 125, 138,	240	Thory	...	139
Sorrell, J. E. A.	...	133	Tibbits, <i>Bro.</i>	...	8
Soult, <i>Marshall</i>	...	299	Tilan, <i>Father</i>	...	295
Souza, <i>Cardinal</i>	...	301	Timmins, James	13, 144	
Spencer, R.	...	71	Tobey, ———	...	278
Spencer, Samuel	6, 42		Totenhams, John	...	94
Spencer, <i>Dr.</i> Wm.	...	43	Townsend, Charles	...	52
Spenser, Edmund	...	78	Townshend, Edward Venables	...	54
Sperling, <i>Bro.</i>	...	22	Tradescant, John	...	73
Speth, G. W.	71, 134, 189,	223	Trowbridge, W. R. H.	...	310
Spottigwoode, J.	...	148	Tuckett, J. E. S.	61, 138,	299
Springer, Joshua	...	32	Turnbull, C. E.	...	136
Springett, Bernard	...	115	Turner, John	...	55
Srawley, <i>Canon</i>	...	64	Turner, John	...	203
Stanciff, J.	...	174	Turner, J. W. M.	...	172
Stanhope, <i>Lord</i>	98, 213		Tyndale, William	...	85
Stanley, Thos.	...	224	Tynte, <i>Bro.</i>	...	29
Stanton, William	...	222	Typerton, Nicholas	...	111
Starkey, George	...	75	Tyssen, <i>Bro.</i>	...	22
Staveley, Richard	...	47	Unbertus	...	279
Stead, Thomas	...	55	Upton, John	...	37
Stephenson, S.	...	142	Valentinus II.	...	175
Sterne, Laurence	102, 146		Varasour, <i>Sir</i> Walter	...	45
Stewart, <i>Col.</i> Sherborne	...	25	Vertue, Robert	...	76
Stewart, Wm.	141, 159		Vibert, Lionel	2, 129, 134, 189, 214, 244, 281,	312
Stoate, F. C.	...	61	Vicars, Matthew	...	51
Stodhard	...	149	Villette, <i>Rev.</i> J.	...	138
Stokes, <i>Dr.</i> John	61, 139, 161, 258, 292		Villiers, <i>Sir</i> George	...	78
Stone, John	...	100	Wade, <i>Field-Marshal</i> George	...	78
Stone, Nicholas	78, 82, 99, 103, 107,	314	Wagstaffe, John	...	57
Stowell, Robert	...	76	Wainsford, ———	...	222
Strahan, William	...	148	Wale, Math.	...	38
Stubbings, Walter	...	256	Wallbank, Thos.	...	178
Stukeley, <i>Dr.</i>	71, 213		Walsingham, <i>Hon.</i> R. B.	...	16
Styles, Thomas	...	75	Walter, A. C.	...	136
Surplice, F. R. C.	...	256	Warburton, <i>Capt.</i> Hugh...	...	52
Sussex, <i>Duke of</i>	13, 101		Ward, J.	...	42
Sutherland, Geo.	...	136	Warner, E. B.	...	139
Suthes, William	74, 99, 110		Warren, <i>Admiral</i> Sir J. B.	13, 63	
Sutton, <i>Bro.</i>	...	150	Warren, Thomas	...	21
Swann, Thos.	...	44	Watson, John	...	45
Swannack, John	...	136	Watson, S. O.	...	47
Swift, John	105, 110		Watson, Sarah	...	130
Swindells, Peter	...	54	Watson, William	...	183
Sykes, C. F.	111, 284		Wattson, James	...	216
Symns, R. C. M.	...	256	Webb, <i>Bro.</i>	...	28
Talman, ———	...	88	Webb, John	...	111
Tamerlane	...	300	Wellington, <i>Duke of</i>	...	89
Tancred, Thomas	...	43	Welton, J.	...	41
Tappenden, Sydney	...	315	West, Benjamin	...	144
Tatin	...	139	West, Thomas	...	30
Tatsch, J. Hugo	120, 229,	311	Westlake, <i>Canon</i>	77, 280	
Taylor, Saml.	...	222	Weymouth, <i>Lord</i>	...	294
Taylor, John	...	203	Wharton, <i>Duke of</i>	98, 216	
Taylor, Thom.	...	106	White, <i>Bro.</i>	...	146
Taylor, Thomas	...	183	White, Wm., <i>G. Sec.</i>	9, 144	
Taylor, Saml.	...	96	White, <i>Dr.</i> Herbert	...	315
Telepneff, Boris	160, 291		Whitehead, Jno.	...	202
Telling, <i>Dr.</i> W. H. Maxwell	...	164	Whitelock, J. Lupton	...	168
Tempest, <i>Sir</i> G.	...	201	Whittaker, Lawrence	...	35
Tempest, Jo.	...	202	Whittington, George	...	168
Tew, T. W.	...	183	Whittle, <i>Capt.</i> Daniel	...	55
Thackray, Thos.	...	43	Whytehead, T. B.	71, 207	
Thelwal, Ed.	...	54	Wienand, F. W. A. J.	...	136
Thiemeyer, E. E.	188, 248		Wigg, Francis	...	105
Thirsk, John	...	76	Wilbraham, John	...	57
Thomas, E. F.	...	301	Wilbraham, R.	...	52
			Wilcock, J.	...	202
			Wildy, <i>Capt.</i> E.	...	136

Persons referred to:—		PAGE.	Persons referred to:—		PAGE.
Wilkinson, W.	...	174	St. Dunstan in the West	...	85
William de Wynford	...	93	St. Helen's, Bishopsgate	...	90
William of Colchester	...	76	St. James', Piccadilly	...	79
William IV.	...	124	St. John the Evangelist, Leeds.	...	165
Williams, John Richard	...	315	St. John's, Clerkenwell	...	99
Williams, W. J.	64, 70, 106, 138,		St. Magnus, London Bridge	...	92
	157, 229, 253, 280,	314	St. Margaret's, Westminster	...	79
Willis, James	...	124	St. Martin's in the Fields;		
Willoughby, Mark	...	11	Inscription on Foundation		
Wilmot, Henry	...	315	Stone	...	81
Wilson, Chrisr.	...	47	St. Olave, Hart Street	...	91
Wilson, Sir Chas. H.	...	166	St. Paul's Cathedral	...	87
Wilson, Rd.	...	174	St. Paul's, Covent Garden	...	84
Wilson, Sir Wm.	96, 222		Sanhedrim Society in Portugal	...	301
Wise, Thomas	...	222	Scottish Rite in Portugal	...	307
Wise, William	96, 222		Sketchley's Tokens	...	148
Wogan, Bro.	...	118	Skipton Castle	...	173
Wonnacott, Wm.	93, 105, 142		Smith, Memorial to Wm.	...	91
Wood,	...	278	Soane Museum	...	103
Wood, Allan	...	50	Society of Freemasons	...	224
Wood, Beavis	...	19	Steinmetz Ordinances	...	238
Wood, Hon. F. L.	...	166	Sterne, Tomb of Laurence	...	102
Wood, Rev. Wm.	...	19	Stone, Monument of Nicholas	...	82
Woodford, Rev. A. F. A.	...	157	Stone, Will of Nicholas	...	82
Woodman, Will.	96, 222		Sussex, Tomb of <i>Duke of</i>	...	102
Woodward, John	...	77	Suthes, Tomb of William	...	74
Woolfe,	...	278	Suthes, Will of William	...	75
Worth, John	...	7			
Wren, Sir Christopher	79, 87, 101,		Temple Church, London	...	84
	122, 213, 226		Temple Newsam	...	166
Wright, Wm.	...	50	Toast List in 1794	...	147
Wycklif	...	245			
Yevele, Henry	76, 92, 100		Tomb of:—		
York, <i>Duke of</i>	...	144	Elias Ashmole	...	72
Young, Sir C. G.	...	74	William Kirwin	...	90
Young, Edmund	...	101	Laurence Sterne	...	102
Young, George	...	293	<i>Duke of</i> Sussex	...	102
Young, Richard.	...	222	William Suthes	...	74
			Sir C. Wren	...	88
Piece work in the Gilds	...	266			
Plot's account of the Craft	...	241	Tracing Boards, Browne	...	185
Pontefract, York Lodge meeting	...				
at	...	178	Uniform in a London Lodge	...	125
Population of England in 1801	...	5			
Portugal, Freemasonry in	...	295	Warrants issued by Provincial		
Preston and the <i>Freemasons</i>			Grand Masters	...	10
<i>Magazine</i>	...	142	Westminster Abbey	...	76
Preston and the Lodge of	...				
Antiquity	...	158	Will of:—		
Processions of Freemasons at	...		Matthew Birkhead	...	130
Sheffield, 1797	...	161	Daniel Chaloner	...	314
Provincial G.M. Warrants	...		Nicholas Stone	...	82
issued by	...	10	William Suthes	...	74
Relief in the Gilds	...	285	Woodward, Monument of John	...	77
Royal Arch device; Dunckerley's	...		Wren, Tomb of <i>Sir C.</i>	...	88
use of	...	32			
Royal Cumberland School,	...		<i>Y Cymmrodor</i>	...	313
Institution of	...	145	Yevele, Documents connected	...	
			with	...	93
St. Alban	...	195			
St. Bartholomew, Smithfield	...	87			

CONTRIBUTORS.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Baxter, Rodk. H. ...	234	Lepper, J. Heron	115, 120, 132
Bean, W. H. ...	183	Manton, J. O. ...	63
Bullamore, Geo. W. ... 62, 236,	285	Meekren, R. J. ...	237
Carter, T. M. ... 4,	277	Moody, C. H. ...	176
Clark, Colonel Kitson ...	170	Poole, Rev. H. 155, 177, 235, 275,	308
Daynes, Gilbert W. 108, 131, 233,	287	Saunders, J. W. ...	255
de Lafontaine, H. Cart ...	293	Songhurst, W. J. ... 121,	240
Edwards, Lewis ...	158	Stokes, Dr. J. ...	161
Elkington, Geo. ... 110, 140,	162	Sykes, C. F. ... 111,	284
Grantham, Ivor ...	61	Telepneff, B. ...	160
Hawkesworth, E. ...	164	Thiemeyer, E. E. ... 188,	248
Hills, Gordon P. G. ... 106,	157	Tuckett, J. E. Shum ...	251
Ivanoff, B. ...	310	Vibert, Lionel 125, 132, 133, 244,	251, 281, 311
Jenkinson, W. ...	159	Williams, W. J. 64, 70, 112, 130,	157, 229, 280, 313
Knoop, Douglas ... 259,	289		

ILLUSTRATIONS.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Adel Church; South Porch ...	176	Knaresborough; general view ...	176
Bolton Priory ... 164,	176	Leeds: Screen, St. John's Church	176
Fountains Abbey ...	176	Temple Newsam ...	176
Frontispiece to Bunyan's <i>Solomon's</i> <i>Temple Spiritualised</i> , 1756 Edn.	92	Kirkstall Abbey ...	176
Inscription by Anderson in copy of 1723 <i>Constitutions</i> ...	253	Monument to Edward Marshall; St. Dunstan's, Fleet St. ...	85
Jewels; R.A. and Master ...	258	Portrait: H. Cart de Lafontaine ...	<i>Frontispiece</i>
		Ripon ...	168

Ars Quatuor Coronatorum

FRIDAY, 4th OCTOBER, 1929.



THE Lodge met at Freemasons' Hall at 5 p.m. Present:—Bros. Rev. H. Poole, B.A., P.Pr.G.Ch., Westmorland and Cumberland. W.M.; George Norman, P.A.G.D.C., I.P.M.; H. C. de Lafontaine, P.G.D., S.W.; W. J. Songhurst, P.G.D., Treas.; Lionel Vibert, P.A.G.D.C., Sec.; Gordon P. G. Hills, P.A.G.Sup.W., P.M., D.C.; W. J. Williams, J.D., as J.W.; Thos. M. Carter, P.Pr.G.St.B., Bristol, I.G.; John Stokes, P.G.D., Pr.A.G.M., West Yorks., P.M.; J. Heron Lepper, P.G.D., Ireland, P.M.; and David Flather, P.A.G.D.C.

Also the following members of the Correspondence Circle:—Bros. Douglas Knoop, A. F. Street, J. P. Hunter, J. Gaskill, G. Vere Montague, P.A.G.St.B., H. F. Mawbey, W. T. J. Gun, H. Thornton Gurner, A. Y. Alsagoff, Robt. Colsell, P.A.G.D.C., L. G. Wearing, George Elkington, P.A.G.Sup.W., Wm. Taylor Russell, R. W. Strickland, J. J. Nolan, P.G.St.B., H. Johnson, C. E. Newman, Alfred Wells, G. W. South, Meyrick W. Heath, David Rice, Allan Ramsay, D. Drysdale Anderson, B. Telepneff, B. Ivanoff, F. Freeman, Wm. Lewis, A. F. Ford, A. D. Bowl, C. F. Sykes, R. Wheatley, Henry G. Gold, W. Emmerson, Ernest Warren, W. Brinkworth, G. A. Wratten, A. Sice, L. Shaw, Arthur Quick, Geo. E. Hoare, F. Lace, P.A.G.D.C., R. J. Sadleir, F. K. Jewson, Wallace Heaton, G.St.B., and J. F. Vesey Fitz-Gerald.

Also the following Visitors:—Bros. A. W. Saunders, Reculvers Lodge No. 4123; F. E. Shillam, Imprimere Lodge No. 4734; W. Penny, L.R., Christ's Hospital Lodge No. 2650; F. W. Bannister, Bisley Lodge No. 2317; W. G. Clarke, Grove Lodge No. 410; J. C. Harvey, P.M., Farringdon Without Lodge No. 1745; R. Sandland, L.R., Golden Square No. 2857; and C. Gunn, Redwood Lodge No. 3411.

Letters of apology for non-attendance were reported from Bros. S. T. Klein, L.R., P.M.; F. J. W. Crowe, P.A.G.D.C., P.M.; J. T. Thorp, P.G.D., P.M.; Rev. W. W. Covey-Crump, A.G.Ch., P.M.; Sir Alfred Robbins, P.G.W., Pres.B.G.P., P.M.; Cecil Powell, P.G.D., P.M.; and Gilbert W. Daynes, J.W.

Bro. H. C. de Lafontaine, P.G.D., was elected Master of the Lodge for the ensuing year; Bro. W. J. Songhurst, P.G.D., was re-elected Treasurer, and Bro. J. H. McNaughton was re-elected Tyler.

Upon Ballot taken:—

Bro. The Rev. WALTER KELLY FIRMINGER, D.D., F.R.G.S. Residing at the Palace, Hampton Court, Middlesex. Chaplain to H.M. the King. Formerly Archdeacon of Calcutta. P.Dis.G.W., Bengal. P.M. Lodge Humility with Fortitude No. 229. Member of Lodges Yeatman Biggs No. 2672, Concordia 3102, etc. Author of *The Early History of Freemasonry in Bengal and the Punjab*, 1906. *A Short History of Lodge Humility with Fortitude*, 1903. Also papers in *A.Q.C.*, *Fresh Light on the old Bengal Lodges*, xviii. (1905). *Studies in Eighteenth Century Continental Masonry*, xix. (1906);

and

Bro. ARTHUR HEIRON, L.R. Residing at 67, Twyford Avenue, West Acton, London, W.3. Senior P.M. of Old Dundee Lodge No. 18, and P.M. of Sir Thomas White Lodge No. 1820. Author of *Ancient Freemasonry and the Old Dundee Lodge*. Also papers in *A.Q.C.*, *The Craft in the 18th Century*, xxxvii. (1924). *Masters' Lodges*, xxxix. (1926). Also "Was Dr. Johnson a Freemason?" published in *Masonic Record*;

were regularly elected Joining Members of the Lodge.

One Provincial Grand Lodge, one Lodge and fifty-four Brethren were elected to membership of the Correspondence Circle.

The SECRETARY drew attention to the following

EXHIBITS:—

By Bro. R. T. HALLIDAY:—

Pierced JEWEL, silver. An ornate G., with square, compasses and other emblems within a rayed oval border. On the square: *Nous vivons sur le Quarre*. On the oval border: *Rv. Sola Concordia Fratrum John Gale No. 184*. Ob.: *Amor Honor et Justitia. Virtute et Silentio*.

(The Lodge in question appears to be St. Alban's, Birmingham, which took this number at the Union. But although there is a very full list of the members before the Union in the G.L. Registers, it does not mention John Gale. The Lodge sent up no returns under its new number. Old Tuscan was No. 184 before the Union, and we also have a full list of the members at the time, but John Gale is not among them.)

APRON and Jewel of the Ancient Order of Gardeners. The Apron is about 16in. square, with circular flap. Dark blue cloth, and flap dark blue velvet: both with gold lace and braid edging. On flap irradiated eye, and the S. and C. with the Gardener's Knife. On Apron three interlaced triangles with S.N.A. and in centre O. Below, an ark, rainbow and dove. On either side: left, P. above H.; right, G. above E. The Jewel is in white metal. The S. and C. with the Gardener's Knife above the C., and below, a crown of five points and two half points. No ring or any other means of suspension.

Formerly the property of John M. Easton of Helensburgh.

By Bro. Major C. C. ADAMS:—

Mark JEWEL, metal gilt, in shape of a keystone. Ob. within the circle with letters an arm holding a cross crosslet fitché. Inscribed: *Alexr. D. MacDougall Hiram Chapter 12th May 5851. No. 733*. Rv. Emblems: Sun, moon, stars and irradiated eye. Above a tessellated pavement the pillars and arch with keystone, from which the G. depends. At foot the S. and C.

By Bro. Dr. JOHN STOKES:—

JEWEL. Pierced metal gilt. R.A. eighteenth century, but no hall-mark.

Master's JEWEL. Silver, compasses, arc and sun type. Maker Pat. Roouer. Hall-mark date 1783.

A second specimen similar. Maker T. Batson. Hall-mark date 1790.

(*Vide* the illustration.)


By Bro. R. J. SADLEIR:—

ENGRAVINGS: A series of Lambert de Lintot engravings.

Through the courtesy of the Librarian to Grand Lodge, Bro. Gordon P. G. Hills, the original *Haddon* MS., in the Library of Grand Lodge, was placed on the table for inspection.

A cordial vote of thanks was passed to the Brethren who had kindly lent these objects for exhibition.

Bro. DOUGLAS KNOOP, M.A., read the following paper:—




R.A. and Master's Jewels: Eighteenth Century.

GILD RESEMBLANCES IN THE OLD MS. CHARGES.

BY BRO. DOUGLAS KNOOP, M.A.

SUMMARY: Comparison of 'General Charges' and 'Charges Singular' of Haddon MS. with Gild ordinances.—The reading of the Charges and the taking of the Oath.—The 9 'General Charges' considered seriatim.—The 17 'Charges Singular' considered seriatim.—Conclusion: nothing important in 'General Charges' or 'Charges Singular' which is not contained in Gild ordinances.—The reverse proposition that there is nothing important in Gild ordinances which is not contained in the Charges is not true—*e.g.*, enrolment of apprentices, search for false work, enticing away of workmen, the use and counterfeiting of marks, relief of poverty and distress.



VERY Freemason who has some acquaintance with the organisation and functions of the mediæval gilds and fraternities must realise that there exist many similarities between these bodies and the Craft with which we are associated. My object in this paper is not directly to describe the leading characteristics of the gilds, but to consider how far gild features are reflected in the Old Charges. It is with the later parts of the Old Charges—the 'General Charges' and the 'Charges Singular'—that we shall be concerned; the legendary matter with which the Old Charges begin, has no exact counterpart among Gild documents so far as I am aware. Neither do I propose to touch on the 'Apprentice Charges,' those comparatively modern additions to the Old Charges. I thus limit myself to the Charges proper, and for the sake of simplicity I follow one MS. throughout, viz., the Haddon MS., which is fairly readily accessible and has the further advantage of presenting a more correct text than usual.¹

In the MSS. the Charges are divided into two classes (i.) General and (ii.) Singular; the former, as the name suggests, consisting of general advice and precepts, the latter chiefly of technical or trade directions and instructions. It is not possible, however, to draw a hard and fast distinction between the character of the two sets of Charges: in both the Mason is instructed to serve the Lord well; in both he is warned against fornication and adultery. On the other hand, it is only in the 'Charges Singular' that he is warned against games of chance and against visiting alehouses at night-time.

Amongst the ordinances, regulations or articles of the Craft Gilds it is possible to distinguish two types of rule: the one is concerned primarily with the social or religious activities of the gild, the other with the trade activities; the former have sometimes been described as 'fraternity' regulations, the latter as 'mystery' regulations. Or, putting the matter in another way, there were some rules which required the sanction of the Crown or of a Municipality if they were to be enforced, whilst there were other rules which were more or less the private concern of the gild alone. It is likely that most Craft Gilds had rules of both

¹ W. J. Hughan, *Old Charges of British Freemasons* (1895), p. 167. The Haddon MS. is reproduced by Hughan in this edition.

types. Sometimes, probably generally, in the early days, the fraternity regulations were kept distinct from the mystery regulations. Thus in the case of the Hull Bricklayers' Gild the former were embodied in the 'Book of Orders' (which, it may be noted, were approved by the Mayor), whilst the latter were contained in the Bricklayers' Composition, which was an indenture between the Mayor and Burgesses on the one part and representatives of the Bricklayers, etc., on the other.¹ At a later date fraternity regulations and mystery regulations were often embodied in one set of ordinances which had the authority of the municipality. In London, according to Professor Unwin, municipal enforcement of fraternity regulations is not found much before 1460; in York the Marshals and Smiths had their fraternity regulations acknowledged by the Mayor as early as 1443.² The ordinances of the Gild of Tailors at Exeter, 1476,³ and the ordinances of the Gild of Carpenters at York, 1482,⁴ are other examples of mixed fraternity and mystery regulations. In some cases the only ordinances which have come down to us are the mystery regulations which have been found amongst municipal records. Fortunately, a fair number of fraternity regulations are still extant, including several which were sent up to London in response to writs to the Sheriff of every shire issued in 1389, calling for returns by gilds.⁵ It is with these various gild ordinances of both types that the 'Charges' have to be compared. Roughly speaking, it is true to say that the 'General Charges' correspond with the ordinances of the religious and social gilds or with the 'fraternity' ordinances of the Craft Gilds, where these are known, whilst the 'Charges Singular' correspond with the 'mystery' ordinances of the Craft Gilds.

Before beginning a detailed examination of the 'General Charges' and the 'Charges Singular,' we may briefly consider the conditions under which they were read and the oath which was taken to observe them.

THE READING OF THE CHARGES AND THE TAKING OF THE OATH.

According to the Haddon MS., whilst the person who was to be made a Mason laid his hand on the Book held by one of the oldest Masons, the Charges were read out, introduced by the following exhortation:—

Every man that is a Mason, take good heed unto these Charges, if any man find himself guilty of any of these Charges that he amend himself towards God: and in principal ye that are to be charged take good heed that ye may keep these Charges right well; for it is great peril for a man to forswear himself upon a Book.

The Gilds appear to have adopted a very similar procedure. Thus the ordinances of the Gild of the Blessed Virgin Mary at Hull state that "the ordinances shall be read over to every newcomer, so that ignorance may not be pretended, and that an oath shall be taken by everyone coming into the gild to observe all the ordinances.

The ordinances of the Gild of St. Katherine at Stamford were re-affirmed in 1494⁷ and the oath to be taken by newcomers is set out in full as follows:—

I shall be a true man to God Almighty, to Saint Mary and to St. Katherine, in whose honour and worship this Gild is founded: and shall be obedient to the Alderman of this Gild and to his successors, and come to him and to his Brethren when I have warning and not absent myself without reasonable cause. I shall be ready to pay scot and bear lot and all my duties truly to pay and do; the ordinances.

¹ Lambert. *2,000 years of Gild Life*. pp. 272-281.

² *York Memorandum Book*, II. (Surtees Society. vol. 120, 1911), xxxiv. note.

³ Toulmin Smith, *English Gilds* (E.E.T.S., xl.), p. 312.

⁴ *York Memo. Bk.*, II., 279.

⁵ Some of these were reprinted in Toulmin Smith's book.

⁶ T. Smith, p. 159. In all cases through this paper where Gild ordinances are quoted, a modern English version is given.

⁷ T. Smith, p. 188.

constitutions and rules of the Gild, to keep, obey, perform, and to my power maintain, to my life's end, so help me God and holydom and by this Book.

The ordinances of the Gild of Tailors at Exeter¹ include the oaths of (i.) the craftsman; (ii.) the Master of the occupation; (iii.) the free brothers, and (iv.) the beadle. The craftsman's oath, which is long, may be summarized thus: He is to swear to be true to the fraternity and to obey the Master and Wardens; not to disclose the affairs of the brotherhood or of the craft; not to encourage strangers; to show the indentures of his apprentices and to bring them into the craft at the end of their terms; not to hire or entice away any worker or apprentice of another man; not to take a shop until admitted as a freeman; not to entice away customers from a brother of the craft; not to leave the gild but to uphold it according to his estate, and on dying to bequeath it a legacy; not to sue a brother of the craft without licence from the Master.

GENERAL CHARGES.

General Charge 1°.—The first Charge is that he or thou shall be true to God and Holy-Church, and that he use no errour or heresy by your understanding, or discreet or wise mens teaching; and also that he shall be a true liege-man to the King of England, without Treason or any Falshood, and that they know no Treason, nor Traytory, but to amend it privily if it may be or else warn the King or his Councill.

General Charge 2°.—And also you shall be true each one to the other, that is to say, every Mason of the Craft of Masonry that have been Masters allowed you shall do to them as you would they should do to you.

Whilst I have not been able to find an exact parallel for these two Charges, three extracts somewhat similar in character may be quoted. The first three ordinances of the Gild of the Blessed Mary at Chesterfield are as follows²:—

First, all shall swear to uphold the due rights of the Church.

Also they shall swear to take care for the rights of the lord of the place.

Also they shall swear to guard all their liberties within town and without town, and to give trusty help thereto whenever it may be needed.

An ordinance of the Gild of Tailors, Exeter,³ states:—

"This is to be read the four quarter days":

Ye shall pray for all the brothers and sisters of this fraternity and all benefactors of the same, and especially for our sovereign Lord, King Edward IV., first founder of this gild and fraternity and for the Queen and for the Princes and for all the King's progeny and for all the lords of the King's Great Council . . . (and for sundry individuals) . . .

The ordinances of the Company of Weavers at Hull lay it down "that the Warden and his brethren shall be loving, gentle and friendly one to another."⁴

General Charge 3°.—And also that you keep truly all the Councils of Lodge, and of Chamber, and of all other Councils, that ought to be kept by way of Masonry.

Probably all gilds required that their secrets should not be disclosed. The oath of the craftsman tailor at Exeter lays it down that "ye shall not disclose the counsel of the brotherhood or of the crafte, that ye have knowledge of, that

¹ T. Smith, pp. 316-19.

³ T. Smith, p. 318.

² T. Smith, p. 165.

⁴ Lambert, p. 211.

should be secret within ourselves." In some gilds the offence of disclosing secrets appears to have been regarded as a much more serious matter than in others. Thus, whilst the ordinances of the Shipman's Gild, Lynn,¹ provide that:

"Whoever discloses the counsel of this gild to any strange man or woman, and it may be proved, . . . shall pay 2 stones of wax or leave the fraternity until he may have grace";

the ordinances of the Gild of the Blessed Mary, Chesterfield,² state that:

"whoever makes known the affairs of the gild, and it is proved by two brethren, shall be put out as perjured, and his example shall be held up to everlasting scorn."

General Charge 4°.—And also that no Mason shall be a Thief, nor thievishly given for as forth as he may witt or know. (*Holywell MS.*: No mason shall be a thief nor in company as far as he doth know.)

Various gild ordinances state how a thief is to be punished; two may be quoted by way of example. The Gild of Fullers at Lincoln³ (1297) provided that:

if any of the brotherhood be justly charged with theft to the value of a penny, he shall be put out of the company.

The ordinance of the London Glovers (1349) laid it down⁴ that:

if any servant in the said trade shall make away with the goods or chattels of his master to the value of 12d. more or less, the same default shall be redressed by the good folks who are Wardens of the said trade: and if such servant who shall have offended against his master, will not allow himself to be adjudged upon by the Wardens of the said trade, he shall forthwith be attached and brought before the Mayor and Aldermen, and before them let the default be punished according to their discretion.

General Charge 5°.—And also that ye shall be true to the Lord, and to this Master ye serve, and truly see his profit and his advantage.

A common formula in an indenture of apprenticeship requires the apprentice "well and faithfully to serve A.B. as his master." But I have come across no similar injunction explicitly embodied in Gild ordinances in the case of journeymen.

General Charge 6°.—And also you shall call Masons your Brethren, or else your Fellows, and no other foul Names.

The terms brother and brethren occur in the ordinances of practically all the social gilds, and no doubt the members referred to each other as brothers. With regard to the use of abusive language, the ordinances of both the Gild of Garlekhith, London, and the Gild of SS. Fabian and Sebastian, London, provided that ill-behaved brethren should be put out of the gild,⁵ whilst the Gild of Conception at Bishop's Lynn had a rule⁶ that if brothers or sisters used foul words amongst one another, a fine should be paid or membership of the gild be lost.

General Charge 7°.—And also that ye shall not take your Fellows wife in Villany, nor desire ungodly his Daughter, nor his Servant, nor put him to any disworship.

This Charge closely resembles No. 11 amongst the Charges Singular ("No Mason shall use Lechery or be adulterous whereby the Craft might be slandered").

¹ T. Smith, p. 55.

² T. Smith, p. 180.

³ Kiley, *Memorials of London*, p. 245.

⁴ T. Smith, pp. 4 and 11.

⁵ T. Smith, p. 167.

⁶ T. Smith, p. 87.

These two Charges have a parallel in the following ordinances of the Gild of the Holy Trinity and St. Leonard, Lancaster (1377)¹:—

No one of the Gild shall wrong the wife or daughter or sister of another, nor shall allow her to be wronged so far as he can hinder it.

No one of the gild shall take into his house anyone known to be an adulterer, nor shall himself live in adultery; and if it be shown that he has done either, and after two warnings he will not amend, he shall altogether be put out of the Gild.

General Charge 8°.—And also that you pay truly for your Meat and Drink, where you go to board.

General Charge 9°.—And also that you shall do no Villany in that place where you go to board, whereby the Craft might be slandered. These be the Charges in general that belong to every true Mason to keep.

These Charges bear witness to the migratory character of the Mason's occupation, to which further reference will be made later; as most gilds were essentially local institutions it is very doubtful whether any counterparts of these particular precepts exist amongst gild ordinances.

CHARGES SINGULAR.

Charges Singular 1°.—That no Master shall take in hand any Lord's work, nor any other man's work, except he know himself able, and sufficient of Cunning to perform and end the Lord's work, so that the Craft have no slander, nor no disworship, but that the Lord may be well served, and truly with his own good, and the Master to live honestly, and to pay his Fellows truly their pay, as the manner is.

In the first place this Charge may be compared with two of the "Regulations for the trade of Masons" which were approved by the Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London in 1356²:—

that good folks of the said trade shall be chosen and sworn every time that need shall be, to oversee that no one of the trade takes work to complete, if he does not well and perfectly know how to perform such work, on pain of losing . . .

that no one shall take work in gross, (*i.e.* by contract) if he be not of ability in a proper manner to complete such work; and he who wishes to undertake such work in gross, shall come to the good man of whom he has taken such work to do and complete, and shall bring with him six or four ancient men of his trade, sworn thereunto, if they are prepared to testify unto the good man of whom he has taken such work to do, that he is skilful and of ability to perform such work, and that if he shall fail to complete such work in due manner, or not be of ability to do the same, they themselves who so testify that he is skilful and of ability to finish the work, are bound to complete the same work well and properly at their own charges in such manner as he undertook . . .

Somewhat similar rules from two other trades may be quoted, to show that such provisions were not peculiar to Masons. The Articles of the London Furbishers, 1350,³ lay it down that:

no one of the said trade shall take any manner of work for working at, from any great lord or other persons, if he be not a perfect man and a man knowing his trade by testimony of the good folks of the same trade . . .

¹ T. Smith, p. 163.

³ Riley, p. 258.

² Riley, pp. 280-2.

Amongst the Ordinances of the London Plumbers, 1365,¹ we find:

that no one of the trade of plumbers shall meddle with the works touching such trade within the said city or take house or apprentice or other workmen in the same, if he be not made free of the city and that by assent of the best and most skilful men in the said trade, testifying that he knows how well and lawfully to work and to do his work, that so the said trade may not be scandalised or the commonalty damaged and deceived, by folks who do not know their trade.

The regulations quoted appear in each case to relate to masters; in the case of the London Founders, whose ordinances were renewed in 1389,² there is a similar provision with regard to no one keeping house or shop until he has been examined as to whether he is 'able and sufficient and skilled,' but there is also the following ordinance with reference to journeymen:—

No man of the said trade shall receive any person to work therein as a journeyman before he shall have been tried and proved by the Masters aforesaid, as to whether he is able to work in such trade as a journeyman or not and it shall have been adjudged by the said Masters how much he shall take by the day . . .

Charges Singular 2°.—And also that no Master nor Fellow shall supplant another of their Work (that is to say) If he take a Work, or else stand Master of the Lord's work, ye shall not put him out, except he be unable of Cunning for ending of the Work.

The oath of the craftsman Tailor of Exeter, referred to above, states that "ye shall not stir, procure, nor excite by yourself nor by other means, to withdraw from your master, nor from any brother of the craft, any of their customers . . ." A more exact counterpart, however, appears to exist in that ordinance of the London Plumbers³ which states:

that no one of the said trade shall oust another from his work undertaken or begun, or shall take away his customers or his employers, to his damage, by enticement through carpenters, masons, tilers or other persons; as he would answer for the damage so inflicted, by good consideration of the Masters of the said trade.

The regulations of the Fraternity of Minstrels in Beverley (1555) provide that no brother "shall take another brother's castle from him."⁴

Charges Singular 3°.—And also that no Master, nor no Fellow take an Apprentice within the term of Seven years, and that the Apprentice be able of birth (that is to say) free born and of Limbs whole as a man ought to be.

This condition with regard to the seven years' apprenticeship is contained in the London Masons' Regulations of 1356⁵:—

no one of the said trade shall take an apprentice for a less term than seven years, according to the usage of the city . . .

It appears in almost the same words in the London Cutlers' Articles of 1344.⁶ In the Articles of the London Spurriers, 1345, a further condition with regard to enrolment is attached⁷:—

No one of the said trade shall take an apprentice for a less term than seven years and such apprentices shall be enrolled according to the usages of the said city.

¹ Riley, pp. 321-2.

³ Riley, p. 322.

⁵ Riley, p. 282.

⁷ Riley, p. 227.

² Riley, p. 513.

⁴ Lambert, p. 136.

⁶ Riley, p. 217.

In the case of the London Plumbers a still further condition is attached ¹ resembling that contained in the oath of the Exeter craftsman Tailor referred to above:

that no one of the said trade shall take an apprentice for less than seven years and that he shall have him enrolled within the first year, and at the end of his term shall make him take up his freedom according to the usage of the said city.

By other ordinances it is provided that no Cutler, Spurrier, or Plumber who is not free of the city is entitled to receive an apprentice. Regulations as to free birth or the physical conditions of apprentices are found among the London Cutlers,² the London Founders,³ and the York Bowers.⁴ The especially strict requirements of the York Bowers are deserving of quotation in full:—

That no master of the said craft shall take any apprentice before he shall have been brought before the aforesaid searchers to be examined and approved by them if he be honest and capable, that is to say, if he be English born, born a freeman, neither deformed nor lacking any limb and well known as of loyal and faithful character.

Charges Singular 4°.—And also that no Master, nor no Fellow take nor allow any to be made Mason without the assent and the counsell of his Fellows, and that hath served Six or Seven years at the least. (*Holywell MS.*: No Master nor Fellow shall take an Apprentice without the consent of at least 5 or 6 Fellows and Masters.)

The Articles of the London Furbishers of 1350 ⁵ provide that:

no one of this trade shall be admitted to the freedom of the said city without the assent of the wardens of the said trade sworn, or of the greater part of them . . .

The Furbishers' rule is not quite analogous to the Charge as it relates to freedom of the city and not freedom of the gild. The following ordinance, however, passed by the Gild of Tailors, Exeter, in 1516 ⁶ appears to be entirely on all fours with the Charge:—

The Master and five Past Masters at least and two at least of the Wardens must assent to every admittance to the gild.

Charges Singular 5°.—And he that shall be made Mason, be able in all manner of degrees, that is to say free-born, and to come of good kindred, and true and no bond man, and that he have good Limbs, as a man ought to have.

This Charge would appear to be covered by what has been said immediately above with reference to the 3rd Charge Singular in respect of apprentices.

Charges Singular 6°.—And also no Mason shall take an Apprentice, except he have sufficient Occupation for two Fellows, or else three at the least.

Many gilds imposed restrictions on the number of apprentices which a master might employ. The restriction might be primarily in the interest of the apprentices, as *e.g.*, the ordinance of the London Braelers⁷ (1355) that "no one shall take an apprentice if he be not testified by the good folks of the said trade sworn, that he is a man proper and sufficient to keep, inform, and teach his apprentice . . ."

The ordinances of the York Girdlers (1307)⁸ provided that no master should take more than one apprentice, whilst a York Glazier could not take a second apprentice until the first had completed four years of his seven years'

¹ Riley, p. 322.

³ Letter Book, K., 375.

⁵ Riley, p. 258.

⁷ Riley, p. 278.

² Letter Book, I., 250.

⁴ *York Memo. Bk.*, I., 61.

⁶ T. Smith, p. 328.

⁸ *York Memo. Bk.*, I., 181.

term.¹ If the proportion of journeymen to apprentices was fixed as in this Charge, it was presumably to protect the journeymen from the competition of cheap labour. The ordinances of the Gild of Tailors at Exeter illustrate this type of restriction:—

It is ordained by the Master and Wardens and all the whole craft that from henceforth no man of the said craft shall hold but 3 servants and 1 apprentice at the most without licence of the Master and Wardens for the time being.²

The Statute of Apprentices, 1563, no doubt had the same object in view when it laid down in sec. 26 that:

Every person that shall have three apprentices in any of the said crafts of a clothmaker, fuller, shearman, weaver, tailor or shoemaker, shall keep one journeyman and for every other apprentice above the number of the said three apprentices one other journeyman . . .

It is probable that in the later days of the Gilds the limitation on the number of apprentices was imposed not so much in the interests of the apprentices or of the journeymen but in the interests of the masters who wished to restrict the number of potential rivals to share the gild monopoly; or possibly in the interests of the small masters to protect them from the competition of larger capitalists.

Charges Singular 7°.—And also that no Master nor Fellow put any Lord's work to task, that was wont to go to Journey, and also that every Master shall give pay unto his Fellows, but as he may deserve. So that ye be not deceived by false workmen.

Wage regulations of various kinds are not uncommon amongst gild ordinances; sometimes they prescribed the exact payment to be made for a task or by the week, in other cases they were general in character. The Regulations for the trade of Masons approved in London in 1356 provide:

that the said Masters so chosen shall oversee that all those who work by the day shall take for their hire according as they are skilled and may deserve for their work and not outrageously.³

In 1350 the Master Shearmen of London presented a petition to the Mayor and Aldermen which, after rehearsing that their men had been paid so much per day in old time, stated that now "the said men will not work otherwise than by the cloth and then do so greatly hurry over the same that they do great damage to the folks to whom such cloths belong . . . The masters in the same trade do therefore beg . . . that it will please you to order . . . the said men . . . to work according to the ancient usage."⁴

Whilst this Charge relates to the substitution of piece work for day work, the petition of the Shearmen relates to the reverse occurrence. With regard to paying a Fellow "as he may deserve," the following rather lengthy ordinance of the London Cutlers (1380) bears on this point⁵:—

III. To provide against the excessive wages of the journeymen of the said trade, be it ordained that no journeyman working in the same, who is not free, or who has not been apprenticed in the trade and has not completed his term in the said city or otherwise served seven years within the city in such trade, shall be admitted to work in the same if such journeyman have not first been tried by the overseers sworn in the trade as to his knowledge therein, to ascertain how much he is deserving to take by the day, by the week or for a whole term; and as they shall find, according to their consciences,

¹ *York Memo. Bk.*, II., 209.

³ Riley, p. 282.

⁵ Riley, p. 439.

² T. Smith, p. 315.

⁴ Riley, p. 250.

that such journeyman can well serve, let them award him what he is to take; and that he who shall give to such journeyman in excess of the valuation so made by the said overseers shall incur the penalty. And after the said overseers shall have so reasonably set such journeyman at his value, as is before stated, that for no reason the wage of such journeyman shall be other than the sum so assessed, either higher or lower, on the pain aforesaid, until he shall have learned to deserve more.

Charges Singular 8°.—And also that none slander another behind his back, to make him lose his good name or else his wordly Goods.

Charges Singular 9°.—And also that no Fellow within the Lodge or without mis-answer another ungodly, nor reproveably, without a reasonable Cause.

Charges Singular 10°.—And also that every Mason shall reverence his Elder, and put him to worship, and also that no Mason shall be a Comon player at Hazard, Dice, or other unlawfull plays, whereby the Craft may be slandered.

These three Charges seem rather out of place here, as they are much more closely akin to those general admonitions and precepts which are embodied in the General Charges than to the trade rules which usually characterize the Charges Singular. Counterparts to these Charges can be found in the fourteenth century gild ordinances, with the exception of the reference to 'hazard' and other unlawful games which, for that period, can only be illustrated from an indenture of apprenticeship. An ordinance of the Gild of the Blessed Mary, Chesterfield (begun in 1218), runs as follows:—

If any brother shall have wronged another in any way, by violence, either with malice aforethought or through ignorance, or by back-biting or by foul words; or shall have sworn at his brother, or evil spoken of him or in any other manner wronged him: and if this shall be proved by two of the brethren, and he is unwilling to make fitting amends for the wrong, on the friendly suggestion of his brethren, then he who has been wronged may seek redress howsoever he like: and the other for his rash presumption shall be put out of the gild or punished in such other manner as the Alderman and his brethren shall think well.¹

The Gild of the Smiths of Chesterfield also had an ordinance in 1387 which provided that:

should it happen (which God forbid) that any brother is contumacious, or sets himself against the brethren . . . or does not obey the Elder Father when he ought nor show him due respect . . . he shall pay a pound of wax . . .²

The Composition of the Hull Weavers, 1490, also embodied a clause providing for the punishment of a brother found guilty of slandering another.³

With regard to hazard, dice, etc., a York Bower's indenture of apprenticeship of 1371 has been preserved⁴ which definitely forbids the apprentice "to play with dice or to frequent inns, gaming houses or brothels." The reference to hazard, etc., in the Charge is probably a comparatively modern addition copied from progressive legislation on the subject.⁵ The only reference to the subject I have come across in gild ordinances (as distinct from apprentices' indentures) is a relatively modern one in the Book of Orders of the Fraternity of Bricklayers at Hull (1599):—

¹ T. Smith, p. 166.

³ Lambert, p. 205.

⁵ See Bro. Vibert, *A.Q.C.* xxxiv., 216.

² T. Smith, p. 170.

⁴ *York Memo. Bk.*, I., 54.

If any of this brotherhood being at work with any man, do in the time of his work, resort to the ale house, or do play at dice, cards, or any other unthrifty game (and duly proved) he shall forfeit and pay for every time so doing 8d.¹

Charges Singular 11°.—And also that no Mason shall use Lechery, or be adulterous whereby the Craft might be slandered.

This Charge was referred to previously when considering the seventh General Charge.

Charges Singular 12°.—And also that no Fellow go into the Town by night, whereas a Lodge is of Fellows, except he have a Fellow with him, that he may bear him witness that he was in honest place.

This, as has been suggested previously, would appear to have more affinity to the General Charges, than to the Charges Singular. I have not been able to discover any very exact counterpart among gild ordinances, but various gilds at Lynn had rules to the effect (i.) that no man shall stay in the gild-house after the Alderman has left² and (ii.) that whoever enters the ale-chamber without leave of the officers of the gild shall be fined,³ which very probably had a somewhat similar object in view.

Charges Singular 13°.—And also that every Master and Fellow shall come to the Assembly, and if it be within fifty miles about him, if he have warning and if he hath trespassed against the Craft, that he abide the Award of Master and Fellows.

Various gilds had annual meetings or assemblies to elect officers and very possibly to transact other business, and stress was frequently laid upon the importance of attendance. These points are well illustrated by the ordinances of the London Cutlers (1380)⁴:—

VIII. Be it ordained and assented to by all the reputable men of the said trade, for their good and honest governance, that each year the overseers chosen and sworn of the trade, shall warn all the good folks of the trade to be assembled in some befitting place in the city to choose their overseers for the following year . . .

IX. Also, if any man of the said trade will not come by reason of his own waywardness, at the warning of the said overseers for the time being, to such assemblies befitting and necessary as well as for the common profit of the city as for the good rule of the said trade, or if he will not submit to the reasonable award of the said overseers, or the greater part of the good and substantial persons of the said trade, such persons shall incur the penalty.

An illustration of an Assembly to attend which a considerable journey might have to be undertaken is provided by the Fraternity of Minstrels in Beverley⁵:—

Whereas it is and has been a very ancient custom . . . that all or the most part of the minstrels playing any musical instruments and thereby occupying their honest living . . . or serving any man or woman of honour and worship of any city or town corporate or otherwise, between the rivers of Trent and Tweed have accustomed yearly to resort unto the town and borough of Beverley at the Rogation Days and then and there to choose yearly one Alderman of the Minstrels with stewards and deputies . . .

Therefore . . . the Governors of the said town A.D. 1555 . . . do grant unto the said brotherhood of Minstrels the renewing of all

¹ Lambert, p. 278.

³ T. Smith, pp. 59, 70, 81.

⁵ Lambert, p. 134.

² T. Smith, pp. 66, 79, 81.

⁴ Riley, p. 440.

godly and goodly orders concerning the said science . . . in manner as followeth: . . . that all the brethren within the science shall come at the commandment of the Alderman or his stewards to what place within Beverley as he shall assign them and there to choose the Alderman and Stewards and to keep the hour to them assigned in pain of every offence 12d.

Also if there be any brother that will not come in or being come will depart without licence before the new Alderman . . . be chosen, and other honest orders there to be taken, for the profit and commodity of the said science and brotherhood, shall have for his fine 2s. 4d. without forgiveness.

So far as the distance of fifty miles is concerned, a similar provision is hardly to be expected in ordinances of gilds which, with very rare exceptions, were local in character. Apart from the case of the Beverley Minstrels, the nearest approach I have found to this type of provision is contained in the ordinances of the Gild of Pelyters, Norwich,¹ which provide . . .

. . . that no man shall be excused of absence at that mass (on the Sunday next after the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul) but it be for the Kings service or for serious sickness or dwelling 20 miles from the city, under the penalty of paying three pounds of wax.

The last part of the Charge is referred to along with the consideration of the next Charge.

Charges Singular 14°.—And also that every Master and Fellow that hath trespassed against the Craft, shall stand there at the Award of the Master and Fellows, to make them accorded and agreed if they may, and if he may not agree then to go to the Common-Law.

The Regulations for the trade of Masons in London, approved 1356, have a clause along somewhat similar lines²:—

If any one of the said trade will not be ruled or directed in due manner by the persons of his trade sworn thereunto, such sworn persons are to make known his name unto the Mayor, and the Mayor, by assent of the Aldermen and Sheriffs, shall cause him to be chastised by imprisonment and other punishment that so other rebels may take example by him, to be ruled by the good folks of their trade.

If it is a question not so much of a member defying the gild authorities or breaking their gild ordinances, but of one brother being at variance with another, then the rule of the Gild of the Holy Cross at Bishop's Lynn³ that no brother or sister of the gild shall go to law with another without leave of the Alderman may be quoted by way of illustration. A Craft Gild ordinance of a similar type existed amongst the London Shearmen in 1452⁴:

that no man of the said craft shall take action by the law upon another where the matter may be ended by treaty or compromise, unto the time that he hath asked the Warden's leave . . . and that the same Wardens shall truly examine both parties and that each of them shall choose a man or two within the said craft and they for to set them at accord if they can.

(If their efforts failed, the parties could then go to the common law.)

The craftsman's oath of the Gild of Tailors at Exeter stated that "he should sue no man of this craft without licence from the Master for the time being."

¹ T. Smith, p. 30.

² Riley, p. 282.

³ T. Smith, p. 84.

⁴ Lond. & Midd. Archeol. Soc., iv., 40, quoted by Lipson, p. 307.

Charges Singular 15°.—And also that no Master nor Fellow make no Mould, nor Square, nor Rule to no Layer, nor sett no Layer within the Lodge to hew Mould-Stones.

Various crafts from time to time framed ordinances to prevent what they regarded as encroachments on the part of other crafts, and the municipal records show that demarcation disputes were by no means uncommon. Thus the ordinances of the Joiners at Hull (1598) provide that no carpenter, housewright or other wright within this town shall make any joiner work whatsoever,¹ whilst the Carpenters had a corresponding rule.² There can be little doubt that the work of the building crafts overlapped considerably. The records at York show that the Tilers and Plasterers were frequently at loggerheads; in 1413 the municipality approved a new ordinance which provided that if any Plasterer undertook any tiling work he was to pay 3d. to the Tilers' pageant and the work was to be supervised by the searchers of the Tilers.³

An illustration of a technical regulation concerning a trade process, and the attempt to exclude a category of workers, is provided by an ordinance of the Gild of Fullers at Lincoln, 1337⁴:

that none of the craft shall work in the trough (*i.e.*, full cloth by treading it with the feet) and none shall work at the wooden bar (used for beating the newly-made cloth) with a woman, unless with the wife of a master or her handmaid.

Charges Singular 16°.—And also that every Mason receive and cherish strange Fellows, when they come over the Countries, and to set them to work if they will as the manner is, that is to say, if he hew Mould-Stones in his place, ye shall refresh him with Money unto the next Lodge.

This is another Charge which relates primarily to an occupation of a migratory character and it is difficult, therefore, to find an exact counterpart to it amongst the ordinances of the local gilds. It may be noted, too, that whilst the ordinances of most of the London Gilds definitely state that no one of the said trade shall keep shop or follow the trade if he be not a freeman of the city, or words to that effect,⁵ the Regulations for the trade of Masons approved by the Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London in 1356 state "that every man of the trade may work at any work touching the trade if he be perfectly skilled and knowing in the same,"⁶ which would at least make it legal for strange masons to follow their calling in London.

The York Carpenters had various ordinances which provided for strange carpenters being set to work. One ordinance approved in 1462⁷ runs:—

It is ordained that if any strange carpenter come within . . . this city and occupy himself as a master in any point pertaining to the said craft, he shall pay yearly . . . to the charges of their pageant and light on Corpus Christi Day 4d.

Two ordinances of the York Carpenters of 1482 bear on the same point⁸:

Also it is ordained that if a journeyman that is not cunning in work come to this city to learn the said occupation better, if he be hired in the said occupation for meat, drink and 20s. a year or above, then his said master that so hire him, within the next quarter of a year shall pay 20d. . . .

Also it is ordained that none of the said occupation shall set any to work within the said city over fourteen days except that he be bound servant for the whole year. or bound apprentice, under pain of 40d.

¹ Lambert, p. 255.

³ *York Memo. Bk.*, I., xliii.

⁵ Cutlers, Riley, p. 218. Spurriers, p. 227. Furbishers, p. 258. Plumbers, p. 322. Haberdashers, p. 354.

⁷ *York Memo. Bk.*, II., 193.

² Lambert, p. 260.

⁴ T. Smith, p. 180.

⁶ Riley, p. 281.

⁸ *York Memo. Bk.*, II., 281.

A supplementary ordinance approved in 1510 provides¹.—

If any strange carpenter come to this city and occupy the said craft with any man in the said city . . . by the space of a week he shall pay 4d. and so many as there be to pay 4d. apiece. And if they work by the space of a month, then they shall pay 2s. apiece and so to work the whole year if it be on one man's work . . .

Charges Singular 17°—And also that every Mason shall truly serve the Lord for his pay, and every Master truly make an end of his work, be it task or journey, if ye have your Covenants and all that ye ought for to have. These Charges that we have now rehearsed to you and all other that belong to Masons you shall keep. So help you God: and by this Book unto your Power.

This Charge does not appear to contain any new precepts but repeats in different words some of the admonitions given previously.

Sufficient has now been said to show how very closely the 'General Charges' and the 'Charges Singular' of the Old MS. Charges follow along the lines of Gild ordinances, articles or regulations. With the exception of small, and I think I may say, unimportant matters—due mostly to the migratory character of the Mason's calling—there appears to be nothing in the 'General Charges' and the 'Charges Singular' which is not contained in Gild ordinances, articles or regulations (or in indentures of apprenticeship). But it still remains to be considered whether the converse proposition is true, *i.e.*, whether there are matters of importance dealt with in Gild ordinances which do not appear to be touched upon in the Charges. There undoubtedly are such matters, and I propose now to set out some of the most important under eight heads.

GILD RULES WHICH HAVE NO COUNTERPARTS IN THE CHARGES.

There are certain matters contained in Gild ordinances which are due to the local character of the gilds and their intimate association with the Municipal Authorities. This type of rule is naturally missing from the Charges in view of the fact that Masons belonged to a migratory trade. Various features of Gild ordinances can be quoted to illustrate this contention, and the first three heads are of this character; in two cases the features have already been illustrated, or referred to, in other connections:—

(i.) *Masters to be freemen of city or borough.*—In commenting upon Charges Singular No. 16, "that every Mason should receive and cherish strange Fellows," reference was made to the fact that the Ordinances of most London Gilds definitely state that no one shall keep shop or follow the trade in question if he be not a freeman of the city, or words to that effect. As Masons were not usually associated with any particular city or borough, no similar restriction must be looked for in the Charges.

(ii.) *Enrolment of apprentices.*—Various gild regulations call for the enrolment of apprentices within a certain period, generally a year. It has already been stated that the craftsman's oath amongst the Exeter Tailors required him "to show the indenture of his apprentices"; an ordinance of the gild definitely calls for the enrolment of the apprentice's indenture before the Master and Wardens within twelve months and a day, and for the master to pay 12d. for the enrolment.²

The regulations of the London Spurriers and of the London Plumbers quoted to illustrate the seven years' apprenticeship required under Charges

¹ York Memo. Bk., II., 283.

² T. Smith, p. 316.

Singular No. 3, both call for the enrolment of the apprentices. The London Furbishers required the apprentice "to be enrolled in the chamber"¹ within the first year of the term; the Hull Shipwrights had a rule that apprentices were to be enrolled at the Town Hall within three months and in the books of the Company.² At York the municipal register of apprentices commences in 1461 and with certain omissions continues to 1502.³

In so far as apprenticeship was a qualification for citizenship, the Municipal Authorities would no doubt favour registration, but that motive for enrolment would not exist in the case of Masons. Registration might also facilitate municipal control over the guilds, but that consideration, too, would not apply to Masons. On the other hand, the guild authorities might desire enrolment to enforce their own regulations and to facilitate the collection of any fees imposed. The subject of enrolment of apprentices, however, is not mentioned in the Charges, nor are the apprentices ever referred to as 'entered' apprentices.⁴

(iii.) *Restriction regarding residence.*—Gild ordinances sometimes required members to live in particular streets, with a view to facilitating visits of inspection by the officials. Thus the ordinance of London Pelterers (1365)⁵ provide that "all freemen of the said trade shall dwell in Walbrok, Cornhulle and Bogerowe and not in other foreign streets of the city; that so the overseers of the trade may be able to oversee them." Obviously no corresponding regulation could apply to a migratory trade like that of Masons.

At this point I wish to say a few words with regard to the use I have made of the term 'migratory' to describe the mason's trade. I do not wish to imply thereby that masons were continually on the move looking for new jobs, but merely that, compared with most occupations in mediæval England, which were highly localized in the sense that an artisan commonly remained all his life in the town where he served his apprenticeship, the mason's trade was one which did involve movement from one locality to another. There were other mediæval occupations which no doubt involved travelling in search of employment. The fact that the York Carpenters introduced ordinances concerning strangers in 1462, in 1482 and again in 1510, strongly suggests that Carpenters to some extent moved about the country in search of work. The Beverley Minstrels, who claimed to serve any man or woman of honour "between the rivers of Trent and Tweed," must have moved about the countryside in search of employment almost continuously. I conceive of the position of the Masons in the matter of mobility as lying between that of the Carpenters and of the Minstrels: they moved about more than the Carpenters but less than the Minstrels.

It is well known that houses in mediæval times were constructed mostly of wood⁶; it follows, therefore, that there must have been permanent employment for Carpenters in the towns, so that the number moving about would probably form only a small proportion of the whole. It also follows that there would be practically no regular work for Masons in the towns except perhaps in the very largest. The principal employment of stone masons was on Minsters, Abbeys and Castles. As one of these great buildings was completed, the need for Masons in that particular spot would almost if not entirely disappear. Thus from time to time Masons would have to move from one locality to another, following the tide of building: on this account the mason's trade is described as migratory.

¹Riley, p. 258.

²Lambert, p. 346.

³*York Memo. Bk.* II., lvi.

⁴The term 'entered' apprentices would obviously imply registration, but it is a modern one, first introduced into the English Craft by Anderson in the eighteenth century.

⁵Riley, p. 330.

⁶The specification for building a house in London in 1308 "by Simon de Canterbury Carpenter," will be found in Riley, p. 65. The builder's name suggests migration amongst carpenters, his description suggests that the house was to be built chiefly of wood.

(iv.) *Search for 'false work.'*—Many craft gilds had regulations with regard to so-called 'false work.' These regulations generally provided for the appointment of "searchers," for false work to be brought before the Mayor and Aldermen, and not infrequently for the prohibition of night work. This type of regulation may be illustrated as follows:—

The Articles of the London Cutlers (1344)¹ provide:

that certain persons of the trade of cutlery shall be chosen . . . so that they may search and make assay of all manner of cutlery that they shall find both in houses and out of houses . . . and so often as they shall find any false work, touching the said trade, they shall cause the same to be taken and brought before the Mayor and Aldermen of the said city . . .

The Articles of the London Furbishers (1350)² state:

that no one of the said trade shall make in his house or allow to be made, pommels or hilts of swords, if they be not of good pattern and steel; and the scabbards must be made of good calf-leather: and if any one be found doing to the contrary thereof, let him lose such false work and be punished at the discretion of the Mayor and Aldermen.

According to the ordinances of the Gild of Fullers of Bristol, 1406³:

it is ordained and agreed that each year four men of the craft shall be chosen as masters to search every house of the said craft, twice a week and oversee all defects in the said cloths, if any such there be, and present them before [the Mayor] at the Court.

With regard to night work, the ordinances of the London Pewterers (1348)⁴ provide "that no one shall be so daring to work at night upon articles of pewter seeing . . . that the sight is not so profitable at night or so certain, as by day—to the profit that is of the community." The London Hatters (1347)⁵ had an article "that no workman in the said trade shall do any work by night touching the same, but only in clear daylight, that so the aforesaid Wardens may openly inspect their work"; whilst the London Bowyers laid it down in 1371⁶ "that no bowyer of London shall work at night from henceforth."

The particular kinds of false work which this type of ordinance had in view, such as the use of poor materials or of inferior processes or actual fraud, all of which would be facilitated by night work, would perhaps hardly apply to the mason's craft. Furthermore, these are regulations imposed upon the gilds by the Municipal Authorities in their endeavours to control the gilds and consequently similar rules should not be looked for among the Charges. In any case "searchers" and "false work" are not referred to in the Charges, although it is quite likely that craftsmen had to submit their work to overseers for approval or rejection.

(v.) *Enticing away of workmen.*—A very common gild regulation forbids the enticing away of workmen. This matter was mentioned in the craftsman's oath of the Exeter Gild of Tailors, but other examples may be quoted. Thus the London Glovers (1349) lay it down that "no one of this trade shall take or entice the serving man of another away from the service of his master, so long as he is bound by covenant to serve him"⁷; whilst the ordinances of the London Founders (1389)⁸ provided that "no one of the said trade shall be so daring as to entice the serving man, journeyman or apprentice of another away from the service of his master, before the covenant between them made is completed."

¹ Riley, p. 218.

³ T. Smith, p. 285.

⁵ Riley, p. 239.

⁷ Riley, p. 245.

² Riley, p. 259.

⁴ Riley, p. 243.

⁶ Riley, p. 348.

⁸ Riley, p. 514.

In one form of wording or another, this particular injunction crops up again and again in Gild ordinances. It should also be noted that it is included in the Regulations for the trade of Masons approved by the Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London in 1356:—

That no one of the said trade shall take the apprentice or journeyman of another, to the prejudice or damage of his master, until his term shall have fully expired . . .¹

The Charges are entirely silent on this subject.

(vi.) *Working in presence of Master.*—In most crafts where masters, journeymen and apprentices worked together in small workshops, the men and youths were always under the master's eye whilst performing their tasks. In the building trades, however, it might easily happen that the workers were not under very close supervision. To meet this case, special ordinances were occasionally drafted. Thus the York Plasterers (1422) had a regulation that the masters should be fined if they allowed either apprentices or servants to work except in the presence of their masters, unless with the consent of the searchers.² There was a similar provision in the Regulations for the trade of Masons approved by the Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London in 1356:

That no one shall set an apprentice or journeyman to work except in the presence of his master, before he has been perfectly instructed in his calling: . . .³

Again the Charges are entirely silent on the subject.

(vii.) *Use and counterfeiting of 'marks.'*—In various trades ordinances relating to 'marks' exist; they generally run in pairs, the one directing a master to put his mark upon his work, and the other forbidding the counterfeiting of a mark. The London Helmetmakers,⁴ Blacksmiths,⁵ Bladesmiths,⁶ and Brasiers⁷ are examples of such gilds; it will suffice to quote one pair of ordinances, viz., those of the Blacksmiths (1372), by way of illustration:

That every master in the said trade shall put his own mark upon his work, such as heads of lances, knives and axes and other large work: that people may know who made them in case default shall be found in the same; on the pain aforesaid.

That no one in the said trade shall counterfeit the mark of another person, or put the counterfeited mark of another upon his own work, but he shall use and put his own mark upon his own work on pain aforesaid.

Although masons undoubtedly made use of 'marks' the Charges do not refer to them.

(viii.) *Relief of Poverty and Distress.*—Many gilds in their ordinances made provision for the relief of brethren who had fallen into poverty or distress. I shall content myself with giving two examples. The Gild of the Tailors of Lincoln (founded 1328) provided that:

If anyone of the gild falls into poverty (which God forbid) and has not the means of support he shall have every week during his life, sevenpence out of the goods of the gild . . .⁸

The ordinances of the trade called "Whittawyers," to which the Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London assented in 1346 include the following:—

Each person of the said trade shall put in the box such sum as he shall think fit, in aid of maintaining the said candle.

¹ Riley. p. 282.

³ Riley, p. 282.

⁵ Riley, p. 361.

⁷ Riley. p. 626.

² *York Memo. Book*, II., lix.

⁴ Riley, p. 238.

⁶ Riley, p. 569.

⁸ T. Smith. p. 182.

If by any chance any one of the said trade shall fall into poverty whether through old age, or because he cannot labour or work, and have nothing with which to help himself, he shall have every week from the said box 7d. for his support, if he be a man of good repute. And after his decease, if he have a wife, a woman of good repute, she shall have weekly for her support 7d. from the said box, so long as she shall behave herself well and keep single.¹

On the subject of relieving poverty and distress the Charges are also silent, but just as we know that the masons had 'marks' although the Charges do not refer to them, so it may quite well be, that in spite of the silence of the Charges on this subject, the craftsmen of those days carefully maintained in their fullest splendour those truly Masonic ornaments: Benevolence and Charity.

A hearty vote of thanks was unanimously passed to Bro. D. Knoop for his interesting paper, on the proposition of Bro. H. Poole, seconded by Bro. H. C. de Lafontaine; comments being offered by or on behalf of Bros. W. J. Williams, C. F. Sykes, Geo. W. Bullamore, G. W. Daynes, T. M. Carter, and Lionel Vibert, Secretary.

Bro. H. POOLE, W.M., said:—

Any Brother present who knows the lines along which my chief Masonic studies have moved, or who heard my Inaugural Address, will be ready to believe me when I say how pleased I was to hear that a paper on such a subject as the one we have just heard was coming along. I have long felt that such a comparison as Bro. Knoop has made might yield valuable results.

And now I must start by confessing that at my first reading of the paper I was disappointed—not at anything for which Bro. Knoop is to blame; but at the scarcity of close *verbal* resemblances which his wide range of quotations must have brought to light if they existed. If we compare the orders of the different Gilds in one Borough, we are apt to be confronted at once with a remarkable similarity between them; and to a certain extent this is true when we compare the ordinances of Gilds of different localities. And so I was surprised and disappointed to find how few really close resemblances Bro. Knoop was able to bring forward.

But on reflection I think that the very absence of such close agreements, if studied carefully, may yield positive results of some interest. Bro. Knoop has pointed out how several of our 'Charges,' being specially devised for an itinerant Craft, have no counterpart among the Gild regulations of localized Trades, and *vice versa*. Is it possible that the Mason, being more or less cut off from local Gild activities, was comparatively uninfluenced by the forms of words used in their codes, except in so far as these were due to legislation on such matters as the taking of apprentices? A very careful scrutiny and comparison of Gild regulations over a wide area might very well reveal the fact that our Charges stand rather apart from the rest; and Bro. Knoop's paper may well stimulate some other student to an attack on the records on those lines.

Bro. Knoop has certainly earned our thanks by calling attention to the migratory character of the Beverley Minstrels. No one who has ever visited St. Mary's Church, Beverley, can have failed to notice and enjoy the quaint little group on the 'Minstrels' Pillar'; but I, at any rate, was quite unaware that they provided us with a rare instance of an itinerant Gild. And I venture to suggest that it might be worth while printing fuller extracts from their

¹ Riley, p. 232.

ordinances, even though they may not be quite apposite here. If the custom of an annual gathering at Beverley is anything like as old as the Gild itself, which appears to date from the tenth century, then we must be careful how we cast doubts on the possibility of similar gatherings of Masons, as enjoined in the Old Charges.

The mention of Beverley gives me an opportunity of bringing forward a curious coincidence of phrase between Gild records and Old Charges, on which I would be glad of an expert opinion. Bro. Knoop has confined his attention almost entirely to the concluding portion of the Constitutions—the Charges General and Singular. But other codes were put into the mouths of Nimrod and Euclid; and it is in one of these—the Euclid Charge—that the Wren MS. has the very curious reading:—

“that they should come assemble theyre and that they should have counsell in their castle how they might work the best to serve the Lord for his p’fit. . . .”

For ‘castle’ the normal reading is ‘craft.’

Now in Beverley the ‘castle’ figures in the ordinances of every Gild from at least as early as mid-fourteenth century, as a part of the outfit for the processions on Rogation Monday. Exactly what form it took, and what purpose it served, I am unable to say. I propose to quote a few of the references, slightly departing from strict chronological sequence, so as to give the best idea I can of their status and functions:—

1411: From a general order as to the Corpus Christi plays:—

That all and singular of the crafts who were wont to have and erect wooden castles to the honour of God and St. John of Beverley, or in future should have them hereafter for ever, should erect and ornament their castles every year in accustomed fashion under penalty of 6s. 8d. . . .

1416: From the ordinances of the Tanners:—

Item, yt ys ordeyned and statuted yerly for evermore to be kepte, That the presayd crafte of Tanners shall raise upe on castle of tree upon Monday in the Rogacion weeke, in the honor of Gode and the glorious confessor Saynt John; and the sayd brethren of Tanners to sytt in the same castell at the hour of prime and the tyme of processyon in clothynge all of one suyt, as nygh as yt maye be hade and gotten.

And also the brethren shall ryd at afternoyn in the sayme suyt, as other crafts doo, after ther old auntyent and laudable custom. And what brother as ys absent and comys not to sytt in the castell, nor rydds not at afternoyn, as ys aforesayd, he shall forfeit and paye to the comminaltie of the towne of Beverley xxd, and to the charges and expenses of the sayd occupaycon of Tanners other xxd. for ether default.

1428: From the ordinances of the Bakers (trans. from Latin):—

Inprimis, it is ordained and decreed, and by the assent and consent of the 12 Keepers confirmed, that there be of the same Bakers one co-Brotherhood to maintain a certain wooden castle to be erected on Rogation Mondays next the castle of the Fullers . . .

1375: Shoemakers:—

that none of the Gild of the Cobblers of Beverley be clothed anew in any other clothes except of the suit of his co-brethren on the day in which they assembled in their castle against the coming of Blessed John of Beverley . . .

1494: Merchants and Mercers (translated):—

Every one elected justly for the honour and good governance of the craft and castle, and not in mere derision, elected Alderman and refusing to serve, to pay 6s. 8d. to use of community, light and castle . . .

Every brother outside the castle on Monday in Rogation Week after prime, or the same day or afternoon not riding with the brethren, if in health and able to ride, shall pay 3s. 4d.

1493: Drapers—a newly-formed Gild:—

That the Drapers shall have a confraternite among thame self, and a Castell as other crafts hafe . . .
that in worship of God and of our Lady and Saynt John of Beverley yerly on Cross Monday the sayde drapers shall have a castell honestly coverd as other crafts hafe, sette by twyx the castell of the merchaunts and the castell of wryghts . . .

I have never come across any similar reference among Gild records; and I trust that they may be deemed of sufficient interest to justify the somewhat lengthy extracts I have given. But my object in introducing the subject is to suggest that here we have matter within the scope of Bro. Knoop's paper; and that the substitution in the Wren MS. of 'castle' for 'craft' may not be merely a case of ignorant mis-copying, but rather the accidental intrusion of a word which, while not unlike the word copied, might (to the copyist) be reasonably expected there. If it could be shown that the Gildsmen assembled in their 'castles' employed their time in discussions of Craft 'ways and means,' then we should have a good case for the truth of my suggestion; and—and this is what I have chiefly in my mind—a broad hint as to the provenance of the original of the Wren MS. But I cannot offer any proof that business was talked or transacted in the 'castles'; Rogation Monday was not, so far as I can find, a 'Prime Gild' day for any of the Trades, though the following day was the annual election day for the Tanners and later for the Drapers.

I would like to add, in this connection, that I am inclined to think that Gild resemblances in the Old Charges which take the form of just a word or two embedded in the text, especially if they represent peculiar variations from the normal—and I think it is probable that many such exist—might furnish the most valuable material towards determining the dates and localities to which the MSS. belonged. But it would be a stupendous task to search for them.

Bro. Knoop has this evening broached a big subject and an interesting one; but one which cannot lead to results of the fullest value until many more sources are tapped on both sides—I mean among both Gild records and Old Charges—and I hope that further contributions will be brought forward in the discussion of this paper.

Brethren, I have great pleasure in proposing a hearty vote of thanks to Bro. Knoop for a paper which must have cost a good deal in industry and research.

 Bro. T. M. CARTER said:—

I am glad to add my thanks to Bro. Knoop for his very interesting relation of the Old Charges to the life of the operative Mason and to other mediæval conditions.

In glancing through the Bibliography which Bro. Knoop has cited, no mention is made of Stella Kramer's work, *English Craft Guilds*, published in America about a year ago. This is a very comprehensive compilation from almost all available sources, of documentary evidence of the conditions and regulations of these Guilds from the earliest times, and it would be interesting to see whether the points of resemblance and difference which Bro. Knoop has

noted could be amplified or modified by going carefully through her data for that purpose. But I have had no opportunity of doing this, and, maybe, some other brother will do so.

Many interesting matters arise from this paper and it may not be considered quite irrelevant if I append a few stray notes on two of them:— (1) The Search for false work, and (2) the Masons' Marks.

While it is true that on neither of these points have the Charges anything to say, both were undoubtedly the custom of the Craft.

Though late in date, the evidence adduced by Bro. Conder in his standard work on the Masons' Company, *The Hole Craft and Fellowship of Masonry*, shows that this survival in London of the Operative and Speculative Masonry of the past put actively into operation the Right of Search for Stone given them under their Charter.

I quote from Conder's book:—

p. 147. Item of Expenditure. 1620.

Spent by the Wardens at the search for Purbeck Stone £1. 3. 8.

p. 149. 1622.

Fined Thomas London for taking stone unsearched 6. 0.

Bro. Conder adding the note: "When stone arrived in the river, the Company sent searchers to see if it was of the required thickness before it was allowed to be landed. Any stone found not to be of the proper size was forfeited to the Company, and sold by them for small work."

p. 200. 1678.

In April of this year we find the Company exercising its powers, granted by the Charter, of making a general search in order to discover any persons working as Masons within the seven miles radius who were not free of the Company. All the works then in progress were visited and the names of all the workmen taken down.

In the year 1679 the right of searching for ill-wrought stone, and the fees arising therefrom, were farmed out to Mr. William Hammond, a member of the Company, for the sum of £27 for the year.

p. 231. In 1683, the profits arising from the Company's right of search were farmed out to the renter Warden at £20 per ann.

p. 242. The following particulars occur this year of a "search" made of stone lying in the River Thames:—

Landed on Hammerslys Wharf for Mr. Woolfe as followith, viz:
Of Purbeck 2900 foot, and 200 of channel; Broke 30 foot as bad and deficient.

p. 242. Nov. 12, 1701.

A general search was ordered to be made.

The district covered was to be divided into three divisions: a number of members under a Warden was ordered to meet at the Rainbow Coffee House in Fleet Street to search the Westminster district and the West End: at 7 a.m. another party was ordered to meet at Martin's Coffee House, near Guildhall, to search the City: and a third party was to meet at the George at Bridge House to search Southwark and the ships in the river.

The following week the Court met to receive particulars of the general search.

In the following January (1702) we find the Court order that the Clerk do write to Mr. Wood, Mr. Dye, also to the Marblers at Swanage, to Mr. Gilbert and Mr. Tobey at Portland, relating to the badness and undersized stone sent by them, and of the Company's resolution to break the same wherever they find it, &c., &c.

their stones, and possibly such were paid by piece work rather than by journey; and it may well be that a highly skilled craftsman coming to a new work where he was unknown might still have to prove his worth there.

In this way, too, we may have some explanation of the comparatively small number of varieties in the marks used. Though in Scotland, and particularly in the border counties, where defensive castles were supplying continuous work for generations of craftsmen, and where, therefore, the mason was less migratory, a central system of registering marks may have early developed, it is unlikely that the travelling mason always used the same mark; one might be registered for him at the particular Lodge when he signed on, and he would use it as often as required when working at that job; but it is very likely, at any rate in the earlier centuries, that the same man might use quite another mark when going elsewhere. This would account for the very wide distribution of similar marks.

BRO. W. J. WILLIAMS said:—

The paper we have before us to-day deals with an interesting branch of our history, and we are in debt to our Bro. Knoop for bringing before us the results of his comparison between the Old MS. Charges of our operative Ancestors and the various Gild ordinances. This comparison has shown us among other things that Fraternities existing side by side with our ancient Brethren proceeded much upon the same lines and were organized in the same general way, saving always the special adaptations which were necessitated by the distinctive characteristics of the particular body for whose government the legislation was ordained.

The following observations occur to me: —

In addition to the few authorities referred to in the paper, those Brethren who decide to follow the matter of Gild history further may be safely recommended to read the late Canon H. F. Westlake's book, entitled *Parish Gilds of Medieval England*, London Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (1919). This contains a list and an analysis of the 507 Gilds who made returns to Richard II. in 1389, which are preserved in the Public Record Office, and so it supplements Toulmin Smith's work in that and in other respects. Only a few of these relate to Craft Gilds, and if the Masons made any return it has not survived. Those returns which do survive include Whittawyers, Barbers, Cutlers, Glovers, Painters, Pouchmakers, Carpenters, Girdlers, Saddlers, Minstrels and Brewers (all London Gilds).

Under the heading "Charges Singular 6°" the paper deals with the question of restriction on the number of Apprentices. How far the Masons' Charges were actually observed is a matter which may be open to question. Probably they were supplemented or varied according to local or other conditions.

In the City of London Letter Book N, fo. 175b, are certain ordinances made for the Masons, including one dealing with this very point. It is dated 24th October in the 13th year of the reign of Henry VIII. (1520).

This I hope to be able in a later contribution to set out in full, but it must for the present suffice to say that it provides that the Master of such Apprentices must first present him to the Wardens and six Liverymen of the Fellowship, so that they may perceive whether he has good capacity to practise and learn the Mistere and have also his right limbs. The Master was to pay a fee to the Fellowship, and fines were incurred for non-compliance with the ordinance.

Only one apprentice was allowed until the time the Master was admitted into the livery, and then the Master might have two and no more. When the Master had been twice a Warden of the Fellowship he could have three apprentices and no more, however auntyent or substantiall he might be.

Changing conditions of labour were inevitably affecting the rights and monopolies of the Company, and in 1719 the opinion of Mr. Sergeant Pengelly was sought and given that the Charter could not be operative in compelling all those who worked as Masons to become members of the Company, and that "persons who are not members of the Company, although they do exercise the trade of Masonry within the limits of the Charter, are not subject to the view or search of the Company, unless they do voluntarily submit thereunto."

(2) *Marks.* As Bro. Knoop says, although Masons undoubtedly made use of marks, the Charges do not refer to them.

In the case of the Blacksmiths and Bladesmiths and Helmetmakers and such like, the articles they made and were ordered to mark were for common use and interchange, and it was a reasonable requirement, in the interest both of the craftsman and of the public, that an approved mark should be put upon them as a guarantee of good work.

But the stone mason's work was not for common interchange, his stone provided material for the building of which it became a permanent part. Marks upon it would, therefore, merely be private concerns between himself and his masters, and there was no need for such a trade custom to be matter for a Charge.

The subject of Masons' Marks is a very interesting one, but still somewhat chaotic.

Much interesting matter relating to it is to be found in Prof. Coulton's book, *Art and the Reformation*, which all Masons should read.

He clearly distinguishes between the banker-mark (or bench-mark, or mark made to pass the benchman or foreman), the position mark, and the personal mark occasionally—indeed, rarely—made by the Mason proud of his achievement.

Indeed, these last more often put their full name rather than a mark, and this most frequently to some sculpture, of which there is a good example in the finely-executed historiated Capital in the twelfth century Church of St. Pierre at Chauvigny, near Poitiers, representing the adoration of the Magi, where the sculptor has put a large scroll beneath the abacus, and the inscription GOFRIDUS ME FECIT: just as also one of the Capitals in the fine Narthex of the old Benedictine Abbey of Fleury at St. Benoit sur Loire has the inscription UNBERTUS ME FECIT.

The idea that all these marks so freely found on the face of stones in the mediæval building were of this kind must be abandoned; as Prof. Coulton says: "The banker mark was a business voucher imposed upon the Mason from above, it was not originally 'I will sign my stone,' but 'You must sign your stone.'"

And yet we know that the great majority of stones were not so signed.

Recently I saw, in the short length of outside wall between two buttresses at the S.W. angle of the twelfth century Church at Corbigny, near Nevers, some score or more stones just above the lower basement drip course, in four or five courses of large ashlar, all of which were clearly marked with the well-known types of Masons' Marks—three marks were frequently repeated on contiguous stones, a few others were single examples; an examination (no more casual than that by which these marked stones had been revealed) around the rest of the church at walking level only showed one or two marked stones here and there.

Such is the experience frequently met with. In the fine fourteenth century tithe barn at Bradford-on-Avon, on the inner wall between the two small porches on the South side, a large number of Masons' Marks is to be seen, and but few elsewhere; and in the broad triforium walk behind the Choir at Gloucester it is only at one part on the North side that they are found together in any great number.

If the craftsman, then, was under the order, "You must sign your stone," it is clear that all were not all the time under that order.

Possibly, newcomers to a Lodge, strangers whose work had to be proved, before they could be accepted without further question, were required to mark

As to Charges Singular 15°.

This regulation appears to relate to the maintenance of the division of the very distinct processes of hewing the stone (which was done in the Lodge) and setting it in its place in the building.

Both classes were Masons, but there were Masons who were Hewers and Masons who were Layers or Setters.

Our Brother in quoting the Regulation made in 1356 that "every man of the trade may work at any work touching the trade if he be perfectly skilled and knowing in the same," proceeds to the inference that this would at least make it legal for strange Masons to follow their calling in London.

It seems to me that this inference is not sustainable. The question to be decided was one between these two sorts of Masons in the City of London, and the Regulation had reference only to Masons of the City, and certainly not to any outsiders or foreigners as they were called. The clause must be read and construed in connection with its context. It simply means that the Masons of the City could do any kind of Masonic work if really capable of doing it.

Referring to "Gild Rules which have no counterparts in the Charges" it is quite clear that in the City of London the Masons Company were fully empowered to search and examine and approve or condemn stones brought into the City. This appears from Bro. Conder's book on the Masons Company and from the Letter Books of the City which I hope hereafter to bring before this Lodge.

The inference appears to be that the Old Charges were not looked upon as providing for every question which might arise, but were capable of being supplemented, and were in fact added to, by such ordinances as those appearing in the City Letter Books.

It seems reasonable to suppose that neither Masons nor any other tradesmen could without authority from the Rulers of their locality assume to themselves the right to forfeit condemned stones or other articles. Hence such matters would not come within the ambit of the MS. Charges which had to do with the history and internal management of the Craft.

Bro. VIBERT said:—

By confining himself to the text of one version of the Old Charges, Bro. Knoop missed one or two points which are raised by the variant readings in other manuscripts. One of these is the reference in *York* 1, which directs that the apprentice shall be no alien. I discussed this in my Inaugural Address (*A.Q.C.* xxxiv., 212-217). I then stated that I could not find any warrant for the restriction in the Statutes, except for the single instance of the worsted-workers of Norwich, but that it is laid down in an Act of Elizabeth that the apprentice in certain specified callings may only be the Master's son or the son of a person with the property qualification. In practice this excluded the alien, but the Freemasons were artisans to whom the restriction did not apply. I have not come across this provision in Gild law, and I would like to ask Bro. Knoop if he has met with it anywhere except among the York Bowers whom he quotes. It is suggestive of the conditions in the Craft itself in the days of the Stuarts when aliens were ousting the indigenous artist. This is consistent with the date of *York* 1, which belongs to the early part of the seventeenth century.

The Charges as they are presented in the *Haddon* MS. are not free from corruptions, and the numbering is different to that usually found.

It combines the First and Second Charges Singular of the standard form. The First Charge ends with "truly served," which in the *Haddon* MS. is "well served." The Second Charge commences with the words:—

That no master take no work but he take it reasonable so that the Lord may be well and truly served with his own good (etc.).

The *Haddon* MS. runs straight on "well served and truly with his own good," making one sentence of the two Charges, by leaving out a number of words. I take the sense of the two Charges, read together, to be not merely that he is only to charge a fair price, but also that he is not to charge an unduly low price, trusting to recoup himself at the expense of his workmen. I have not found anything quite similar in such Gild rules as I have been able to consult.

Bro. Knoop has found no precise parallel to the First General Charge. But the first "point," as it is termed, of the Articles of the Gild of Garlekhith (*T.S.*, 3) is that "he love God and Holy Church and his neighbours," and the Gild of the Hammermen of Ludlow (*A.Q.C.* xii., 108) lays down, as the second Charge, that you shall be true to our Sovereign Lord the King [etc.].

I am very interested in his discovery of provisions in Gild law corresponding to the injunction in Charge Singular Three that the apprentice shall be whole of limb. I have for years been trying to find any, and the nearest I had to it was a statement by Dr. John Hall, Chyrurgyen, who in 1565 wrote a treatise entitled: *A Historicall Expostulation; against the beastlye Abuses both of Chyrurgerie and Physyke in oure time* [etc.]. This was preceded by a letter addressed to the loving readers, in which he says: "What availeth the goodly orders taken by our forefathers and ancient authors that none should be admitted to the arte of chirurgery that are miscreate or deformed of body?" But of any such rules I had found no record.

The Fourth Charge of the *Haddon* MS. is corrupt. The words "and that hath served six or seven years at the least" are out of place, as Bro. Knoop suggests, by his printing of the *Holywell* text as well.

The Sixth Charge of the *Haddon* MS. is one that is peculiar to the G.L. Family. That is to say, that at some date subsequent to the first framing of the code it was inserted in the text (now missing) from which the G.L. Family generally derives. Accordingly, it is interesting to note that the provisions are found all over the country in the Gilds, at York, Exeter and London, and also at a very early date. But yet it was not in the Charges as we have them in the *William Watson*, which purports to give us the code approved by Henry VI. and his Council. This suggests that an emendation was carried out to bring the Craft into line with Gild legislation generally, but that only certain localities in fact became aware of it.

The Seventh Singular. The text is not clear. The rule, as we see from other versions, is to the effect that the Master shall give pay to his Fellow but as he may deserve it so that the Lord may not be deceived through false workmen. This zeal for the interests of the employer is not a common feature of Gild law: indeed I wonder if it can be paralleled in any other trade.

The Tenth Charge is really a combination of two, and the Eighth, Ninth, and the first part of the Tenth are all connected.

With regard to the prohibition of hazard, etc., I have dealt with this in detail at *A.Q.C.* xxxiv., 216, and, as Bro. Knoop observes, the many variations of it in our Old Charges reflect the progress of the legislation on the subject.

Twelve is of interest because it exists in two forms, the *Haddon* text being an intermediate and distorted version. The simpler form as we have it in the *Wood* text is: "That no mason walke abroad in the night from his lodging, except one or two of his brethren or fellowes go with him. that they may testify that he was in no evil company." This is straightforward and is indeed a rule in monastic orders to-day. But if we turn back to the *William Watson*, we find that there the rule originally had, after "company" the words "For if he so doe there [is] a Lodge of fellowes to punish the sin." This is interesting as it suggests some tribunal of fellowes as distinct from Masters. In the *Harris* Form we have: "If you be in a Town or Corporation where there is a Lodge of sufficient fellowes you shall not go [etc.]." This is apparently a late attempt at improving some text, which, as we see it in the *Haddon*, read as though the Lodge of Fellowes was in the town. But the *Harris* version of the rule is in fact nonsense.

The Fifteenth Charge has perhaps a somewhat wider significance than Bro. Knoop gives to it. It prohibits the communication of trade secrets to Layers, the unskilled workmen. We meet with a similar injunction among the Swordmakers (*A.Q.C.* x., 15, and Riley, 547). "That none of the said craft shall teach his journeyman the secrets of his trade as he would his apprentice." The practice here enjoined may have a very important bearing on the development of the Craft at a later date.

Sixteen again is defective. The rule enjoins that if you have moulded stones in place you are to set him a fortnight at least in work, but if you have no stones for him to work then refresh him to the next Lodge with money, etc. The *Haddon MS.* leaves out everything between *his place* and *ye shall refresh*.

William Watson, Tew and *Dauntsey* have six more Charges which disappear in the later forms. They enjoin the Mason: (i.) to work truly upon the working day so that he may live honestly upon the holy day; (ii.) to receive his pay contentedly; (iii.) to endeavour to compose the quarrels of his brethren; (iv.) when acting for the Master to be a true mediator between him and the fellows; (v.) when steward in the Lodge to give a true account of his stewardship; (vi.) when he sees a less skilful fellow in danger to spoil the stone, to inform and teach him honestly so that the Lord's work be not spoiled.

This last injunction can be paralleled from the Articles of the Whittawyers as given by Riley, p. 232. Brentano says it is specially frequent among the Masons, no doubt with this Charge in his mind. (*T.S.* cxxx.). The first of these additional Charges suggests that the Mason is not to work on holidays; this we find laid down in the Gild of the Fullers of Lincoln, to which Bro. Knoop refers in this paper. They shall not work after dinner on Saturdays or on any church festival. (*T.S.*, 180.) The provision as to the Steward, in the Lodge, which we also find much more fully in the *Regius Poem*, is one I have not found in any Gild ordinances, and it seems to be appropriate only to the special conditions of a Lodge.

It would be possible to add a number of illustrations to those given by Bro. Knoop, of Gild regulations on such points as using bad language, quarrelling, attendance at the annual meeting and so on. But they would add nothing to the argument. He has brought out quite clearly that, except for the Eighth and Ninth General Charges, these Charges can all be paralleled in Gild legislation, and it is to be observed that there are no provisions in them for which we have to go outside the Gilds of our own country, nothing suggesting importation from French or German builders' organizations. The one feature that did distinguish the Freemasons was that they travelled, and accordingly their ordinances provide rules on the subject which other Gilds were not called on to furnish. In some Gilds the members provided funds for those going on pilgrimages, as at Lincoln, for instance. (*T.S.*, 177). But nothing is said as to the conduct of the pilgrims themselves on their travels. The majority of the Craft Gilds knew nothing of travelling.

Fallou alleges that a regulation was in force in early German building Fraternities enjoining silence while at work. (Gould I., 111.) This is monastic and quite foreign to the Gild spirit. Our Old Charges know nothing of any such regulation, nor did our Gilds, I imagine. But the rule would have been in force in monasteries in this country at the time. The German Steinmetz rules in 1563 direct that the workmen are not to run together in Lodge to chatter. (Gould I., 128.)

Although it does not come strictly within the scope of this paper, reference may be made to these Steinmetz Ordinances, the first of which are dated 1459 and are therefore probably closely contemporary with our own Charges General and Special. They are quite distinct although as they are strictly operative they naturally include a number of similar provisions. But the two codes are independent productions. The opening Invocation of the German texts refers to travelling Masons and instructions as to what they are to do in strange Lodges. There is a definite provision for the help of brethren who are in distress or sick. The apprentice free of his indentures is entitled to his mark, and no craftsman

may alter his mark without the consent of all his associates. Apprentices are to be formally enrolled and obligated. They may not be enticed away.

So that these Ordinances have several of the points of Gild law that Bro. Knoop notes as absent from our Charges. But some of them can also be found in Lodges in our own country, in legislation which we can speak of as supplementary to the Charges themselves. Bro. Knoop himself quotes the London Regulations for the trade of Masons of 1356 in this connection. At Swalwell the apprentice had to be enrolled within forty days.

At Alnwick it is expressly laid down that the apprentice must be entered and given his Charge within a year. (Gould II., 262.) The Alnwick rules also provide for assistance to brethren in difficulties and for grants to their widows and children. In this Lodge the brethren sign with their marks in the Scottish fashion.

The position in Scotland is, of course, quite different. The Lodges are themselves Trade Gilds or closely associated with them; they know nothing of our Old Charges until their importation in the reigns of Elizabeth and James. But in England it is almost certain, not only that marks were carefully recorded, and strictly adhered to, but, as Bro. Knoop himself concludes by suggesting, that the Lodges looked after their distressed brethren and their dependants without needing any specific injunction on the point. The other omissions he mentions can be accounted for simply by saying that the conditions of the Fraternity were such that regulations as to residence, freedom of the city, search for false work, and working in the Master's presence, were not applicable to a society which was always external to city organizations, and did much of its work as a body in a common workroom, the Lodge. It is fairly evident that the Craft custom was that the work in the Lodge only began with daylight and ceased at dark: obviously it could hardly have been carried on by artificial light. The common Gild rule prohibiting working by candlelight was therefore provided for by trade custom, which we see specifically recited in the York Orders, for instance, as given in vol. xxxv. of the Surtees Society.

Bro. Knoop refers to the enrolment of apprentices, and the term "enter'd apprentice." This was introduced by Anderson, from the Scottish Lodges, and these we find over and over again to be Gilds and Incorporations, in which the apprentice was definitely "buked" and the term "enter'd" was a record of that fact. Whether there was such a system in England or not I am uncertain.

Bro. C. F. SYKES said:—

Bro. Knoop's paper is full of interest. I hope when it is published in the *Transactions* he may consider it advantageous to include the Regulations for the trade of Masons, sanctioned by the Mayor and Aldermen in 1356.

It is curious that not one of the General Charges can be supported by a resemblance in the London Regulations for Masons. The Singular Charges are supported in five instances.

On the other hand, the spirit of the General Charges is reflected to a greater extent in our ritual than is that of the Singular Charges.

In the introduction to the paper Bro. Knoop says:—"In London according to Professor Unwin municipal enforcement of fraternity regulations is not found much before 1460."

I find in Unwin's book at page 47: "The Whittawyers is the only craft that we find bringing a full set of fraternity ordinances to be sanctioned by the Mayor and Aldermen, and the reason for their doing so probably was that they were pieceworkers to the Skinners, and that unless they got authorization for their fraternity, it would be liable to denunciation as an unlawful combination." These ordinances were assented to by the Mayor and Aldermen in 1346, which is 114 years before 1460.

Among the Gild rules which have no counterparts in the Charges, Bro. Knoop quotes (vii.) "Use and counterfeiting of marks."

Bro. Gould in his *History*, chapter ii., "The Old Charges of British Freemasons," writes: "Another peculiarity of the 'Melrose' text is its addition to the third of the special charges, viz.: 'Also that no M^r. nor fellow supplant on other of his mark.'"

On the subject of the relief of poverty and distress, Bro. Knoop says, "the Charges are silent." The conclusion of Charges Singular 16 in the present paper reads, "ye shall refresh him with money unto the next Lodge." Other of the Old Charges contain similar expressions. The *Melrose* says, "if lawful members cannot be given work they must be furnished with money." The *Buchanan*, "and if he have noe stones for him hee shall refresh him with money to the next Lodge." The *Holywell*, "If there be no stones to work he shall Supply him with Money to Bring y^m to y^e next Lodge."

Does not this imply a form of relief for the needy? The next sentence in the *Holywell* MS. is suggestive, too: "There shall Every Mason Serve his distress wheather it be task or Journey & from y^e fund you shall be repayd."

If, however, we allow both these, it does not appear that the Old Charges made any considerable provision for relief. This may be capable of explanation. The predecessor of the Craft Gild was the trade religious fraternity, and it was, indeed, the latter which provided the power of securing the recognition of the Craft Regulations, Articles or Ordinances. In the Fraternity Ordinances it was definitely stated that certain alms were to be contributed by the members. As early as 1271 the Fraternity Ordinances of the Cordwainers were sanctioned by the Mayor. Apprentices had to contribute 2/- to the poor box. A stranger wishing to enter the trade had to pay the same "for the relief of the impoverished." A little later the Painters' Ordinances provide that fines for offences should go half to the city and half to the trade. Every newcomer should give 2/- to the 'confrarie,' every one who keeps house by himself to give 8d. in four quarterly instalments, journeymen taking more than 18/- a year to give 4d. and each piece worker 4d. The money to be collected by the wardens was to be spent in whatever manner they and other good men of the Fraternity considered best for the honour of God and the Fraternity.

The extract which Bro. Knoop quotes is from the Fraternity Ordinances of the Whittawyers. They also provided for funerals of indigent members. "And if any one of the said trade shall depart this life and have not wherewithal to be buried, he shall be buried at the expense of their common box; and when any one of the said trade shall die, all those of the said trade shall go to the Vigil and make offering on the morrow."

All the evidence we have of the Fraternities points to the importance of the alms box as a great feature in their activities.

Fraternities grew up and gathered influence under the protection of the Church, and as Masons were peculiarly closely associated with the Church, they had their Fraternity also. This, Bro. Williams brought out in his paper on "Archbishop Beckett and the Masons Company," showing that a Fraternity of Masons in London existed at St. Thomas of Acres, and that members bequeathed money to the Fraternity.

The Fraternity and Craft Gild or Mystery went side by side. Is it not possible that as the Fraternity legislated for the relief of poverty and distress, there was no need for the 'Mystery' to do so? And may not this apply to the Old Charges, too?

Bro. GEO. W. BULLAMORE writes:—

The Gilds had a religious bond and the Craft Gilds were originally fraternities of masters who were also workmen banded together to burn candles to the patron saints of the crafts. The Gild and the Mystery or Craft were therefore the same. Later, however, the entrance fee was raised, costly masterpieces were demanded, and as a result a body of journeymen grew up outside the Gild and often formed a fraternity of their own. When the Masters of the Gild were sworn to govern the mystery, they either had to suppress or control

this journeymen gild. The religious bond of the Masons was, perhaps the work itself, viz., the erection of sacred buildings, but with the development of domestic architecture, the Masons would form candle gilds to the patron saints of Masonry which would practically resemble the other Craft Gilds. If we take the Pewterers as an example of the organization of a mystery we find that there were two Gilds, the Brotherhood of the Assumption of our Lady and the Fraternity of St. Michael the Archangel of Bachelors of the Craft of Pewterers. The Master and Wardens of the latter were chosen from the former, but they are described as "A fraternity or perfect guild of one or two wardens and commonalty of the yeomen of the mistery of Pewterers, of the brothers and sisters of the Fraternity of the same mystery and of others who of their pleasure are willing to be of the same fraternity or guild within the city of London."

The Brotherhood that Anderson had in mind in 1723 was of a similar character. Its master was to be among the fellows, and masters and fellows were only to be made in the superior gild.

It is obvious that such a system must lead to three sets of ordinances, viz., ordinances for the gild, ordinances for the journeymen gild issued by the same governing body, and general ordinances for the whole of the mystery. It must be borne in mind, therefore, that Bro. Knoop's comparisons are between a post-Reformation reduction used for ceremonial purposes in secret, and certain ordinances issued by pre-Reformation gilds under varying conditions. If we augment our knowledge of Masonry in information from sources other than the O.C., it is very difficult to hit upon any specific difference which distinguishes it from other crafts.

Like the Pewterers, most of the Gilds admitted non-craftsmen and the government of the Craft or Mystery was sometimes in the hands of non-members of the Craft.

The City ordinance which permitted men free of one Gild to follow another Mystery would tend to produce this. (A curious example of the difference between the Gild and the Mystery is shown by the case of the Swordmakers. They were of the Gild of the Armourers, but to avoid dispute were adjudged to be of the Mystery of the Cutlers and the Mystery of the Armourers in alternate years.)

An Installation ceremony is suggested by a passage of Morley's *History of the Armourers*. "The crowning of the master and wardens with garlands kept for the purpose was a constant practice and attended with a good deal of singular ceremony."

About 1475 the Pewterers were using the expression Brethren of the Country "sworn to the King and the Craft."

The most difficult point on which to trace an analogy is that of a secret ceremony. The Gilds usually pledged their members to secrecy, but in only one instance that I know of is there a suggestion of a secret ceremony of admission. One of the Cambridge Gilds laid it down that the objects of the Gild were to be explained publicly to the candidate before admission. This implies, I think, that the entrance itself was a private ceremony. Perhaps the secrecy was so general that mention of it other than with Gild business was not necessary.

The dispute of 1356 was between Yeomen Layers and Yeomen Hewers of London, and the decisions could only refer to them, and would not entitle foreigners to work in the city. The city ordinances were sufficient protection. It was probably different for ecclesiastical building, and the Masons Charter of 1677 did not permit them to interfere with the building of St. Paul's and other churches.

The size of building stone was standardized, and the Masons Company of London had the right of search with forfeiture of unsatisfactory material. In this they resembled other Craft Gilds.

The Gilds seem to have passed from religious to municipal control, and this may have taken place about 1460; but before that date they were not quite helpless as regards the enforcement of ordinances. In addition to the municipal enactments as regards the mysteries we have the following in the Rules of

the Shearmen:—"If a brother break his oath he shall be punished by the law of our mother Holy Church," and "that the said wardens shall make certification unto the Officers of the Bishop of London to the intent that they by the law spiritual compel the said person so being rebel and disobedient for to pay and satisfy the said fine."

A similar provision was made in other instances. A notary was sometimes admitted to administer the oaths and thus ensure proof that the oaths were properly administered.

Bro. Knoop's paper gives rise to some very interesting questions, but, in the absence of the Ordinances of such Gilds as that of the Quatuor Coronati and of St. John, which probably existed at some time as a Yeomen Gild, it will be very difficult to make a complete study of the subject.

Bro. GILBERT S. DAYNES writes:—

Bro. Knoop is, I consider, to be congratulated upon the subject-matter he has chosen for his paper. He has brought together many quotations from various Gild Ordinances and has used them in a manner both interesting and instructive. Clearly, a close comparison between the MS. Constitutions—or as they have been familiarly termed Old Charges—and the many Gild Ordinances that are still preserved may possibly throw further light upon the precise use to which the Old Charges were put and who exactly came within their laws.

Before discussing the details of the paper there is one general point in relation to it upon which I should like to have some definite body of opinion. Which came first—the Old Charges or the Gild Ordinances? Craft Gilds were in existence in towns certainly by 1260 and probably earlier, while the Social or Religious Gilds were still older. We know that the building of ecclesiastical edifices and castles became continuous after the Norman Conquest, so may we say that the Old Charges came down to us from originals older than any of the Gild Ordinances? In effect, did the Gild Ordinances—Social or Craft—derive any assistance from the Old Charges when being drawn up, or *vice versa*, or was it that each class was framed independently of the other?

In his paper, Bro. Knoop has quoted from many of the Gild Ordinances, which appear in Toulmin Smith's *English Gilds*, as if they all appertained to Craft Gilds, although some of them appear to be Social or Religious Gilds, and there is no indication that they were in any sense Craft Gilds. Of course, later Craft Gilds may have used some of the older Social Gild Ordinances as precedents, but it is a little confusing to have comparisons made from both types without drawing any distinction.

With regard to the oath, which the Old Charges as well as the Gild Ordinances required should be taken, we learn from the Coventry Leet Book that, in 1457, the Court Leet at Coventry alleged that:

Great discord daily falleth in the city amongst the people of divers crafts because that divers masters of crafts sue in spiritual courts divers people of their craft, affirming that they have broken their oaths made in breaking divers their rules and ordinances, which rules oft-times be unreasonable and the punishment of the said masters over excess; which if it continued by liklihood would cause much people to void out of this city.¹

From this it would appear that where an oath to keep any Ordinances or Charges was broken the offender could be brought before the spiritual courts and penalties imposed. It is therefore quite easy to see why the imposition of the oath was such a common stipulation amongst the Gilds.

A doubt has been cast, I believe, as to whether in some cases the oath given in the Old Charges was taken on the Bible. It has been suggested that

¹ *Coventry Leet Book* ii., p. 302.

the oath was taken upon the roll or book containing the Old Charges. It would be interesting to find out whether there is any evidence of the oath prescribed by the Gild Ordinances being taken on the Book of Ordinances. If the object of the oath was to bring any offender before one of the spiritual courts, then clearly the oath must have been taken in such a manner as would be recognized as binding by the court.

The number of apprentices that a Master might have was the subject of continual controversy during the mediæval ages, and much depended upon whether the matter was being considered from the point of view of the apprentice, the journeyman, or the master. In 1519, York, and in 1524, Coventry, removed all limitations as to the number of apprentices a craftsman might take. As might be supposed, the deciding factor in the policy of the Gilds was what was best for the masters.

Bro. Knoop seems to have gone astray in his comments upon Charges Singular 12. The ale-chamber is the cellar or place where the ale of the Gild was kept, and did not mean the Tavern or Ale House. Surely the Brother was forbidden to enter the ale-chamber because the officers of the Gild felt that a Brother entering alone would be subjected to too great a temptation, and might consume more than his share! The object of Charges Singular 12 would appear to have been designed to enable a Brother to prove an alibi, if necessary.

With regard to Charges Singular 16 we may note that in the Boke of Ordinances of the Carpenters of the City of London there was a clause as follows:—

If any brother go idle for default of work and another brother have work whereon he may work his brother, and that work be such that his brother can work in, then shall he work his brother before any other and give him as another man would take of him for the same work.¹

This, no doubt, refers to fellow workers in the same Gild who are not perhaps comparable to the "strange fellows," but still, having regard to the migratory character of the Masons, we can see some similarity.

Bro. Knoop refers to the enrolment of apprentices. It would be interesting to know more concerning what actually happened. Have any records of enrolment survived in Gild archives, as distinct from Municipal archives? We have records of the enrolment of apprenticeship Indentures in York, Norwich and other places, but I cannot recall any records of a similar nature emanating from the Gilds themselves. Clearly the Gild Ordinances provided for the enrolment of the Indentures in their own records, but were the Municipal records considered as an equivalent?

It was by means of the Gilds that much of the poverty of the craftsmen was relieved. The Carpenters of the City of London had this provision:—

If any brother or sister fall into poverty by God's hand or in sickness . . . so that he may not keep himself, then shall he have of the brotherhood each week fourteenpence during this poverty, after he hath lain sick a fortnight . . . and that he shall be so timely visited and holpen that he shall not for default of help be brought to nought, nor be undone of his estate ere he be holpen.¹

Bro. Knoop has given us eight headings in which the Gild Ordinances find no counterpart in the Old Charges. There are at least the following five that may be added:—

- i. Provision for the periodical election of officers with fines for not serving.
- ii. The wearing of a Livery by certain members of the Gild.
- iii. Attendance of the Brethren at Mass on certain specified days at a certain specified Church.

¹ *The 'Boke' of the Ordinances of the Carpenters of London*, by C. Welch, p. 13.

- iv. Periodical Feasting by the Brethren.
- v. Rules as to the Burial of deceased Brethren and the compulsory attendance thereat by the other Brethren.

I have chosen a few points at random as it would take too long to deal with each charge in detail, but I cannot close my notes without expressing my regret that Bro. Knoop has failed to make his comparisons sufficiently thorough. Except for an occasional quotation from the Regulations of the London Masons Company, approved in 1356, he has made no attempt to compare the Old Charges with such other Gild Ordinances of the Masons as have come down to us, particularly those of the Masons of the City of London (1481), Norwich (1572), Durham (1657) and elsewhere. If this had been done it might have enabled some of the many differences between the Masons Gild Ordinances and the Old Charges to be more fully appreciated. Again, the Ordinances of the Trade Gilds at Ludlow and the Charges of the Hammermen might have been compared with the Masons Gild Ordinances of, say, Norwich and the Old Charges. This might help towards the solution of the problem of whether the Old Charges belonged to all Masons, and were in addition to the Gild Ordinances of the Towns, or whether such Old Charges represented the Ordinances of any special class of Mason who were not subject in any way to such Gild Ordinances. In this connection I would draw attention to the absence of all penalties for disobedience in any of the Old Charges, whereas failure to obey any of the Gild Ordinances was invariably attended with a monetary penalty. This is a matter for some thought and may be an indication that the Old Charges were not complete laws by themselves, but were in addition to Gild Ordinances. However, as Bro. Knoop has not brought this aspect of the matter into focus, I do not propose to discuss it further. I hope, however, that what I have said in the concluding portion of these notes may induce Bro. Knoop, or some other Brother, to prepare a further paper on those lines, as I am sure it would form a very useful addition to this present one.

Bro. KNOOP, in reply, *writes*:—

I have to thank the W.M. and Brethren for the kind way in which they have received my paper and for their helpful and suggestive comments. The reason I made no reference to Stella Kramer or H. F. Westlake was that, unlike Riley and Toulmin Smith, neither sets out Gild Ordinances in full. With regard to Bro. Sykes's suggestion, I may say that the London Masons Regulations, 1356, are printed in Gould's *History*, vol. ii., as well as in Riley's *Memorials*. I am obliged to Bro. Sykes, too, for reminding me that the *Melrose* text forbids a Mason to take another's mark. By limiting myself to one version of the Old Charges, I have obviously missed some points.

I accept Bro. Daynes's view that I have gone astray in my comments on Charges Singular, No. 12, with regard to a Fellow going into town by night. I also recognise that my interpretation of the London Regulations for the Trade of Masons, 1356, made in commenting upon Charges Singular, No. 16, is probably wrong and that Bro. Williams and Bro. Bullamore are right. The Regulations were to allay disputes between Mason Hewers on the one part and Mason Layers and Setters on the other part, and when they state that "every mason of the trade may work at any work touching the trade, if he be perfectly skilled," they permit a Layer or Setter to do the work of a Hewer, if competent, but do not grant authority to strange Masons to work in London.

In reply to Bro. Daynes, I have not come across any Gild Register recording the enrolment of apprentices, though such registers did exist. *E.g.*, at Coventry the Capper's Ordinances required the names of apprentices to be entered in "the Craft book" and provided that every Master once in his year was to go through the whole Craft to every man's house and by the register

to call for every apprentice before him.¹ In reply to Bro. Vibert, with reference to the exclusion of aliens as apprentices, the Bristol Hoopers required apprentices to be "no rebels of Ireland, nor aliens, but English and liegemen to the King, our Sovereign Lord."² The York Tapiters were forbidden to take any apprentice who was not born under the allegiance of our lord the King.³

Two other examples of the injunction that an apprentice shall be whole of limb occur among the London Cutlers⁴ in 1420 and among the London Founders⁵ in 1456. The Regulations of 1420 ordained that no one was to become an apprentice who was not handsome of stature and had not straight and proper limbs.

In my paper, in commenting upon Charges Singular, No. 10, I stated that I had been unable to find a reference to hazard or dice in a fourteenth century Gild Ordinance, and had to content myself with quoting an Indenture of Apprenticeship of 1371. I have subsequently found such a reference in the Ordinances of the Gild of the Assumption at Cambridge, established in 1384 and returned in 1389:—

§8. If any of the brethren be wont to wander in the streets at night without good cause, or wont to play chess, dice, or be caught in suspect company or conducting himself improperly, wherefor the fraternity may be disturbed or defamed, and if after two warnings from the rectors he will not amend, he shall be expelled for ever and lose all benefit of the gild.⁶

In what concerns the W.M.'s interesting observations regarding the Castles, I feel that the Castles of the Beverley Minstrels were the actual dwelling places of the nobles: each Minstrel had his own circuit.

In conclusion, may I thank Bro. Daynes for his valuable suggestion of comparing the Old Charges, not with Gild Ordinances in general, as in my paper, but with Ordinances of Gilds of Masons in particular. I do not know whether sufficient material is available, but I shall endeavour to explore the field to see what I can find.

¹ *Coventry Leet Book* iii., pp. 670, 673.

² *Little Red Book of Bristol* ii., p. 163.

³ *York Memo. Bk.*, II., 190.

⁴ *Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London*, Letter Book I., p. 250.

⁵ *Letter Book, L.*, p. 375.

⁶ *Bateson, Cambridge Gild Records*, p. 73.

Festival of the Four Crowned Martyrs.

FRIDAY, 8th NOVEMBER, 1929.



THE Lodge met at Freemasons' Hall at 5 p.m. Present:—Bros. Rev. H. Poole, P.Pr.G.Ch., Cumberland & Westmorland, W.M.; George Norman, P.G.D., I.P.M.; H. C. de Lafontaine, P.G.D., S.W.; Gilbert W. Daynes, J.W.; W. J. Songhurst, P.G.D., Treasurer; Lionel Vibert, P.A.G.D.C., P.M., Secretary; Gordon P. G. Hills, P.A.G.Sup.W., P.M., D.C.; W. J. Williams, J.D.; Thos. M. Carter, P.Pr.G.St.B., Bristol, I.G.; John Stokes, P.G.D., Pr.A.G.M., West Yorks., P.M.; J. Heron Lepper, P.G.D., Ireland, P.M.; Arthur Heiron; David Flather, P.A.G.D.C.; and Rev. Walter K. Firminger, D.D., P.Dis.G.W., Bengal.

Also the following members of the Correspondence Circle:—Bros. P. Clemens, C. A. Newman, Major N. S. H. Sitwell, H. Spencer, W. T. Dillon, E. Eyles, G. T. Harley-Thomas, P.A.G.S.B., Geo. F. Pallett, Ed. H. Miller, Robt. Colsell, P.A.G.D.C., Ed. B. Holmes, H. Thurnton Gurner, A. G. Harper, Jos. J. Nolan, P.G.St.B., L. G. Wearing, Wallace Heaton, G.St.B., B. Telepneff, Ed. M. Phillips, S. W. Rodgers, P.A.G.R., A. W. Hare, H. G. Bennett, J. F. H. Gilbard, A. H. Smith, Walter H. Brown, P.G.Stew., F. Lace, P.A.G.D.C., E. A. Uttley, P.G.D., A. E. Gurney, I. Nesteroff, W. T. J. Gunn, J. J. Tesoriere, C. E. Newman, W. Brinkworth, A. F. Ford, A. P. Salter, F. J. Boniface, J. L. Smart, R. Wheatley, Lewis Edwards, A. Quick, and A. Ellis Wynter.

Also the following Visitors:—Bros. Herbert W. Lambert, W.M., La Belle Sauvage Lodge No. 3095; T. M. Chitty Thomas, Lodge of Felicity No. 58; C. Lambert Peterson, St. Andrews Lodge, Gothenberg; R. W. Knightley Goddard, P.M., Gibon Lodge No. 49, P.G.St.B.; G. C. A. Nassen, Bifrost Lodge, Sweden; Matthew Warren, P.M., South Norwood Lodge No. 1139; and Francis C. Polden, P.M., Anglo Colonial Lodge No. 3175.

Letters of apology for non-attendance were reported from Bros. R. H. Baxter, P.A.G.D.C., P.M.; S. T. Klein, L.R., P.M.; Rev. W. W. Covey-Crump, A.G.Ch., P.M.; J. T. Thorp, P.G.D., P.M.; Cecil Powell, P.G.D., P.M.; F. J. W. Crowe, P.A.G.D.C., P.M.; Sir Alfred Robbins, P.G.W., Pres.B.G.P., P.M.; and Wm. Watson, P.A.G.D.C.

Upon Ballot taken:—

Bro. BORIS TELEPNEFF. Residing at 10, Prince's Park Avenue, Golders Green, London, N.W. Director of Companies. Member of Lodge Harmony No. 600, Bradford, Yorks., and of The Aldwich Club Lodge No. 3794, London. Master Mason. Author of papers in *A.Q.C., Freemasonry in Russia*, xxxv. (1922). *Some Aspects of Russian Freemasonry during the reign of the Emperor Alexander I.*, xxxviii. (1925). *A few pages from the History of Swedish Freemasonry in Russia*, xxxix. (1926). *Johann August Starck, and his Rite of Spiritual Masonry*, xli. (1928).

was regularly elected a joining member of the Lodge.

One Lodge, one Library and Twenty-five Brethren were admitted to membership of the Correspondence Circle.

W. Bro. H. T. Cart de Lafontaine, P.G.D., the Master-Elect, was presented for Installation, and regularly installed in the Chair of the Lodge by Bro. H. Poole, assisted by Bros. John Stokes, George Norman, and Gordon P. G. Hills.

The following Brethren were appointed Officers of the Lodge for the ensuing year:—

Bro. G. W. Daynes	S.W.
„ W. J. Williams	J.W.
„ W. J. Songhurst	Treasurer
„ Lionel Vibert	Secretary
„ G. P. G. Hills	D.C.
„ T. M. Carter	S.D.
„ David Flather	J.D.
„ A. W. Oxford	Almoner
„ W. K. Firminger	I.G.
„ A. Heiron	Steward
„ B. Telepneff	Steward
„ J. H. MacNaughton	Tyler

The W.M. proposed and it was duly seconded and carried:—“That W. Bro. H. Poole, B.A., P.Pr.G.Ch., Cumberland & Westmorland, having completed his year of office as Worshipful Master of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge No. 2076, the thanks of the Brethren be and hereby are tendered to him for his courtesy in the Chair and his efficient management of the affairs of the Lodge, and that this Resolution be suitably engrossed and presented to him.”

The SECRETARY drew attention to the following

EXHIBITS:—

By Bro. Dr. JOHN STOKES.

Full Dress and Undress Clothing of Senior Grand Warden of England; date about 1820.

By Bro. HARRY BLADON.

Apron and Sash; R.A. Ireland.

Collar and Jewel: Rose Croix. Ireland.

Jewel of Master Mason: five-pointed star set with brilliants.

Jewels of Grand Officer and member, Red Cross of Babylon.

Centenary Jewel. Grand Master's Lodge, Grand Lodge of Ireland.

All formerly the property of Col. Jocelyn.

Goblet. engraved glass. Masonic Emblems and monogram: S.A.S.

By Bro. CART DE LAFONTAINE.


Oriental Embroidery; Armenian Mitre.

A hearty vote of thanks was passed to the Brethren who had kindly lent these objects for exhibition.

The WORSHIPFUL MASTER then delivered the following

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

FREEMASONRY IN PORTUGAL.



It has been said by more than one occupant of the Master's Chair in this Lodge that it is a difficult matter to break fresh ground on these occasions. The force of such a statement now appeals to me in a somewhat overwhelming manner. So I have cast about in my mind how I could excite interest in presenting what to many may be a new subject, in order to awaken attention, and to direct your thoughts to what may be termed one aspect of international Freemasonry. I therefore have selected as the subject of this, my Inaugural Address, a consideration of Masonry in Portugal.

Portugal, compared to other European countries, is small in size, and somewhat insignificant in the polity of nations, but we have only to look back to the past to see what a mighty influence she, in the days of her glory, wielded both on sea and land. Though sometimes involved in acrimonious disputes with the Governments of our country, we must never forget that she has on more than one occasion been to us a faithful ally. And there are certainly strong ties between the two peoples. This may be evidenced by some quotations from a modern work written by George Young, entitled *Portugal Old and Young*. In the early pages of that book Mr. Young tells us that: "In the agricultural class of Portugal there are still obviously English types; as, for instance, in certain villages of the Tagus valley, where Crusaders, among them yeomen from Devon and apprentices from London, settled centuries ago. Povos, a village on the Tagus, was until the seventeenth century known as Cornoalha, through its having been a Cornish settlement dating from the time of the taking of Lisbon from the Moors with the help of an English expedition. In the same way the House of Lancaster now only survives in Portugal as a not uncommon surname, Lencestre, whose bearers show no trace of their origin; whereas some red-headed, long-legged 'Saloyo' ('Saloyo' is the Portuguese for 'peasant') that you may meet riding after the fighting bulls over the water meadows of the Tagus may talk to you in the same soft voice, and with the same sly humour as he would in the meadows of the Tavy." Mr. Young, in another passage, reminds us that the Portuguese have left a deeper linguistic impression in their short regime over a few districts in India than we have in our centuries of rule over the whole country, while 'Pidgin English,' the 'Lingua franca' of the Far East, is in structure and vocabulary as much Portuguese as English. As to the literature of Portugal, ample testimony is given to the fact that it is most copious and characteristic, "though few of us English know of its existence. To most of us Portuguese literature probably suggests the 'Letters of a Portuguese Nun,' which are in French, or the 'Sonnets from the Portuguese,' which are in English." It is extraordinary that these Letters should have produced such a sensation as they undoubtedly did at the time of their appearance, but they fell upon a world that was just as eager for scandal and for raking over the social muck-heap as is the world to-day. I have read the Letters recently, and I can assure you that they fade away into insignificance when contrasted with the fervidly erotic character of some publications of present date. I suppose the ground for a curious delight

was that they were written by a nun of good family to a young soldier, who eventually became the Marquis de Charmilly, and who actually seduced this young lady in one of the houses attached to the convent. The Marquis had every facility for such an escapade, for at that time, the end of the seventeenth century, the rigid seclusion which was in force with regard to Portuguese women and girls did not extend to members of a religious body. The nuns of that day enjoyed more liberty in the way of receiving visits than did the married women in the towns. As a French writer remarks, "The pleasure of conversation was not the only pleasure that was allowed the visitor."

To return to Mr. Young. When he is writing about the Abbey church of Batalha in Portugal he remarks: "We are reminded when we look at Batalha Abbey" (a term which corresponds to our own Battle Abbey) "that the battle of Aljubarrota was won by the help of English bowmen and that the Treaty of Windsor and the marriage of John of Gaunt's daughter established the glorious national dynasty of Aviz and inaugurated the golden age of Portuguese nationality."

I remember well that when I first saw the wondrous Abbey, which is justly called the Westminster Abbey of Portugal, I was astounded to find in that comparatively small country anything so grandiose, so awe-inspiring, so desolately magnificent in its surrounding circle of unfinished chapels. It is here that one sees in the highest perfection that elaborate style of architecture known as the Manoelesque. It is to my mind very curious that there are traces of this ornamentation in parts of the inner structure of Rochester Cathedral. This does not seem to have been generally observed, but there it is, and clearly to be seen. I have alluded to "imperfect chapels"—whether they were left in this condition purposely or whether for want of money to finish them does not seem to be satisfactorily explained, but nothing more has ever been done to them. This is strange, especially when one reads that a certain king of Portugal, John V., being possessed apparently by that love of magnificence which characterized "le grand Monarque," Louis XIV. of France, made a wonder-house of the monastery-palace-barrack of Mafra. It is said that it took thirteen years to build: fifteen to thirty thousand workmen were employed: it possesses 866 rooms and 5,000 doors; 10,000 men could drill on the roof, and it cost over 20,000,000 crowns.

This much by way of introduction. We now come to our main subject. I think it may be said in brief that the history of Freemasonry in Portugal is the history of political intrigues and relentless persecutions. It is difficult to build up any continuous account of the various events, and that is largely owing to the want of reliable material, and in many instances the bricks are made of straw. But I think we can make a beginning by talking about what is apparently the genesis of the Masonic movement in Portugal.

In the Minutes of Grand Lodge for April 17th, 1735, when Lord Weymouth was Grand Master, we read about "A Petition from several Brethren now residing in and about the City of Lisbon in Portugal humbly praying that a Deputation may be granted to Mr. George Gordon for constituting them into a regular Lodge." Then follows, "The Prayer of which Petition was granted," and "Ordered . . . that the Secretary make out proper Deputation accordingly." George Gordon was a mathematician, and he wrote the mathematical part of Nathaniel Bailey's "Dictionarium Britannicum," an etymological English dictionary that was published in 1730. In Vol. IV. of the "Masonic Magazine" (1876-7) there is an open letter from Bro. W. T. Hughan to the Grand Lodge of Ohio, and in this he reproduces the following item of news from an issue of the *St. James' Evening Post* for the year 1736, and this is the item:—"They write from Lisbon that by authority of the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Weymouth, the then Grand Master of all Mason's Lodges, Mr. George Gordon, Mathematician, has constituted a Lodge of F. and A. Masons in that city, and that a great many merchants of the Factory" (probably a wine establishment) "and other people of distinction have been received and regularly made Freemasons. That Lord George Graham, Lord Forrester, and a great many gentlemen belonging to the English fleet, were present at constituting the

Lodge, and it is expected that in a short time it will be one of the greatest abroad." Bro. Dring (and how much we miss his visible presence) alluded briefly to this notice in his inaugural address, or at least in the appendix, which he was pleased modestly to style, "A tentative list of English references to, and works on Freemasonry, published before 1751."

A Portuguese writer, Emmanuel Borges Grainha, in his book on the history of Freemasonry in Portugal, to which I shall frequently refer, says that Gordon was the one who introduced Freemasonry into Portugal, and that there were two Lodges at Lisbon, one composed of Catholics, the other of Protestants. In 1738, a high official of the Inquisition, having heard of the presence of Masons in Lisbon, summoned several people to furnish further information. The first to give evidence was a Dominican, Charles O'Kelly, professor of theology at the College of Corpo-Santo. He confessed that in a restaurant of the street called Remolares a Masonic Lodge was held: that it was attended by several brethren; that the restaurant was kept by an Irishman called Rice. He then gave the names of the members, at the same time saying that he considered them all to be excellent Catholics, judging by their frequent attendance at the services in the church of the Corpo Santo. These members were in turn summoned to appear, and they confessed that they were Masons and that they attended the meetings of the Remolares Lodge: that nothing was done contrary to religion; that they were good Catholics and obedient servants of the Holy Father: but that they would give up Masonry, seeing that it was condemned by the Pope. Amongst those thus summoned by the Inquisition were the following:—Hugo O'Kelly, a retired Irish colonel; Denis Hogan, lieutenant in a cavalry regiment; Thomas French, merchant; Patrice (evidently meant for Patrick) Brown, a captain; James O'Kelly, dancing master to the Royal family; Michael O'Kelly, his brother, proprietor of a glass-factory; Charles Carroll, merchant; Charles Mardell, sergeant-major and German engineer (a curious combination); and three Dominican monks, Father Patrick O'Kelly, Father Tilan, and Father Leynan. The latter did not appear, he being abroad at this time. The Grand Master (that is the title given him) confessed that he had been a Mason for two years; that he only attended the Catholic Lodge, which was called "Royal House of Freemasons of Lusitania": that this Lodge was quite distinct from the Protestant Lodge, of which he knew nothing; that they held their meetings on the first Wednesday in each month, and occupied themselves with subjects that were instructive, economic, or recreative; that there were three grades in the Lodge, Apprentice, Companion, and Master, besides two others, Excellent Master and Grand Master: that he had been elected on St. John's Day, 1738, but that in obedience to the Papal interdict the Lodge had ceased to exist, and that its members had for the most part given up Masonry. After this explanation, the Inquisition abandoned its enquiries, so far as these Masons were concerned, but it began to make enquiries about the Protestant Lodge. Not being able to get hold of anything incriminating, it desisted from further effort, but not with its eyes shut, for five years later, in 1743, Jean Coustos, the Master of a Lisbon Lodge, was arrested on coming out of a café at night-time, and hurried off to the prison of the Inquisition. Jacques Mouton and Jean Thomas Bruslé were also arrested. Gould, in his History, says that "Coustos, the son of a Swiss surgeon, was born at Berne, but emigrated in 1716, with his father, to England, where he followed the trade of a gem-cutter, and was admitted into the Fraternity. After spending 22 years in London he went to Lisbon with the intention of shipping for Brazil, but failing to obtain a permit from the government, he settled down to his trade in the Portuguese capital. There, with two French jewellers, Mouton and Bruslé, he founded a Lodge, where they were surprised by the familiars of the Inquisition." I rather question this last statement—it is much more likely that Coustos was taken when he had emerged from the café, as the Inquisition officials generally made their arrests at night-time, in the dark, secretly, so that the unhappy victims were spirited away, and in many cases never seen again. It is not unlikely that Coustos was a Huguenot, and therefore a Protestant.

Mouton and Bruslé followed the same trade as Coustos. A Spanish writer tells us that the wife of a Frenchman, La Rude, wishing her husband to have a monopoly of the trade, conceived with a friend, Dona Rosa, the idea of getting the other lapidaries expelled. Dona Rosa, with an almost infernal malice, denounced these unoffending tradesmen to the familiars of the Inquisition. Mouton's wife first began the trouble by telling Rude's wife that Mouton was a Mason. I shall not refer to the horrible sufferings these individuals endured. I daresay you have read about them, so far as Coustos is concerned, in the book which gives an account of his imprisonment. We will briefly say, as does Gould, that Coustos was again and again subjected to the rack: that he was scourged, branded, and otherwise tortured. At long last, in 1744, there was celebrated in the church of St. Dominic the first "auto-da-fe" in which Freemasons were punished. Twenty-two men and eleven women figured in that ghastly ceremony, and the king, John V., his children, all the Court, the Papal Nuncio, and the ambassador of Castille were amongst the spectators. Coustos was sentenced to four years at the galleys, but the other two, owing to their being Catholics, were condemned to five years' exile. Bruslé died, in consequence of his sufferings, in prison. Coustos in some way was able to communicate with Lord Harrington, and it is said that that nobleman brought the matter to the notice of our king, George II., who through our ambassador in Portugal, Lord Compton, after much contriving, secured Coustos' release. Coustos and Mouton were smuggled on to a Dutch vessel, the *Damietta*, and brought back, landing at Portsmouth, and afterwards proceeding to London, where, as Gould remarks, "they were well received and cared for by the Fraternity."

About the time that Coustos received his sentence, or a little later, a friend of his, Jean Baptiste Richard, recanted as a Protestant in order to secure liberty, and had only to pay the costs of his trial. You may say that he was one of the weak-kneed brethren, but I often ask myself: Have the principles of Freemasonry such a hold upon me as to enable me to endure torture, solitary confinement, ignominy, shame, as these men did? I wonder! We sit comfortably in our Lodges: we feast ourselves liberally: we toast each other with effusion and declare what a wonderful thing Masonry is; but when it comes to the pinch, who would go out into the dark, torn away from wife, children, and friends, to pass days and nights uncertain of one's fate: to tremble at every footstep and wonder whether there was a summons to the torture chamber; to return to the light of day, perhaps a hopeless cripple? I say this, because I think we ought to thank God that our lot lies in pleasant places, and to bear in pious memory those who cemented and strengthened Masonry with their life's blood.

To resume: during the major part of the time when the Marquis de Pombal was in power the Masons incurred no persecutions. It will be remembered that this able statesman was a determined enemy of the Jesuits, and therefore their plots and plans were held in abeyance, and Freemasons increased in number, especially in the army and amongst the cultured classes. But towards the end of Pombal's tenure of office, in 1770, the governor of the island of Madeira, Jean Antoine de Sá Pereira, announced to the Marquis the discovery of a group of Freemasons. This statement he confirmed by the despatch of documents that had been seized, and amongst these were some Masonic catechisms. The head of the Douane Department in Funchal was arrested, and his wife, on interrogation, said that two Frenchmen, Francois d'Alincourt and Barthelemy Andrieux, were also Masons. These two were sent to Lisbon to be further examined, and Andrieux confessed to being heretical, and indeed opened his mouth very largely to the detriment of others, and was consequently released.

When Maria I., who married her uncle, Dom Pedro, came to the throne, there was a political and religious reaction. The Marquis de Pombal was deposed from office and sent into exile. Several scientists, seeing another reign of terror approaching, took to flight: many who did not escape were arrested by the Holy Office, and received sentence at the "auto-da-fe" held in 1788. "In 1792 the Queen was attacked by incurable melancholia, and her son was made Prince Regent. Matters then became worse, and the Governor of Madeira was ordered

to deliver over all Masons to the Inquisition. A few escaped to America, their vessel on entering New York Harbour flying a white flag with the inscription, 'Asylum Quaerimus.' Nevertheless, the Fraternity was not exterminated. Lodges are known to have existed at Coïmbra, at Oporto, at Belem on the outskirts of Lisbon, and others were held on board various ships in port." A celebrated reunion of Masons was held in 1797 on the frigate *Phœnix*, which was at anchor in the Tagus. English, French, and Portuguese Masons then met together in fraternal unity. From this assembly dates the birth of the Lodge of Regeneration, and from this Lodge sprang five other Lodges, the best known of which was the Lodge "Fortress." It is said to have had among its members 110 Portuguese brethren, many of whom occupied prominent official positions.

Pina Manique, a savage persecutor of Masons, who had been chosen as Intendant-General of the Douane at Lisbon, said in 1801 that there were five Lodges in Lisbon, containing Irish and Illuminati members. A somewhat confused statement, surely, on his part. He added that "the members of this infamous association belong to all classes of society. Our rigorous measures have reprimanded some, made others forswear themselves, and several waverers have received sentence."

About this time, François Gilles, who was a merchant dealing in wool, in Holland, and who often visited for business purposes Portugal and Spain, during a lengthy stay of three years at Lisbon formed a Lodge with the co-operation of one Jean d'Origny and others. D'Origny afterwards went to Madeira, where he established a Lodge which had among its members some of the nobility and clergy. The Governor soon got wind of this, and, knowing what might ensue, several of the initiates sought flight at night-time on board the Portuguese brigantine, *Les Deux Amis*. Amongst them were Antoine François Figueira and Thomas de Cantuaria. I mention these two names, because one will be easily recognized, and the other carries us back to early days, and will probably excite to further research our Brother Williams. The Bishop of Funchal, having heard of the presence of ecclesiastics in the Lodge, suspended them from exercising their office. The whole island was now aflame with excitement and party strife, and for fear of a rebellion, both the Governor and the Bishop were ordered to moderate their zeal.

About this time, when auxiliary troops arrived from England in Portugal, it was found that there were many who were Masons in the various regiments. An endeavour was made to establish a Lodge in Lisbon, and it was thought advisable to obtain a warrant from the Grand Lodge of England. The story goes that a certain James Gordon was, consequent on delay in the delivery of the warrant, sent to London in January, 1793, and that at the beginning of March he returned, carrying the warrant in his valise. So far so good, but Pina's spies were always on the alert, and Mr. James Gordon was arrested, and with him all the other individuals who were conspiring in this unlawful movement. Among the papers taken from Gordon were the warrant, some diplomas, and some Masonic symbols. History does not relate what became of these things.

As we are now talking about Pina Manique and his doings, I must not omit to mention that this period saw the arrival at Lisbon of one whose name will not be unfamiliar to your ears, the Comte de Cagliostro. This may be pure romance, but it is asserted that he visited Lisbon on his way to Italy, and wormed his way into some of the best family circles, but Manique was soon at his heels, and he was expelled, with not too much display of courtesy.

In spite of the persecution which at this juncture once more threatened Masons, and which should have led them to stand together as a compact body, a misunderstanding arose between the Lodges at Lisbon and at Oporto, but this was not of long duration, for some faithful and courageous brethren, seeing the danger that might be caused by dissension, arranged for an assembly of more than 200 brethren in the palace of Brother Gomes Freire d'Andrade. The Abbé Monteiro presided. At this meeting the Marquis de Loulé received the degree of Master, and peace was re-established in the midst of fraternal salutations and firm resolution to unite in maintaining a strong and unbreakable bond of brotherhood.

This was in 1801, whilst the persecutions of Manique were continuing. In the hope of ameliorating conditions, Hippolyte Joseph da Costa, the Abbé Monteiro, and the Abbé Joseph Ferrão de Mendça, all three being Masons, held a consultation with the then Minister of Finance. The Minister, after having spoken to Bro. Hippolyte, and the Abbé Monteiro, turned to the Abbé Ferrão, who was acquainted with Manique, and said, "Monsieur le Frieur, go back at once, and say on my behalf to Monsieur l'Intendant that the Freemasons are faithful subjects of the King, and I know this is true, because I was present at the initiation of Dom Alexandre Holstein at a Lodge held in Turin, and no one can doubt his devotion and fidelity to the Portuguese throne. Go in peace, my friends, and remain tranquil. Henceforth the persecution will not be so rigorous; but always remember to be cautious, and above all, avoid all abuse of your privileges." This allusion to caution leads me to refer to some remarks by the Spanish writer to whom I have already made reference. He is discussing the want of prudence amongst foreign Brethren in Portugal, especially those who were English and French. He says that they, being ignorant of the rigorous legislation against Masonry, and imagining that the conditions are the same as in their own countries, have no scruple in speaking openly about meetings and lodges, thus playing completely into the hands of the enemy. He also points out that in consequence of the frequent changes in the way of meeting-places, which were effected to throw the police off the scent, these assemblies were often deprived of any Masonic appearance. Recourse was had to such deception as the holding of a concert or the giving of a ball in order to cover up any outward signs of a Masonic meeting.

According to Gould, "although this persecution lasted until 1806, it is during this very period that some remarkable Masonic manifestations occurred. The first Grand Lodge of Portugal was erected, and the first Grand Master, Don Sebastian José de Sampajo, a counsellor of the High Court, was appointed in 1800 or 1802" (or, according to Grainha, 1804). "This new Grand Lodge, acting through four Lodges, empowered Don Hippolyte Joseph da Costa to act as their representative at the Grand Lodge of England, and in their name to solicit a regular authority to practise the rites of the Order under the English banner and protection. After mature deliberation it was determined that every encouragement should be given to the Brethren in Portugal: and a treaty was immediately entered into and signed by Da Costa and Heseltine, then Treasurer of the Grand Lodge, and approved by the Grand Master, whereby it was agreed that as long as the Portuguese Lodges should conform to the ancient Constitutions of the Order they should be empowered to have a representative in the Grand Lodge of England, and that the Grand Lodge of England should have a representative in the Grand Lodge of Portugal, and that the Brethren belonging to such Grand Lodge should be equally entitled to the privileges of the other." I have given you the exact words of Gould regarding this transaction, as I find no allusion to it in Grainha's history. He merely says that "the establishment of a Constitution for the direction of the national lodges of the Grand Orient of Lusitania had become indispensable. To this end a summons was sent to the representatives of those lodges, they having been given full power to act on behalf of their brethren in organising and sanctioning the General Statutes which were to govern Masonry in Portugal. At the meeting which ensued, after considerable discussion the first part of the Constitution was approved." The date given for this event is "eighteenth of the fifth month of the year 1806, precisely at twelve-o'clock (noon)." With regard to the second part of the Constitution, which was to regulate details, it was decided to postpone it for further consideration.

It was about this time that Napoleon sent a first division of his army into Portugal under the command of Marshal Junot. At Santarem he was welcomed by a deputation of Portuguese Freemasons, headed by Luis Sampajo, the brother of the Grand Master. Junot received them most cordially and promised complete security and said that in no manner would they be disturbed in their work. This was in May, 1807, and this heartened the Brethren to efforts towards a

further consolidation of interests. Our Portuguese writer says that Junot was a Mason, as also was Napoleon and most of the officers in the French army. This assertion gives us furiously to think, and carries our minds back to that oft-disputed question, "Was Napoleon a Mason?" People still debate the point from time to time, but I think that those who turn to Bro. Tuckett's valuable paper on the question will be able to settle in their minds the veracity of the statement of our Portuguese Brother. Bro. Tuckett's paper may be found in vol. 27 of our *Transactions*, and it makes most interesting and educational reading.

Junot's friendly attitude was not of long duration. As a rule all the Portuguese Lodges exhibited a portrait of the reigning sovereign. Junot persuaded two Masons to bring forward a proposition that the portrait of Bonaparte should be substituted for that of the Prince-Regent, who, to rid himself of troublous State affairs, had fled to Brazil. The proposition excited the ire of many of the Brethren, and it was squashed. Junot then attempted to suggest to the Grand Orient that the nomination of a Grand Master belonged to him, as a consequence of his high position; but the Grand Orient unanimously turned down the suggestion, and on these grounds:—(1) There was already a Grand Master, so the position was not vacant: (2) the position of Grand Master belonged by right to one who was of Portuguese birth: (3) it was not the period in which elections took place: (4) Junot was wanting in those eminent qualities and uplifting aspirations which were indispensable to one occupying such a position. As one may imagine, the Marshal was vastly incensed at what he considered to be a direct insult, and he immediately ordered the Intendant of Police to re-commence the persecutions.

A rather different version of Junot's "volte-face" is given by our Spanish Brother. He relates that in December, 1807, at a Masonic banquet, a Brother gave the toast of the Prince-Regent and also of the National Guard. This was very distasteful to the French Masons and they left in high dudgeon. "One may understand this when one reflects that France at that time considered Portugal as a conquered country, an idea to which the Portuguese could by no means accustom themselves. The Marshal Junot, who up to that time had shown himself quite tolerant, as soon as he heard of this happening, which he considered an event of the greatest importance, ordered the Governor-General of Lisbon to take all necessary steps to prevent any recurrence of acts of this kind." There are the two versions; you may take whichever one appears to you the most natural and the most credible.

During these events, the Grand Master continued in office, and was re-elected in 1808, and in 1809 he was succeeded by Fernando Romão d'Ataíde Freire. In the year 1810 there was a new invasion of Portugal by French troops under the command of General Massena. This gave rise to a violent persecution of Masons, many of whom were cast into prison, and afterwards deported to the Azores. Many of the Lodges ceased work, a large number of the Brethren failed to attend those meetings that were held, and the numbers dwindled to almost vanishing point. A year before this, at the time of the French invasion under Soult, there had been trouble caused, as was alleged, by the Masonic body. Some Masons, belonging to the English army, conceived the idea of having a Masonic procession through the streets of Lisbon. Those soldiers who were on duty in the streets that were traversed, not knowing what was afoot, gave the military salute. The clergy stirred up the lower classes to make a counter-demonstration, and the result was that a number of Portuguese Masons, who were probably in the procession, were thrown into prison. The archives of the Grand Lodge of Lisbon were seized, and amongst the articles removed were the registers, the pictures, the certificates, the constitutions, and various other matters. Gould corroborates this unfortunate occurrence, for he says: "The English Masons assembled publicly, and walked in procession with banners and emblems of the Society. This remarkable spectacle the Portuguese troops took—not unnaturally—for one of the pageants of the Romish Church, and therefore turned out in order to render the usual military honours."

At this time a Portuguese journal was published at London by a Portuguese Mason, Bro. Hippolyte, and in this, as well as in other London papers, the proceedings of the Portuguese Regency were severely blamed, and the despotism of the Portuguese Government occupied the attention of our Parliament. So far as concerns the French and their ruler, a pamphlet of this epoch stated that "before the entry of the French army into Portugal, Masonry in France had recognised the unworthiness of Bonaparte, and had given notice of the same to the Grand Orient of Lusitania by a letter from a deputy, in which this phrase was employed, 'Bonaparte is no longer a Mason, he is Tamerlane.'" It will be recalled that, according to Rowe's tragedy, written in 1702, Tamerlane, emperor of Tartary, in a sudden access of rage, had his captive, Bajazet, chained in a cage, like a wild beast.

When the French had been driven out of Portugal, Major-General Beresford, who afterwards became Lord Beresford, was sent from England to command and discipline the Portuguese troops. He did not at first interfere in any way with the Masonic bodies. According to information given by the Abbé Joseph de Macedo, there were now at Lisbon thirteen Lodges, and the Mother Lodge had its headquarters in the monastery of St. Vincente de Fora. Joseph Liberato, Mason and monk in this monastery, denies this statement, but acknowledges that frequently at night-time some Masons assembled there, and these individuals formed a society known as "Les Philosophes." The most active Lodges at this time were the Lodges "Regeneration" and "Virtue." Joseph de Andrade Corvo, an infantry captain, had been initiated in the last-named Lodge, and he became an indefatigable worker. He is said to have suggested to the Vicomtesse de Jerumenha that she should enter the Order, and she was initiated in a country house belonging to a certain Marquis, amidst a concourse of well-known people. This initiation was effected in the hope that through the Viscountess information might be obtained as to Beresford's probable future attitude to Masonry. Despite his manifested zeal, Corvo turned out in the end to be a traitor, as you will see by what follows.

In 1814 General Gomes Freire de Andrade, a distinguished officer and also a Mason, returned from France, to which country he had pursued the French invaders. He found Portugal in a state of great unrest. The King still remained in Brazil, and Portugal was governed in a manner that suggested its being merely a Brazilian colony. Beresford's attitude towards the Portuguese army was that of a general training an army of colonists. The spirit of revolution was in the air, and people were looking here and there for a leader. He was found in the person of the General Gomes, who was now Grand Master of Portuguese Masonry. In 1817 the revolutionary plotters were betrayed by some of their adherents, and chief amongst them was Joseph Corvo. On the 25th of May in that year Gomes was arrested, and ultimately suffered death by hanging, and eleven others came to a similar end. On the day before the execution of Gomes, an English colonel, putting aside all obstacles, and fully conscious of the danger incurred, went to visit the prisoner, and offered him a means of escape. But Gomes would not allow this generous friend to sacrifice himself, and with an expression of heartfelt thanks he refused the offer of this brave man. This incident, says our Portuguese writer, is "a further proof that a good Mason never fails to help a Brother." In 1853 General Cabreira caused to be erected a monument to the memory of Gomes. Its site was on the very place where he died, and it serves as a perpetual remembrance of a Grand Master of Portugal who proved himself to be a hero.

The failure of the attempt at a revolution did not stop the unrest which was now pervading all classes of the community. The governing body in Portugal and the fugitive King put their heads together, and they conceived the idea that quietude might be ensured by closing all Masonic Lodges, and making a clean sweep of all Masons. In pursuance of this idea, the Regents of Portugal sent to King John VI., still absent from his kingdom, an official despatch in which it was declared "that, whatever may be the part taken by Freemasons in the recent events, it is indisputable that the existence of secret societies has always

been impolitic and dangerous, and that it is needful that rulers should crush such associations, for they in their unlawful assemblies are bound by oath to an obedience to unknown heads, and it is sufficient, seeing that their aims are veiled in secrecy, to create a reasonable suspicion as to their being lawless and evil-living persons." In response to this, King John signed in Brazil letters patent, which forbade the existence of secret societies in Portugal, and which threatened with pain of death and confiscation of all goods to the State those who, in spite of this order, were still members of such societies. The confiscation of goods was to be applied even to offspring and descendants. It was further ordered that all houses in which meetings had taken place should be confiscated, and the penalty of from four to ten years' exile in a fortress was to be imposed on all those who caused to be sold, or who lent, or gave any medals, symbols, engravings, books, catechisms, or seals which had any relation to such associations. Even these terribly harsh measures did not extinguish the aspiration towards liberty which Masonry symbolised.

Emmanuel Fernandes Thomas, a judge of the Court of Cassation in Oporto, foresaw another approaching revolution, and he deemed it advisable to form a group of intelligent men to guide the future destinies of the country. He therefore assembled a party of friends at dinner, and there and then was formed an association known under the name of the "Sanhedrim." This was not a Masonic body, though most of its members were Masons, amongst them being Cunha Souto Maior and Silva Carvalho, who afterwards became Grand Masters. So secretly did this body work that the police and the Government were taken by surprise when in August, 1820, a revolution broke out in Oporto, and it had such a measure of success that a Committee was formed to govern the nation, and to convoke the Parliament in order to formulate a Constitution. In September of the same year the revolution spread to Lisbon with successful results. It must be mentioned that the Liberal party, which was represented by this Constituting Assembly, was still attached to the Crown and the Roman Catholic religion, in spite of the influence of the Jesuits. As a consequence of this upheaval the King was obliged to leave Brazil, and in 1821 he gave his adhesion to the Constitution. In this same year Dr. Jean da Cunha Maior was elected Grand Master. The meeting at which he was elected, called "La séance de la Grande Diète," had a very difficult task. The last Grand Master, Brother Gomes, had met his death in the manner that I have described, and the ensuing persecution had thrown Masonic matters into a state of the utmost confusion. There was only an administrative commission, and it was found difficult to maintain communication between various groups of Masons, and there ensued much heart-burning as to questions of preferential treatment.

In 1823 Joseph da Silva became Grand Master in the place of Cunha Maior. And he entered on a troublous year, for internal dissensions had by this time so weakened the new Constitution that, as Gould reminds us, "a counter-revolution of Royalists triumphed, and re-installed John VI. in all his autocratic privileges. Freemasons were once more persecuted by an edict of June 20, 1823." A proclamation by the Cardinal Archbishop Souza, published the same evening, so inflamed the minds of the rabble that many people were murdered on the mere suspicion of being Freemasons. The pains and penalties mentioned in this edict were perhaps not quite so severe as those in the former one issued by King John. The penalty of death was altered to exile in Africa for at least five years, together with a fine of 500 francs to be devoted to some pious work; this was for those only who had not been concerned in conspiracy or rebellion. All in authority were obliged to give written promise, and to exact from their subordinates a similar promise, that they would never take part in the meetings of any secret societies, or be allied with them in any way whatsoever.

A good deal of excitement was caused about this time by the discovery in a cistern of the paraphernalia of a Lodge, and amongst the articles described were some painted boards (undoubtedly tracing boards), some black cloth, some mitres, and an "atmosphere" in white metal, and it is said that those who

examined the booty decided that they must belong to a Lodge of Freemasons, or to a Gardeners' Lodge.

In 1824 the Infante, Dom Miguel, besieged the King in his palace at Lisbon under the pretext that the Freemasons were trying to murder the King. The Marquis de Loulé, for counselling the King to flee to Villa Franca, was assassinated, and it is said that the evil deed was done by the agents of Dom Miguel. The proclamation issued by this would-be usurper contained these words: "You see the licence of the Masonic Clubs where they even discuss the possible happenings to the King and the Royal family, without making an attempt to take measures to extinguish the fire of revolution"; and it ended thus: "Long live the King! Long live the Roman Catholic religion! Long live the Queen! Long live the Royal family! Long live the Nation! Death to the perverse and dangerous brood of Masons!" These sentiments inflamed some of the fanatical preachers of the day, and it is said that the Abbé Jean Mariano, when preaching, uttered words to the effect that the blood of the Portuguese must flow, just as the blood of the Jews flowed in former days; that he thought it a necessary thing, and that he would not fail to put it in force, according to the promise of the Infante, who had sworn that his sword should not return to its scabbard so long as he had not made an end of the Freemasons; that he felt himself to be in a transport of rage, filled with fury, and eager to bathe his hands in blood.

Happily the united action of the foreign ambassadors and ministers accredited to Portugal secured the restoration of King John's authority: the insurrection was suppressed; Dom Miguel was banished, and at the close of 1824 the King returned to Brazil. On reaching Rio he recognised Dom Pedro as Emperor of Brazil, and at his death he left the regency of Portugal to his daughter, Isabel Maria, much to the disgust of Dom Miguel. This same Miguel was afterwards put forward as a suitor to the hand of Isabel, and he was appointed Regent of Portugal in the name of the little queen. In a very short time he took on every appearance of sovereignty. During Dom Miguel's government of the country, the tribunals waged war incessantly against the Liberals and the Masons. As many as could escape fled to France and England. A Portuguese student, who was obliged to leave his native land, and who afterwards became Master of the Lodge "Emigration Regeneratrice" at Paris, says of this period, "All Masonic reunions were severely repressed. The fugitive Masons once more resumed work when they had either arrived in Brazil, or in England, France, or Belgium. Some maintained their allegiance to their own Grand Master, Joseph da Silva, whilst others selected John Charles de Saldanha, afterwards Duke of Saldanha, to preside over them. Dom Miguel strengthened his attempts at persecution by bringing into the country from France a large number of Jesuits. But a time came when he had to cease his evil designs, for the Liberals, having formed themselves into a warlike force, vanquished their assailants at Oporto. They then marched on to Lisbon, which was captured, and a few days after this Dom Pedro IV. made his entry into Lisbon from the sea. This new ruler was a Mason, as were many who held commands in his army. His initiation took place in a Lodge in the *Vallée du Rio Janeiro*, in 1822, and on the 21st of September of the same year he was made Grand Master of Brazilian Masonry. One of Dom Pedro's first legislative measures was the expulsion of the Jesuits and the punishment of those priests and monks who had taken part in the usurpation of the throne by Dom Miguel. This was followed by a decree suppressing all the religious orders in Portugal. Gould, in writing about this period, says that "on the return of the exiles two Grand Lodges existed in Lisbon. To add to the confusion the brethren in Oporto elected a third Grand Master, Manuel da Silva Passos . . . To add to this multiplicity of jurisdictions we find the Grand Lodge of Ireland warranting Lodges at Lisbon; and ultimately a Provincial Grand Lodge was established, making the fifth ruling body in Portugal." It is said that this Provincial Lodge kept pretty much to itself, and did not fraternise to any large extent with the other bodies. Its leading spirit was a Spaniard, named Juan Cello. Its work was almost entirely

of a philanthropic nature. Among its chief supporters was the Abbé Marcos, and a certain Mr. Silva, who was employed in the Royal household. In 1869 it had as its head a celebrated magistrate, Frederic da Silva Pereira. In 1872 it joined the Grand Orient of Lusitania, and was known as "Regeneration Irlandaise."

From what has been said, a very good idea can be formed of the motives which pervaded Masonry at this time, and of the reason for the existence of these various bodies. The true Masonic spirit seemed for the moment to have departed, its place being taken by quarrelsome political factions and an ever-increasing longing for membership in the higher grades of Masonry, a longing aroused by an insane desire for display. Some of the more sincere and more thoughtful Masons, wishing to bring the Order back to a state of greater purity, put their heads together and took counsel, and their efforts were eventually crowned with success, for in 1869 all the rival bodies were amalgamated, and from this resulted the proclamation of a Grand Orient of Lusitania, with the Comte de Paraty as the Grand Master.

But even now troubles were not over. In 1871 dissensions arose in Coïmbra and Oporto, and in the latter city a new Constitution was proclaimed under the style and title of "Constitution of Northern Portuguese Masonry." And in 1882 six Lodges broke away from the parent body, and constituted a Grand Lodge of Ancient and Accepted Masons of Portugal. This latter coalition was, however, dissolved, and its members returned to their former allegiance. Various other spasmodic efforts were made in the direction of creating detached and self-governing bodies, but in the end they all came back to their mother, saner and wiser men.

In the month of June in 1880 there was celebrated at Lisbon with indescribable enthusiasm the third centenary of Camoens, who, as you know, was the national poet of Portugal, just as Dante was the national poet of Italy. I wonder if you have ever read Camoens' great work, his "Lusiad." If you have not, there is still some literary delight awaiting you. If you are not acquainted with Portuguese, then seek to read a capable English version, if you can find one. Mr. Aubrey Bell, in a pleasant little volume, a monograph on Camoens, says: "We look for something new in a literature unknown to us: we do not go to Lisbon to gaze into shop-windows which we can see in Paris. But the fact is that in Camoens' lyrics we enter an enchanted country. They have a peculiar glow and magic which one seeks in vain elsewhere. . . . In his studious humanism Camoens was well qualified to distinguish with Dante between goose and eagle." (This is an allusion to Dante's words in his treatise, "De Vulgari Eloquentia." The words are: "And therefore let those who, innocent of art and science, and trusting to genius alone, rush forward to sing of the highest subjects, confess their folly and cease from such presumption; and if in their natural sluggishness they are but geese, let them abstain from imitating the eagle soaring to the stars.") "Were Portuguese literature, so rich in varied fascinating works in prose and verse, confined to the works of Cameons, whom Schlegel considered to be in himself a literature, even then no lover of poetry could afford to neglect the study of the Portuguese language, if only for the sake of reading Camoens in the original." Having reminded you of Camoens' literary worth, I will now return to our real subject, and say that at this Lisbon celebration the occasion was considered to be in the nature of a triumph for the Liberal party and for the Masonic body. The flag of the United Grand Orient of Lusitania appeared for the first time in public in the civic *cortège*.

In December, 1889, there was a certain amount of ill-feeling between this country and Portugal, and this aroused the ever-latent revolutionary spirit. A Mason appeared at night-time on the balcony of the house belonging to a publishing office and incited the thousands of assembled people to make their way to the Royal palace. Another individual, the reporter to a Royalist paper, suddenly declared himself to be a Republican, and urged a revolution. The students of the higher academies made a demonstration against England. These

may be but straws, but they showed which way the wind was blowing. For the reason why it was blowing in an adverse quarter, so far as England was concerned, I will refer you to English history. The whole trouble was considered to have originated in the indifferent attitude of the Portuguese Government and the corrupt state of the Court.

In 1905 the French President, Monsieur Loubet, arrived at Lisbon on an official visit. The Republican party, together with the Freemasons, gave him the warmest of welcome. Indeed, so enthusiastic was his reception that it occasioned much misgiving amongst the adherents of the Royalist party. This misgiving was increased when it was seen that important men were giving up Royalist ideals. A peer and an ex-minister went over openly to the Republican side. A well-known judge gave up his post in the Criminal Instruction Department, and another celebrity penned a phrase which tersely foretold the future in these words: "This will finish either in revolution or crime." At the beginning of 1908 there was an attempt at revolution, but it was suppressed. Four days later the King and the Prince Royal were shot dead whilst driving in an open carriage through Lisbon. In consequence of this tragic event all suspected persons were arrested, and amongst them were several Masons. There was an outburst of indignation and of sympathy for the widow and orphaned son on the part of the stunned populace, but that sentiment swelled like a wave, and passed like one; and then the Portuguese people relapsed into an amazing apathy. As Señor Magalhaes Lima wrote: "An ordinary newspaper paragraph about the murder of a woman would have made more stir than the disappearance of His Most Faithful Majesty." Lima added: "What has happened at Lisbon is one among many steps towards emancipation." On the 14th of July, 1910, a large Masonic assembly was organised by the Lodge "Montagne." This was presided over by Dr. Joseph de Castro, in the absence of the actual Grand Master, Magalhaes Lima. There was carried by acclamation a proposition for the establishment of a commission with sovereign powers to watch over the integrity of the Order. This commission was a powerful element in the triumph of the Revolution, and on October 10th in the same year the Republic was proclaimed.

So far as Masonic charity is concerned, we are told that besides the House of Charity of St. John of Lisbon, founded by Joseph Estevam, and another institution of the same character established at the expense of the Masons of Oporto, there were the schools erected in memory of the Marquis de Pombal, the Academy of Instruction for young girls, the "Ecole Usine" for boys, and various other agencies of a like nature. The "Fête de l'Arbre," which was started as a means of attracting the attention of both children and adults to the advantages of forestry and agriculture, was introduced into Portugal by Masons, and was made a subject for study in the schools.

In the years that preceded the Revolution of 1910, the Grand Orient detected in its midst the presence of spies, for the clerical newspapers, the *Courrier National* and *Portugal*, published some notices which were only known to Masons, and indeed the *Portugal* actually gave the pass-word (which was altered from time to time for security) before it was known in the Lodges. I only mention this to show what ever-present difficulties seem at all times to have surrounded the Masonic community in Portugal.

There were two Portuguese Masons who attracted a considerable amount of attention, owing to their breaking their Masonic obligations. These were the Duke of Saldanha and Joseph Marie de Sousa Monteiro. The Duke was in his later years ambassador to Great Britain, and he died in London in 1876. He was a brave soldier, a heroic adventurer, whose glittering sword was the fascination of the Portuguese army. He possessed an extraordinary versatility of mind, which enabled him to change from one party to another with the greatest ease. An article in a certain newspaper, an article much spoken about when it appeared, described him as the man with fifty-one faces, each of which represented some change of view in political matters. It is not known exactly when he gave up Masonry, but in a letter that was published in a Portuguese journal, the *Coinbricense*, on September the 27th, 1872, he writes as follows:—"I will say,

in order to completely justify the memory of the first Duke of Palmella, that for the purpose of fighting against the usurpation of the throne, I have been not only Grand Master of Masonry, but also Grand Plenipotentiary of the Carbonari, and Grand Constable of the Templars. From my position as Grand Master of Masonry I ought to know those Portuguese who belonged to the society, and I can therefore state on my honour that the Duke of Palmella has never been a Mason. . . . As to my own justification, I will say that on the very day that the Cortes assembled, I resigned my membership of all secret societies, being convinced that if they are efficacious in destroying established governments they are also powerful in blocking the progress of any government which is not to their liking. My separation from these secret societies was partially the cause of the celebrated article about the man with the fifty-one faces. The *Times* of this date does not conceal its astonishment on seeing that Marshal Saldanha, the idol of the opposition, in spite of his fifty-one faces, has to their displeasure added to the fifty-one faces even another visage, that of a diplomatist. To quieten the conscience of good Catholics, I will say that the hero of the nineteenth century, the adorable Pius IX., has, as a mark of his extreme kindness, as is announced in the brief that he sent me at Paris after I had quitted the Embassy at Rome, bestowed on me the new Grand Cross of the Order of Pius the Ninth. This honour was accompanied by expressions which cannot but be flattering to a Catholic, and he has withdrawn all the major and minor excommunications that I had merited."

Joseph Monteiro was in 1838 Secretary of a Lodge, and in 1850 he was appointed Grand Orator in the Grand Orient of Lusitania. In this same year 1850, he lost his wife. She had been a devotee to religion, and had constantly urged him to give up Masonry, so when she was on her deathbed he made a vow never again to enter a Lodge. He did this, he says, "more from respectful obedience than from any conviction of the incompatibility of Masonry with the Roman Catholic religion and with true patriotism, for I had at that time very little doubt on this matter. It was only later, when I began carefully to examine the character, laws, and tendencies of this institution that a change of mind came upon me. And to-day I render thanks to God that He, in His mercy, by gradual ways and means, has delivered me from the noisome abyss in which I should have perished miserably."

With regard to this question—Roman Catholic Freemasons—our Portuguese writer says: "One remarks that Masons and even Grand Masters, when speaking in Parliament and in Masonic assemblies, declared themselves to be Christians and Catholics under the rule of the Pope. At a first glance, one finds it difficult and almost impossible to harmonise this affirmation with their position as Masons, and yet one accepts it in the end, when one remembers that the Infallibility of the Pope was not a dogma of the faith till it was proclaimed on July 18, 1879, in the Encyclical of Pius IX."

I have alluded in an earlier portion of this paper to the sufferings endured at the hands of the Inquisition by John Coustos and his companions. There is another individual whom I think I ought to mention, though he belongs to a more modern date than Coustos, and that is Hippolyto de Mendonça. I am taking my information from a book which was published in London in 1811, the title of which is "A Narrative of the Persecution of Hippolyto Joseph da Costa Pereira Furtado de Mendonça, a native of Colonia-do-Sacramento, on the river La Plata, imprisoned and tried in Lisbon by the Inquisition for the pretended crime of Freemasonry." The dedication is worth quoting: "To the British Nation at large and more particularly to the most ancient and venerable Society of Free and Accepted Masons, who have the honour at this time, and have had for more than twenty years, of possessing His Royal Highness the Prince Regent for their Grand Master, this work is most humbly and very respectfully dedicated, as a token of his admiration for their Constitution, and as a pledge of gratitude for their universally acknowledged philanthropy, which is not merely confined to Europe, but has extended its influence to the most distant corners of the globe; by the Author." Mendonça was arrested suddenly in July, 1802, by the police

authorities of Lisbon, almost immediately after his arrival from England, and after six months' detention was consigned to the prison of the Inquisition. At his previous examination by a magistrate, Mendonça said that as amongst his papers had been found his certificate as a Freemason, and other documents relating to Freemasonry, he had no hesitation in acknowledging that the certificate was his, and that he had been admitted a Freemason in the city of Philadelphia. "The 'corregidor' minutely inquired what motives had induced me to enlist myself in that society; to which I answered that, being informed of several persecutions which some magistrates had excited against several individuals, whom they were pleased to denominate Freemasons—and observing likewise, that the measures of the Portuguese magistrates were so much at variance with the general estimation in which Masonic societies are held in America—this opposition was the powerful motive that raised my curiosity, and induced me to seek admission into the society, that I might be able to form a personal judgment if such a difference really existed between the opinions and proceedings of two different countries." Speaking of one of his many examinations by the Holy Office, Mendonça says: "The inquisitor again insisted that my heresy consisted in the refusal to confess and declare that the society of Freemasons was heretical, as the supreme pontiffs had declared it to be. To this I answered that whether the pontiffs had or had not the right of declaring or establishing a tenet of faith, it was incontrovertible that no pontiff whatever had declared the society of Freemasons to be heretical; for the Bulls said only that it suspected it to be so, perhaps on account of their ignorance at that time with respect to this society. . . . The inquisitor then called on me to make satisfactory replies to the following questions: Who are the Portuguese Freemasons with whom you are acquainted? Where is the coffer, or money-chest kept, belonging to the Portuguese Freemasons? What business did you negotiate relating to the Portuguese Freemasons in the Grand Lodge of England? What is the actual state of Freemasonry in Portugal? . . . To the first question I replied that in order to prove whether I knew or was acquainted with any Portuguese Freemasons it was necessary that such a fact should be substantiated by them, and this I was sure nobody could do. To the second; that I knew nothing of the coffers or pecuniary affairs of Freemasons. To the third; that though he, the inquisitor, had thought it proper to assert that he knew I had gone to England on purpose to negotiate some business for the Portuguese Lodges in the Grand Lodge of London, it was, nevertheless, in my power to produce proofs that I had other interesting business to execute in London, not at all connected with Freemasonry. As to the papers they took from me, the greater part consisted of exercises in the English, French, and German languages, with a view to my being better acquainted with them, and it sometimes happened that some were copied from books published in several languages, relative to Freemasonry in general. To the fourth; that I had passed many years out of Portugal at different times, during my travels, and at the time of my imprisonment I had just arrived from England; and this circumstance formed in itself a sufficient explanation why I could not answer this question." Towards the latter part of his narrative, Mendonça writes: "I now thought it necessary to embrace a resolution which I had long formed, of escaping from confinement, and rescuing my health from the total ruin of it that was rapidly approaching." As to how he escaped and when, we are not told, but apparently he had suffered imprisonment for more than three years. I have brought this case to your notice, because it is not so generally known as the Coustos narrative; also because it is interesting for its reference to the Grand Lodge of England. There seems to be a deep undercurrent of meaning in that pertinent question about the coffer or money-chest of the Portuguese Freemasons. It shows that even the members of the Inquisition did not look askance at the handy shekel, if it were tendered in becoming secrecy and weighty multiplication.

Now let us see what particulars we can piece together concerning Freemasonry in more recent times. In the Library of our Grand Lodge there are a good many numbers of an official Bulletin, the "*Revista Maçonica*," recording

very briefly the meetings of Lodges, with occasionally an article on some Masonic question. I am told that they do not arrive with any regularity, and that a considerable period may elapse between the reception of the copies. I have looked through most of them, and there is very little that is of interest, or worthy of mention, but a more detailed study may reveal some things that might be noted. In one number, the issue for July, 1903, I did find a rather curious statement, to the effect that the Grand Orient of Portugal received from the Grand Lodge of England an expression of thanks, in the name of the Grand Master, His Highness the Prince of Wales, for the manifestations of sympathy and respect exhibited to His Majesty King Edward VII., on the occasion of his recent visit to Lisbon. This must surely be a "rechauffé" of old news, for the Duke of Connaught was Grand Master in 1903, having been installed in 1901.

In the Bulletin for February, 1924, we have this information:—"We here give the extensive and important list of Masonic jurisdictions with whom we maintain relations and exchange guarantees of friendship." In this long list there are included the Grand Lodge of Flanders, the Grand Orient of France, the Grand Lodge of Alpina, also Tasmania, and New South Wales. Those not in the list are the Grand Lodge of England, the Grand Lodge of Scotland, the Grand Lodge of New Zealand, the Grand Lodge of New York, and various other American Grand Lodges.

Reverting to what I said about the infrequency in the issue of the Official Bulletin, our Portuguese writer corroborates the statement, for he says: "The Grand Orient of Lusitania has published its Official Bulletin since 1869, but not only has there been irregularity in the issue, but complaint may be made that it has not kept to the standard set in the early numbers. After 1887 there was a lapse of nineteen years, during which a few numbers appeared at very irregular intervals. It was only in January, 1906, that publication was undertaken in a proper sequence, and the first number of this issue gave the history of the Bulletin from its commencement."

That Portuguese Masonry has lately passed through troublous times may be gathered from an account of the proceedings at the International Masonic Congress held at Paris in 1927. At its fifth session Bro. Costa-Santos, representing the Grand Orient of Portugal, depicted in very impressive words the situation created in Portugal towards Masonry by reason of the military dictatorship existing in the country. On the proposition of Bro. Nicol, also representing the Grand Orient of Portugal, a letter of fraternal sympathy was ordered to be sent to Very Illustrious Brother Magalhaes Lima, the then Grand Master.

From a letter sent to me in 1924 by the then Grand Secretary of the Grand Orient of Portugal I extract the following information:—"The United Grand Orient of Lusitania consists of eighty Lodges and twenty-nine Triangles. . . . It is undoubtedly the Scottish Rite that predominates. The French Rite has twelve Lodges, and the Symbolic Rite only one. The Lodges of the Scottish Rite, working under the obedience of the Grand Orient, open and close with the invocation of the Great Architect of the Universe. The Chamber of the Scottish Rite has the Bible on the altar, that is ordained by the ritual. In 1914 there was some dissension as regards the Scottish Rite, which caused the secession of some Lodges, and they constituted a Supreme Council. The matter was referred to at the Congress at Lausanne in 1922, but with no result. However, six of the seceding members returned to the Grand Orient. In the United Grand Orient Supreme Council, the Grand Master is, for convenience in voting, also the Sovereign Grand Commander of the Council. These posts are held by Doctor Sebastiano de Magalhaes Lima, whose 33rd degree was conferred on him in Scotland, whilst on a visit to the United Kingdom. Dr. Magalhaes Lima has been re-elected to his high offices for another period of three years, 1923 to 1925. There were long ago two English Lodges working under the authority of the United Grand Orient, one at Funchal in Madeira, another at St. Vincent, but now there are none either in Portugal or the Colonies. It is the intention of the higher Masonic bodies in Portugal to revive

the Supreme Grand Chapter of Royal Arch Masons. There are in Portugal several active Masons who hold a commission delegated to them by the higher bodies of that Rite in England." There follows a long list of all the Masonic bodies that recognise the Grand Orient of Lusitania, and amongst them is the Grand Lodge of Ireland.

I have perused the ritual of the Entered Apprentice degree in a copy dated 1921. I cannot enter into any description, but will only say that it runs on lines which are, in many instances, closely akin to our English ritual. The Lodge is opened with these prefatory words: "Ad Universi Terrarum Orbis Summi Architecti Gloriam," so that there is a reference to the Deity. There is, however, a marginal note, where the obligation occurs, and it is to this effect: "The rituals order that this obligation should be taken on the Bible, open at the third chapter of Ruth. This order applies especially to those who are Christians or Jews. But, seeing that in Masonry complete religious tolerance is allowed, it is absurd to exact from persons who profess some other religion an obligation on the Bible. Therefore it is to be recommended that the obligation should be taken on the Bible so far as Christians or Jews are concerned, and on the Book of Constitutions in all other cases."

I think I cannot better conclude than in briefly quoting a tribute paid to the memory of Magalhaes Lima in a Swiss Masonic journal:—"The Very Illustrious Brother Dr. Sebastiano de Magalhaes-Lima, Sovereign Grand Commander of Portuguese Freemasonry, Grand Master of the United Grand Orient of Lusitania, passed on to the celestial Orient on December 8th, 1928. Endowed with a rare intelligence, our very dear Brother knew, by virtue of his moral worth, how to inspire respect even in his most implacable adversaries and to gain the esteem of the great men of all countries. An ardent patriot, a convinced pacifist, a writer, a poet, an eminent lawyer, he placed all the talents with which Nature had endowed him at the service of his ideal of liberty and of universal brotherhood. To the 15,000 persons who at Lisbon have passed before his coffin we are joined in thought to bring to the memory of this Brother, who adorned so highly our Order, the fraternal and pious homage of our admiration. Full of years and full of glory, he has gone in an apotheosis towards the unknown Orient."

This, my Brethren, is, I think, a fitting end to the history of sorrow and persecution to which we have been listening. And what is the message? Continual struggle on earth, but peace at last. To which peace may we all come!

At the subsequent banquet W. Bro. Rev. H. POOLE, I.P.M., proposed "The Toast of the Worshipful Master" in the following terms:—

Brethren.—It is our custom at our Installation Dinners to take the opportunity of the Toast of the Worshipful Master to say something of the many activities, Masonic and otherwise, of our Master: and I feel sure that few Past Masters of this Lodge can have had more distinguished or more varied careers to recount than I have on this occasion.

Bro. de Lafontaine was born in 1857. Having taken degrees at London and also at St. John's College, Oxford, he was ordained: and became Curate, and later Vicar, of St. Luke's, Kentish Town. He was afterwards Vicar of Berkeley Chapel, Mayfair, until it was demolished, when he availed himself of the provisions of the Clerical Disabilities Act.

He then turned his attention to civic activities, and had the distinction of being Sheriff of the City of London in 1914-15: but pecuniary losses prevented the realisation of his ambitions in a civic career.

Bro. de Lafontaine became a Mason in 1898, when he was initiated in the Playgoers' Lodge. He has joined, and helped to found, various Lodges and Chapters, and was the first Master of the Dante Lodge, and also of the National Guard Lodge. He was Deputy Master of Antiquity in the year of the Masonic

Peace Celebration, and Z. of the Chapter of St. James in the same year. He assisted in founding the Grande Loge Nationale of France, and is a P.G.W. of that body.

He received Grand Lodge honours in 1908, being now a P.G.D.; and he was made P.A.G.S. in 1909. Outside the Craft, we find him as P.G.O. in the Mark, 1917; Past Great Almoner in Great Priory, 1908; and 31 in Rose Croix. He is a Past Great Chamberlain in the Order of the Secret Monitor; and Past Celebrant of Metropolitan College, and Grade 9 in S.R.I.A.

He is a Patron of each of the three Masonic Institutions, and a Vice-Patron of the Freemasons Hospital. He holds the Gold Medal, as well as the Stewards' and Collector's Medals of the M.M.M. Fund.

Bro. de Lafontaine has contributed several papers to our *Transactions*, the latest being that on Benjamin Franklin. He has also written on Goethe, Cagliostro, Freemasonry in Italy and France, Dante and Freemasonry, and the Ancient Egyptian Mysteries, besides several papers for the Soc. Ros. Study Circle.

His works, outside Masonry, deal largely with Music. He was editor of *The King's Musick*—a record of musicians of the Chapel Royal and the Royal Household from early times: he has written on "Dante and War"; and has done much lecturing and writing on musical subjects, in particular on the Spanish School of Music.

He has been dramatic critic, and later editor and proprietor, of the *London Figaro*, and has also been associated with the *Weekly Comedy*; while, earlier in his career, he edited *The Banner*, a Church newspaper.

As an Antiquary, we see our W.M. as a member of the Middlesex Archæological Society; while he has had the distinction of being a Member of Council of the British Archæological Association, and a delegate at International Archæological Congresses at Rome, Cairo, and Athens. He is a Past Vice-President of the Sette of Odd Volumes; was for many years Secretary of the Dante Society; and is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Literature. He was formerly Secretary of the Society of English Composers, and is now Sec. of the Benevolent Fund of the Incorporated Society of Musicians; he is also a Fellow of the Royal Philharmonic Society, and Vice-President of both Trinity College of Music and the Royal College of Organists.

On the charitable side, we find him a Governor of the Foundling Hospital; a member of Committee of the Normal College for the Blind, at Norwood, as well as of the London Blind Association, and the National Benevolent Society; and a Director of the French Hospital at Victoria Park.

Turning to the civic sphere, our W.M. is a Member of no less than eleven City Companies. He is the present Master of the Fruiterers' Company—his seventh Mastership. He is also a Past President of the Farringdon Ward Club.


Such, Brethren, are some of the distinctions and activities of Bro. de Lafontaine when we elected him as our Master a month or so ago. I can now add to the catalogue his appointment as Prestonian Lecturer for the coming year, when he will have the honour of being the first Master of this Lodge to deliver the Prestonian Lecture from the Chair.

Lastly, he has this evening been installed as Worshipful Master of Quatuor Coronati Lodge; and as such I call upon you, Brethren, to drink his health.

REVIEWS.

CAGLIOSTRO AND HIS EGYPTIAN RITE OF FREEMASONRY.


By Henry Ridgely Evans, Litt.D. (New York, 1930).

“ NOUGH ill has been said of Cagliostro. I intend to speak well of him, because I think this is always preferable, providing one can.” Such is the quotation from Baron de Gleichen’s “Souvenirs” with which our distinguished American Brother, Henry Ridgely Evans, starts his newly-published book under review. A very wise beginning indeed. It gives the reader at once a clear idea as to the light in which the author will represent Cagliostro, about whom so many contrary opinions have been expressed ever since that extraordinary and mysterious personage became famous at the end of the eighteenth century. At the same time it disarms a critic. It would seem at least inconsiderate to criticize severely a book in the very first lines of which we are reminded of the excellent and honourable principle to speak well if we can. And, of course, one can speak well of Bro. Evans’ new book. First of all, it is beautifully edited: good paper, clear print, a number of well re-produced engravings, pleasant binding. Then the book is written in excellent, lively language and with a good, benevolent spirit. And it is accompanied by an interesting bibliography, two appendices (A—“Reception of an apprentice into an Egyptian Lodge,” and B—“Cagliostro’s masonic affiliations”) and an Index. The first of the appendices is particularly valuable. It gives a good English translation of a part of Cagliostro’s ritual as it was reproduced in the official organ of French Martinism, “L’Initiation,” in August, 1906, and incidentally demonstrates the same pompous and confused character of Cagliostro’s orations as we find in his lectures written down by Mme. von der Recke while he was in Courland. (See *A.Q.C.* xl., 37.)

As regards the original work of Bro. Evans, one can hardly expect to find very much in a pamphlet on 59 pages of large print with very wide margins. Having extracted a number of appropriate remarks from the vast literature on the subject, he produces a very favourable picture of Cagliostro, a more favourable one even than that given by W. R. H. Trowbridge in his voluminous work, *The Splendour and Misery of a Master of Magic*, by which the author has evidently been largely influenced. But it is not surprising that Bro. Evans appeals to “Masonic writers” to change their views regarding Cagliostro and describes him as “a Masonic martyr” and “one of the most fascinating characters of his time” (p. 45), who “undoubtedly believed in his mission to enlighten the world through his mystic doctrine” and possessed “undoubted gifts as a genuine psychic” (p. 24). At the end of the last and, by the way, the most interesting and original chapter, entitled “A visit to the House of Cagliostro,” Bro. Evans tells us in his book how he became interested in Cagliostro. It appears that this interest was evoked in 1893 by a conjuring exhibition at a Paris theatre, at which he was present. During the exhibition, the conjuror (Caroly) performed an ingenious trick called the “Mask of Balsamo.” It produced upon him a very deep impression, the Mask obsessed his mind, and he had strange dreams during the night following the entertainment. “Cagliostro, Cagliostro,”—

NOTE.

RANDLE HOLME AND FREEMASONRY.



N *I Cymmrodor* (the Magazine of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion), Vol. XL. (dated 1929) is an Article, pp. 207-225, entitled "Two Welsh Heraldic Pedigrees with notes on Thomas Chaloner of Denbigh and Chester, Ulster King of Arms." By W. J. Hemp, F.S.A. (Pedigree and four Illustrations). Mr. Hemp is Secretary to the Royal Commission on Ancient Monuments (Wales). He is a descendant of John Chaloner, a brother of the said Thomas Chaloner.

The following extracts from the Article appear to be of interest to students of Freemasonry, having regard to the well-known statement of Randle Holme (the 3rd of that name) in the *Académie of Armory*, printed 1688: "I cannot but honor the Fellowship of the Masons because of its Antiquity and the more as being a member of that Society called Free-Masons; In being conversant amongst them I have observed the use of these several tools following, some whereof I have seen born in Coats Armour."

The extract from *I Cymmrodor* is:—

p. 208. The name of Chaloner often occurs among the early records connected with Cheshire and the adjoining parts of Lancashire.

Several members of the family were students of heraldry and genealogy and our Thomas Chaloner was employed as an agent by the College of Heralds for some years under the designation of "Deputy to the office of Arms" before he was created Ulster King of Arms. This appointment he only received on the day of his death 14th May 1598 as recorded on his monument in St. Michael's Church, Chester (fig. 3).

He also took advantage of his visitations and travels in North Wales and Cheshire to make antiquarian and heraldic notes, which are now of great value. (Note by Mr. Hemp.—According to Mr. Earwaker, MS. Harley 2101 contains notes on monuments and windows in churches made by Thomas Chaloner and others and arranged by the third Randle Holme.) He became a Freeman of Chester on Oct. 6th 1584 and as noted by Mr. J. P. Earwaker was a painter, poet and Antiquary as well as a member of Lord Derby's company of players.

On Nov. 8th 1584 he married Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Alcock, of Chester, and on Jan. 10th 1587 he took as his apprentice one Randle Holme. After Chaloner's death in 1598, Holme married his master's widow, and in 1602 apprenticed his step-son, Jacob Chaloner, to himself. Jacob became a well-known heraldic agent, painter and collector of pedigrees, and eventually moved to London where he died in 1631. Randle Holme remained in Chester, and built up the heraldic business which was to be carried on by his son, grandson and great-grandson, all bearing the same name, on the foundations laid by Chaloner's work. Randle III. was the author of the well-known "Academy of Armory."

(p. 210.) A brief reference may be made to the possible connection of Thomas Chaloner with Freemasonry. Mr. Earwaker, in the article already mentioned, refers to evidence proving that the Holmes were masons and quotes the third Randle's description of himself in 1688 as "a Member of that Society, called Free-Masons," pointing out that he was one of the earliest Freemasons whose name has come down to us.

Thomas Chaloner's son Daniel is called "Freemason"—whatever that may connote in the case of a professional sculptor—and at the end

of the Chaloner monumental inscription in St. Michael's is a symbol, a triangle point downwards surmounted by a ring, which also appears in some of the Harleian MSS., and may perhaps have been Chaloner's private mark (fig. 3). (Extract ends.)

The plate referred to as figure 3 shows that the thing called a ring is a circle with a central point.

Reverting to the pedigree, the following particulars are given of Daniel Chaloner:—Daniel, sculptor and "free mason." Born 14 Dec. 1589. Bap. St. Michael's Chester. Freeman of Chester 30 Oct. 1615. "Stone Cutter" of London. Apprenticed to Maximilian Poutrain, alias Colte, "stone carver" of St. Bart. the Great, 15 May 1607. Freeman of London. Died in London 1 March 1636. Will 44 Goare.

I made a note of the Will some years ago. It bears date 28 Feb. 1636. Testator describes himself as "Daniel Chaloner Cittizen and freemason of London." He gave everything (except a legacy of 10s.) to his wife Ursula Chaloner, and appointed her sole Executrix. She proved the Will in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury on 22nd March, 1636.

He is mentioned in Bro. Conder's work, p. 151, in the year 1627, as paying a fine of one shilling for coming after the time of prayer on the quarter day for Christmas quarter according to a late order on that behalf.

Page 294 of the same book shows that in 1633 he was Warden of the Masons Company while Nicholas Stone was Master.

Randle Holme the first (who married Thomas Chaloner's widow) was born 1571 and died 1655.

Randle Holme the second was born 1601 (?) and died 1659.


The third was born 1627 and died 1699. The MS. of the Old Charges known as The Harleian No. 2054 is in his handwriting. A *facsimile* of it is in *Q.C.A.* iii.

His grandmother was the Mother of Daniel Chaloner, Citizen of London and Freemason.

January, 1930.

W. J. WILLIAMS.

OBITUARY.



It is with much regret we have to record the death of the following Brethren:—

Sir **John Alexander Cockburn**, K.C.M.G., M.D., of Harrietsham, Kent, on 26th November, 1929. Our Brother was Past Deputy Grand Master, South Australia, and held the rank of Past Grand Deacon and Past Grand Sojourner, England. He had been a member of our Correspondence Circle since November, 1900.

J. W. Coulson, of Stamford, Lincs., on 27th August, 1929. Bro. Coulson had attained the rank of P.Pr.G.Sup.W., and P.Pr.G.R. in Royal Arch. He was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in May, 1911.

Joseph Joddrell Dowson, of Buenos Aires, on 8th August, 1929. Our Brother held the rank of Past Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies and that of Past Grand Standard Bearer in Grand Chapter. He joined our Correspondence Circle in October, 1917.

Joseph Frost, of Berkhamsted, Herts., in 1929. Bro. Frost was P.M. of Berkhamstead Lodge No. 504, and P.Z. of the Chapter attached thereto. He became a member of our Correspondence Circle in 1927.

Caleb George Gurr, of Adelaide, on 8th October, 1929. Our Brother was a P.M. of Lodge No. 99, and a P.Z. of Chapter No. 363 (I.C.). He was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in 1925.

Frederick Hubert James, of Newport, Mon., on 6th July, 1929, at the age of 70 years. Bro. James had attained the rank of Past Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies, and Past Grand Standard Bearer in Grand Chapter. He had been a member of our Correspondence Circle since October, 1908.

Major **Edward Lyall**, D.S.O., of Darlington, on 22nd September, 1929. Our Brother held the rank of P.Pr.G.W., and P.Pr.G.So. He was a Life Member of our Correspondence Circle, which he joined in 1923.

Horace Nelson, M.A., D.C.L., J.P., of London, W.C., on 9th September, 1929, at the age of 68 years. Bro. Nelson had held office as Grand Deacon, and Deputy Grand Registrar in Grand Chapter. He was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in May, 1907.

Charles Percy Noar, of Manchester, on 25th September, 1929. Our Brother had attained the rank of P.Pr.G.D., and was P.Z. of Starkie Chapter No. 935. He joined our Correspondence Circle in October, 1913, and was for many years Secretary of the Manchester Association for Masonic Research.

James Smith Protheroe, of Swindon, in 1929. Bro. Protheroe held the rank of P.Pr.G.D., and P.Pr.G.S.B. in Royal Arch. He was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in June, 1919.

Arthur Robert Ray, of Leigh-on-Sea, suddenly, in 1929. Our Brother had attained the rank of P.Pr.G.Pt., and had been a member of our Correspondence Circle since November, 1909.

Percy E. Reinganum, of London, N.W., suddenly, on 24th September, 1929, at the age of 54 years. He was a member of Valentia Lodge No. 3097, and of Maida Vale Chapter No. 2743. Our Brother was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in March, 1916.

Sydney Tappenden, of Enfield, on 2nd October, 1929. Bro. Tappenden was a P.M. of the City of London Lodge No. 901, and a member of the Chapter attached thereto. He joined our Correspondence Circle in June, 1913.

Dr. **Herbert White**, of Coulsdon, in September, 1929, as the result of an accident. He was I.P.M. of Woodcote Lodge No. 4891, and was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in May of this year.

John Richard Williams, of Oruro, Bolivia, on 15th August, 1929, when home on leave. Our Brother was a P.M. of Lodge No. 812 (S.C.), and of Walton Chapter No. 1086. He was a Life Member of our Correspondence Circle, which he joined in March, 1928.

Henry Wilmot, of Northallerton, in 1929, at the age of 67 years. Bro. Wilmot had attained the rank of P.Pr.G.W. He had been a member of our Correspondence Circle since June, 1904.

ST. JOHN'S CARD.



THE following were elected to the Correspondence Circle during the year 1929:—

LODGES, CHAPTERS, etc.:—Provincial Grand Lodge of Antrim, Belfast, Ireland; Grand Lodge of Finland, Helsinki; Grand Lodge of Maryland, Baltimore, U.S.A.; Loyal Berkshire Lodge of Hope No. 574, Newbury; Lagos Lodge No. 1171, Nigeria; Star of the North Lodge No. 1647, Whangarei, N.Z.; Loxfield Lodge No. 2450, Uckfield; Northern Nigeria Lodge No. 3325, Kaduna; Thet Lodge No. 3334, Thetford; Port Harcourt Lodge No. 3881, Nigeria; Suomi Lodge No. I., Helsinki; St. John Lodge No. IV., Helsinki; Lodge Te Aroha No. 52, Te Aroha, N.Z.; Lodge Ohaeawai No. 101, Auckland, N.Z.; St. Ambrose & Kilburn Lodge of Instruction, East Molesey; United Services Lodge of Instruction No. 3813, Gibraltar; Jervis Memorial Library, Bangalore, India; Scottish Rite Library, Minneapolis, Minn., U.S.A.; Wisconsin Consistory Library, Milwaukee, Wis., U.S.A.; Rochdale Masonic Buildings, Ltd., Rochdale, Lancs.; Masonic Hall Committee, Valletta, Malta.

BRETHREN:—Alexander Adams, of London, N. J.D. 4205, A.So. 3376; Major Gordon Adams, of Canterbury, Kent. I.P.M. 63, 63; L. S. Adlington, of Worcester; William Burt Aitken, of Glasgow. Grand Steward, 377; Ralph G. Albrecht, A.B., LL.B., of New York City, Dalhousie Lodge, Mass.; Frank Amos, of Canterbury. P.M. 31, P.Z. 31; Captain Maxwell H. Anderson, K.C., R.N., Fiji. P.P.G.M. (S.C.), Gibraltar; William Archer, of Elgin, Morayshire. S.D. 1319, Z. 263; Harry Astin, of Rochdale. P.M. 226, P.Pr.A.G.Sc.E.; Harry Lawrence Attwater, of London, W. 2620, 3092; Norman Stanley Bache, of Stourbridge. J.D. 564, 498; Oswald Felix Baerlein, LL.B., of Paris. 16, 1706 (E.C.); Charles Harry Baker, of Khartoum. P.M. 2954, H. 2954; Charles Joseph Baker, of Tokio. S.D. 2015, Sc.N. 2015; George Kennedy Barnes, of London, W. S.W. 2550; Frank Batey, of Monkseaton, Northumberland. J.D. 3892, P.So. 3691; Leonard Bayley, of London, N. S.W. 4972, 3095; C. H. Beedle, of Tampico, Mexico. 1; Francis Winton Beeny, of Keighley. 4598, 129; Robert Beetlestone, of Linsi, N. China. P.M. 3001; David Smeaton Bennet, of Cahirciveen, I.F.S. P.Pr.G.W., Munster, 62; Hugh Garner Bennett, of Harpenden, Herts. 4314; William John Bennett, of Sao Paulo, Brazil. 1897 (E.C.); James Bennetts, of Mexico. 3; Thomas Bent, of Taunton. P.G.St.B. (Craft and R.A.); Captain Frederic George Bevis, of Dalhousie, India. S.W. 1399, P.Sc.E. 1308; Walter Bickerdike, of Newhaven. 3277, 3277; Herbert Bigglestone, of Canterbury. P.Pr.G.D., P.Z. 31; Richard Billington, of Stoke-on-Trent. 2214, 418; Charles Rosser Bishop, of Shepton Mallet. P.Pr.G.W., P.Pr.G.H.; Charles Sydney Bishop, of Kingston-on-Thames. P.M. 1539, P.So. 2262; Edward Louis Frederick Bittermann, of Tynemouth. 1863; Gilbert Bradshaw Blackman, of Oxted. P.Pr.G.St.B., P.Z. 2769; Samuel Pery Blackmore, of Ceylon. Dis.G.D.; Edward Booth, of Birmingham. P.Pr.G.D.C., Staffs. P.Z. 3826; William Morris Bower, of Romford. 538; Frederic Brabner, of San Paulo, Brazil. S.W. 13, 317 (E.C.); John Percival Bradford, of Masham. 4171; Henry Waterford Braithwaite, of London, W. 742; Ronald Maxwell

Braithwaite, of Sydney, N.S.W. 256 (Q.C.), P.Z. 4 (Q.C.); Charles Bree, of Buenos Aires. P.Dis.A.G.D.C.; William Bregenzer, of Camperdown, Victoria. P.Dis.G.D.C.; Norman Hamilton Brewster, of Trinidad. W.M. 1044 (S.C.), Z. 184 (S.C.); Wallace Bridge, of Rochdale. P.Pr.G.Treas., P.Z. 298; Richard Stanley Brittain, of Wellington, N.Z. 66, 30; William Brittain, of Newmilns, Ayrshire. P.M. 51, P.H. 251; Norman Fraser Brown, of Rangoon. 4374; Joseph Charles Browne, of East Molesey. P.M. 1891, P.Z. 2540; Arthur Alexis Bryant, of New York City. J.W. 21, P.So. 215; Joseph Buckley, of Sao Paulo, Brazil. Treas. 13, 1083 (E.C.); Robert George Alexander Bullerwell, F.G.S., of Bedlington, Northumberland. I.P.M. 4398, 2868; Anthon Bundgaard, of Aabenraa, Denmark. St. Nicholas; Edred Thomas Burfield, of Heathfield, Sussex. 859; Arthur John Burgess, of Somerton. P.M. 2038, A.So. 329; George Burrington, of Peacehaven. P.Pr.A.G.D.C., 3277; Walter Alfred Busby, of Coulsdon, Surrey. 232; Alexander William Caddy, of London, N. 4600; Patrick Thaddeus Carey, of Canton, China. W.M. International (Mass.C.); M. J. Cary, of Colombo. P.A.G.D.C., P.Z., 2170; Samuel George Catt, of London, N. 4734; William George Cave, of Banbury. 2334, 599; Gerald Pelligrino Cawthorn, of Masham, Yorks. I.G. 837, 837; Joseph Ernest Cawthorne, of Leeds. 4353, Sc.E. 289; Alexander Gustavus Adolphus Chalmers, of Brighton. W.M. 1466, A.So. 271; Harry Cherrington, F.R.I.B.A., of Dudley. W.M. 252, 252; Revd. Frederick Cæsar Parr Clucas Clarke, of Madeira. P.Dis.G.Ch., P.Dis.G.Sc., Burma; Gilbert Samuel Clegg, of Beckenham. S.D. 720; Arthur Othie Coates, of Hornsea. W.M. 1511, 1511; C. G. Coates, of Paris. W.M. 16; William Lonsdale Cockcroft, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., of Keighley. S.W. 4644, 810; Walter Benjamin Cole, of Sao Paulo, Brazil. J.W. 13; Percy George Coleman, of Bedford. W.M. 5000, A.So. 4413; Arthur Stanley Marcus Collins, of Geelong, Victoria. P.M. 398, A.So. 19; Horace William Coe, of Swaffam. W.M. 2879, 107; Henry Albert Cook, of Kimberley. P.M. 1417, Z. 3142; William Burrowes Cooke, of Philadelphia, Pa. W.M. 631; Fred Cooksey, of Sinoia, Rhodesia. J.W. 1075 (S.C.); Charles Dewey Coombs, Jr., of Pittsburgh, Pa. 430, 288; Charles Harry Copestake, of Schenectady, N.Y. 971, 157; William Dawn Copley, of Bulawayo. P.A.G.D.C., P.Z. 2566; Herbert William Coupe, of Lewes. P.Pr.G.D., P.Pr.G.J.; George Edward Crowter, of Oxted. P.M. 2769, 2769; T. J. Curliss, of Adelaide. 107; Jack Cursetji, of London, E.C. P.M. 4445, P.Z. 742; Oliver Royer Daly, of London, N. J.D. 1423; Oliver Carl Daniell, of Calcutta. 4536, 229; Raymund Daniel, of Atlanta, Ga. G.M.; Frank Hillier Davey, of Cambridge. 88; Arthur Woollacott Davies, of Luton. 1967, 1470; Gilbert Henry Davis, of Singapore. W.M. 2933; F. W. Davey, of London, W. P.A.G.R.; Charles Frederick Day, of Leigh-on-Sea. W.M. 3475, P.So. 101; Johan Hendrik de Sitter, LL.D., of Meppel, Holland. Humaniteit, *L'Union Provençiale*; Walter Herbert Dickie, of Caterham. S.W. 857; Harold Edward Dicks, of Evesham. P.M. 3308, H. 3308; William Thomas Dillon, of London, N.W. P.M. 1567; Revd. Peter H. Ditchfield, M.A., F.S.A., of Wokingham. P.G.Ch.; George Nelson Dobson, of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. P.M. 636, A.So. 3635; James Robert Donaldson, of Bassano, Alberta. P.M. 55, P.Z. 26; John Richard Doren-Ditch, of Uckfield. P.Pr.A.G.D.C. (Craft & R.A.); Ernest Duffield, of Roundhay. Pr.G.D., 304; Thomas John Duncan, of Barnet. P.M. 4705, A.So. 1385; James Philip Dunn, of Edinburgh. P.M. 2, P.J. 56; Harold Earlam, of Sydney, N.S.W. P.Dis.G.I.W., P.Z. 9; F. H. Ellerton, of Ba, Fiji. 4883; Thomas Lea Elliott, of Edgbaston. W.M. 4621, P.So. 3185; James Ellis, of Rangoon. 4374; Edward John Hoghton Ellison, of Eccleshall. I.G. 4054, 546; Louis Warren Emerick, of Fulton, N.Y. 305, 70; Robert Eschur, of Brakpan, S. Africa. 110 (D.C.); David Rudolf Evans, of Newcastle Emlyn. W.M. 4648, 476; Charles Kingston Everitt, of Sheffield. P.M. 139, 139; Capt. Denys Oldfield Fardell, R.A., of Jubbulpore. W.M. 3265, 1065; William A. Faulkner, of Sheffield. J.W. 1239; Charles Frederick Vinten Fenton, of Glossop. W.M. 5017, A.So. 625; Frank Ronald Fifoot, of Cardiff. 4026, 4026; Marcus Flint, of Basford, Nottingham. 3955, 3955; Harry John Ford, of Lagos.

A.Dis.G.Sec.; Randolph R. Fox, of Milner, B.C. S.D. 103, 6; Harry Preston Francis, of Pittsburgh, Pa. 430, 288; Major General Sir George McKenzie Franks, K.C.B., of Knocklong, Limerick. P.G.S.B. (Craft and R.A.); Frank Freeman, of London, S.E. S.D. 3927, 2399; James William French, of Portsmouth. 405 (S.C.), 513 (S.C.); Frank Mainwaring Furley, of Canterbury. P.A.G.D.C., Pr.G.J.; Torsten Bertel Gadolin, of Tammersfors, Finland. 3; Herbert Henry Galvin, of Vryburg, S. Africa. P.Dis.G.W., P.Z. 2232; Edward Thomas Gibbs, of Bexhill-on-Sea. Pr.G.D., Z. 1580; Charles Malcolm Giles, of Kampala, Uganda. W.M. 3492, Sc.N. 543 (S.C.); Henry Thomas Gittings, of London, N. P.M. 4752, Sc.N. 2426; Sqdrn.L. John Samuel Goggin, of Stanford-le-Hope, Essex. S.W. 2738, 2738; Major Charles Oliver Graham, O.B.E., of Gosport, Hants. P.M. 2612, H. 4795; Thomas James Graham, of Tientsin. P.Dis.G.W. 3001; John Alfred Grantham, of Macclesfield. I.G. 3382, 2679; Richard Clegg Greenwood, of Chorley, Lancs. P.Pr.G.S.B., P.Pr.G.A.So.; Geoffrey C. Griffith, of London, E.C. 1677; John Ernest Grosvenor, of Stourbridge. P.Pr.G.R., P.Z. 377; Alfred Henry Gwinnell, of Epsom, Surrey. 2422, 2422; Francis Haden-Crawford, of Paignton, S. Devon. P.Pr.G.W., Bucks. 1358; Basil Graham Burnett Hall, of Woking. 357, 7; Dr. Kai Hammer, of Aabenraa, Denmark. 6; Allan William Hare, of Ilford. W.M. 3969, H. 410; Walter C. Harris, of Philadelphia. 493; William John Harrowell, of Nigeria. Treas. 3973, 1331; Werner Hartmann, of New York; Edgar Haydon, of New Plymouth, N.Z. 670, P.Z. 5 (N.Z.); Eric Sidney Charles Heathcote, of Brighton. W.M. 811, 315; Stanley Baird Hemming, of Parkerville, W. Australia. S.D. 90, J. 12; Ross Hepburn, LL.B., of Christchurch, N.Z. 276; Robert Hewitt, of Durham. P.M. 1334, 124; Edmund Thomas Hewlitt, of Epsom. L.R., P.Pr.G.D., P.Z. 1604; Raymond Arthur Hill, of West Wickham, Kent. 73; Walter Hereward Hill, of Java. W.M. 1302 (S.C.); W. J. Hill, of Worcester. P.Pr.G.W.; Rupert Polack Hilton, of London, N.W. 3130; Major George E. Hoare, of London, S.W. 511; Otto Holstein, F.R.G.S., of Mexico City. 445 (S.C.), 161 (S.C.); Bernard Leslie Hooper, of London, S.E. W.M. 23; William James Host, of Adelaide. P.G.Stew., P.G.Sc.N.; Arthur Trevor Houghton, of London, W.C. 11, 3113; Benjamin Howgate, of Leeds. 1221; Robert Walter Hudson, of Leeds. W.M. 306, Sc.N. 306; Rowland Thomas Armstrong Hughes, of Bruton, Somerset. Dy.Pr.G.M., P.G.D., P.Z. 285; Claude Ethelbert Hutchence, of Woking. J.D. 2317; Geoffrey Granger Hutt, of Sao Paulo, Brazil. I.G. 13; John Inglis, of Glasgow. P.M. 153, 67; John Charles Innes, of Leeds. P.M. 2608, 289; John Cecil Ireland, of Scarborough. S.D. 1760; Albert Edward Jackson, of London, S.W. 11; Herbert John Jackson, of Shipley. P.Pr.A.G.D.C. 304; Solomon Leon Jacobson, of Natal. W.M. 3170, A.So. 3170; Ernest Douglas James, of Lewes. W.M. 1303, 311; Evan Parry James, of Bristol. P.Pr.G.W., P.Z. 2943; Isidor Kaplan, of Edinburgh. 1209; Glenn G. Keeling, of Dearborn, Mich. P.M. 542; Dr. Erstine Loring Kelly, of Bulawayo. 2566, 2566; Peter Anderson Kemp, of Snaresbrook, Essex. J.W. 95; Wilfred Kipling, of Ashford, Middlesex. P.M. 2979; Dr. Solomon Kirk-Cohen, of Louis Trichardt, Transvaal. S.W. 3640; Frank George Knight, of London, N.W. Sec. 4981; Herbert Wheatley Knocker, of Croydon. P.Pr.G.R., Kent; Toivo Kontio, of Helsinki, Finland. G.Sec.; Herbert William Lambert, of Woking. W.M. 3095; Joseph Langridge, of Lewes. P.Pr.G.O., J. 311; Leonard George Langton, of Edinburgh. S.D. 1310; Frederick Arthur Last, of Cambridge. 2477; Edwin Charles Leach, of Diamond Creek, Vic. P.G.Ins.Wkgs., P.G.Sc.N.; Duncan Campbell Lee, of London, E.C. A.G.R.; John Burnell Hunt Lee, of Sao Paulo, Brazil. 13; George Evett LeMaitre, of London, E.C. L.R. 1818; Harold Martin Lewis, of Taunton. 261, 261; Ben Lightfoot, of Salisbury, Rhodesia. 439; Stanley Lightman, of Leeds. P.Pr.G.W. 1991; Arthur Emanuel Lindborg, of St. Thomas, V.I., U.S.A. S.D. 356, P.So. 356; Ernest Gwynne Lloyd, of Neath. 364; Harry Bertram Lodge, of Epsom. W.M. 2422; Ernest Lawson Lomax, of Sidcup, Kent. P.M. 3346, P.J. 1556; Herbert

William Fortescue Long, B.Sc., F.R.G.S., of Barnehurst, Kent. 2951; Percy George Loxley, of Buenos Aires. 3641, 1553; John George Macdonald, of Yea, Victoria, Australia. P.G.W., 66; Ralph McIntosh, B.A., of Carlton, Victoria, Australia. J.W. 276, 39; John Henry Aitken McIntyre, M.I.Mech.E., of Glasgow. P.M. 571, P.P. 69; John Stanley Machin, of Weybridge. P.M. 231; Raymond Aubrey Maltby, of Oxford. 340; John Martin, of Falkirk. Sec. 16; Robert Lyndon Matthews, of Twickenham, Middsx. P.M. 1818; William Matthews, of Nuneaton. 432, 432; Manuel Maza-Escudero, of Cuba. W.M. 13; Oswald Chettle Mazengarb, of Wellington, N.Z. G.Lecturer: Campbell Miller, of Glasgow. P.M. 437; Edward Henry Miller, of Ewell, Surrey. P.M. 1826, J. 1347; Herbert Mitchell, of Morley, Leeds. 380, 380; Herbert John Moore, of Hitchin. 4670; Allan Morton, of Glasgow. G.Stew.; Hugh Fletcher Moulton, of London, E.C. P.M. 2190, P.Z. 1789; Thomas William Naylor, of Bishop Auckland. P.M. 2415, P.Z. 2415; Rev. Alexander Moncur Niblock, of Auckland, N.Z. W.M. 45, 52; Frederick John Nield, of London, N. 4081; Ranald Noel-Paton, of Colombo. 2170, 2170; Barker North, of Bradford, Yorks. W.M. 3600; Daniel Oakley, of Stourbridge. Pr.G.D.C. (Craft & R.A.); Charles Henry Ochse, of Harrismith, O.F.S. 1022, 1022; Ernest Oetzmann, of Gerrards Cross, Bucks. P.M. 52, P.So. 52; Bruce William Oliver, of Barnstaple. J.W. 251, 251; Guy Oliver Michael O'Reilly, of Trinidad. P.M. 405; William Thomas Osborne, of London, W.C. P.G.Stew.; George William Frederick Pallett, of Plymouth. 159; Charles Robert Palmer, of Banbury, Oxon. O. 599, O. 599; Arthur Douglas Parham, F.R.I.B.A., of Colombo. 2170, 2170; George Edward Parrett, of Ilminster. P.Pr.G.W. 814; Frederick George Payne, of London, S.W. 3680; Ernest Andrew Penman, of London, N. 1572; Major Albert Edward Perkins, F.R.G.S., of Moshi, Tanganyika. W.M. 5111; Thomas J. Perry, of Burton-on-Trent. P.M. 4850; Arthur Le Roy Peterson, of Hitchin. 180, 449; Alexander Plant, of Greenock. P.M. 175, G.Sup., Renfrewshire (R.A.); Professor Arthur Reginald Prince, of Truro, Nova Scotia. 43, 4; Edward H. Prior, of Hartford, Conn. P.M. 118; Alfred George William Provart, of Stockport. P.Pr.G.W., P.Pr.G.H.; Arthur Leslie Pugh, of Esher, Surrey. 3860, 881; Arthur Stanley Quick, of London, S.W. 2183, 53; Douglas Llewellyn George Radford, of Edinburgh. P.M. 1, 1; Clifford Ramsden, J.P., of Luddenden, Yorks. P.Pr.G.W., P.Pr.G.J.; Cuthbert Raymond, of Ryde, I.W. S.W. 1896, Sc.N. 1896; Ernest John Reed, of Bristol. 3108, 103; John Hawkes Reed, of Isfield, Sussex. L.R., P.M. 108, 29; Franklin H. Reeder, of Philadelphia. P.M. 631; Walter William Reeve, B.Sc., of Brighton. 1821; Dr. Robert Galbraith Reid, of London, W. W.M. 235; Herbert George Riley, of Market Harborough. 1330; William Henry Riley, of Leicester. P.M. 3448, 279; Thomas Emmanuel Rippington, of Gt. Missenden, Bucks. W.M. 2421, J. 2421; Alfred Charles Roberts, of Jersey, C.I. P.M. 4449, A.So. 491; John David Roberts, of London, W. 3817, 3817; Thomas John Roberts, of Ruthin, N. Wales. 4533; Robert Robertson, of Tynemouth. P.Pr.A.G.D.C.; Albert Edward Robinson, of Blackhill, Durham. P.M. 2135, Sc.E. 2929; John William Robson, of Rotherham. P.M. 3023, 904; Percy Thomas Robson, of Hanley. P.Pr.G.Sup.W. 3934; William George Roehrich, of New York. 245; James Gillon Ross, M.B., C.M. (Edinburgh), of Whitby, Yorks. P.Pr.G.D., P.Pr.G.O. (R.A.); James McKear Rowbotham, of Buenos Aires. P.Dis.G.W., P.Dis.G.J.; Frederick Walter Rowe, of Worcester. W.M. 280, A.So. 280; Samuel Reginald Royce, of Fulton, N.Y. P.M. 144, 167; William Taylor Russell, of Bolton. 4595; Dr. Kaikhuru N. Sahiar, of Bombay. Dis.G.D., P.Z. 757; Lisardo Munoz Sanudo, of Havana. P.G.M.; Samuli Sario, of Helsinki, Finland. W.M. 1; W. A. Service, of Ba, Fiji. J.D. 4883; Leo Shaerf, of London, N.W. 657; L. J. Sharpe, of Worcester; Alexander James Shaw, of Montevideo. P.M. 876, 876; William Shipley, of Brighton. P.M. 1829, 315; Wyndham Cornelius Shipp, of Bristol. 3884; Herbert Maynard Short, of Westmount, Quebec. 94 (N.Y.), 24; Arthur Lind Simpson, of Harrow, Middsx. D.C. 5046, 2022; Major Esmond Moreton Sinauer, M.C., of London, W. P.M. 2852, P.So. 3016; Gerald Maurice

Joseph Slot, M.D., M.R.C.P., of London, W. J.W. 4, P.So. 4; William Henry Mills Smeaton, of London, W.C. P.Dis.G.St.B., Madras, P.Dis.G.So., Madras; Harry Smith, of London, S.E. L.R. 3240, L.C.R. 3240; John Edward Smith, of Ilkeston. J.D. 3852, 1179; Jan Prescott Smith, of Cape Town. W.M. 12 (D.C.); James Willison Smith, of Philadelphia, Pa. G.M.; William Smith, of Ilkeston. W.M. 3852, A.So. 1179; Rev. Walter Henry Smith, of Tolaga Bay, N.Z. Ch. 232; William James Shand Smith, of Nelson, N.Z. P.M. 735 (E.C.), P.Z. 157 (S.C.); Axel Solitander, of Helsinki, Finland. G.M.; Abraham Joseph Solomon, of Senekal, O.F.S. A.Sec. 110 (D.C.); Dr. Dinshaw Sorabji, of Surat, Bombay. P.M. 584 (S.C.), P.Z. 336 (S.C.); William Ritchie Spence, of Bath. W.M. 41, 41; Augustine Wilfred Cussen Spencer, of London, W. 3923, 3923; Harrison Nutter Spencer, of Auckland, N.Z. 1710, 1338; The Hon'ble Percy Julian Sproule, of Penang. Dis.G.M., G.Sup.; Alvis Thomas Stapley, of Canterbury. P.Pr.G.D., P.Z. 31; Robert William C. Steele, of Hastings, N.Z. P.M. 272; William Stenbridge, of Leeds. P.M. 306, P.Z. 306; William Stephens, of Cardiff. 1992, 1992; William Edgar Stephens, of Gorleston-on-Sea. P.Pr.G.Treas.; Donald Stewart, of Glasgow. 1241, 189; William George Street, B.A., of London, S.W. S.D. 4660, 1348; George Henry Strevens, of Eastleigh, Hants. J.W. 1990, 1461; Reginald William Strickland, of Ightham, Kent. P.M. 720, 1414; William M. Strom, of Greenville, Texas. 335, 114; Joseph Colin Sturton, of Cambridge. 441, 441; Alfred Henry Summers, M.A., of Cosham, Hants. P.Pr.G.W., P.Pr.G.J.; Arthur Bruce Sutton, of Nassau, Bahamas. P.M. 443; Robert Henry Swainson, of Ulverston, Lancs. Pr.G.Stew., P.So. 995; Peter Swanson, of Rio de Janeiro. P.G.D., G.Treas., Brazil; William James Talbot, of Sao Paulo, Brazil. J.D. 13; Kenneth Walsham Taylor, of Colombo. S.W. 2170, 2170; Lt.-Commr. Walter Lee Thompson, of San Pedro, Cal., U.S.A. 319, 356 (E.C.); Judge Eugene D. Thomas, of Atlanta, Ga. P.M. 523, P.H.P. 155; Leonard Russell Tofield, of Penang. W.M. 1555, 1555; Owen Richard Thomas Turner, of Ashanti, W. Africa. P.M. 3717, P.Z. 3717; Harold Van Buren Voorhis, of Red Bank, N.J., U.S.A. 21, Sc. 1; Clarence Gordon Wade, of Leeds. 3047; Robert Teese Waid, of Santiago, Chile. 517 (Ohio C.); Herbert William Walton, of Lewes. P.M. 1303, P.Z. 311; John Hugh Walton, of Bihar, India. P.Dis.G.D., P.Dis.G.So., Bengal; Ernest Frank Warren, of Brentwood. J.W. 4838, 3031; Reginald Herbert Webb, of Wellington, N.Z. G.R. (Craft & R.A.); Harry Percy Webster Webber, of Bexhill-on-Sea. P.M. 2483, Sc.N. 2483; Dr. Arthur Sydney Webley, of London, S.E. 4797, 1536; Ralph Younger Welch, of Gateshead. W.M. 4078; Alfred Wells, F.C.I.S., of Redhill. P.M. 4307, P.Z. 4150; Clarence Jay West, of Washington, D.C. P.M. 41, P.H.P. 5; Henry Westron, of Canterbury, Kent. P.Pr.G.D.C. 31; Harry White, of Lorne Park, Ontario. 524, H. 230; Dr. Herbert White, of Coulsdon, Surrey. P.M. 4891; L. T. Williams, of Prairie, Queensland. P.G.B.B. (N.Z.); Henry Walker Willcox, of Sunderland. W.M. 1389; Percy Ablewhite Wilson, of Shortlands, Kent. 1963, O. 1963; Ralph Henry Shannon Woodgate, of Surbiton. 2473, 2473; Harry Edwin Worthington, of London, W. P.Pr.G.Treas., Mddsx. J. 1309; Gilbert Alfred Wratten, of London, S.W. 558, 4600; Percy Augustus Yapp, of Sheerness. P.Dis.G.W. Gibraltar. P.Dis.G.Treas. (R.A.) Gibraltar; Alleyne Alfred Bardsley Yeatman, of Limpsfield, Surrey. S.W. 23; Edwin Fritz Young, of Lewes, Sussex. P.Pr.A.G.D.C. 311; Alfred J. Zimmerman, of Philadelphia, Pa. P.M. 606, P.Z. 236.

Note.—In the above List Roman numerals refer to Craft Lodges, and those in italics to R.A. Chapters.

Quatuor Coronati Lodge, No. 2076, London.

PUBLICATIONS.

ARS QUATUOR CORONATORUM.

COMPLETE SETS OF THE *TRANSACTIONS*.—A few complete Sets of *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, Vols. i. to xli., have been made up for sale. Prices may be obtained on application to the Secretary. Each volume will be accompanied as far as possible, with the St. John's Card of the corresponding year.

ODD VOLUMES.—Such copies of Volumes as remain over after completing sets, are on sale to members.

MASONIC REPRINTS.

QUATUOR CORONATORUM ANTIGRAPHA.

COMPLETE SETS OF *MASONIC REPRINTS*.—A few complete Sets of *Quatuor Coronatorum Antigrapha*, Vols. i. to x., consisting mainly of exquisite facsimiles, can be supplied. Prices may be obtained on application to the Secretary.

ODD VOLUMES.—Vols. vi., vii., ix., and x. are on sale to members, price 30/- per volume.

FACSIMILES OF THE OLD CHARGES.—Four Rolls, viz., Grand Lodge Nos. 1 and 2 MS., Scarborough MS., and the Buchanan MS. Lithographed on vegetable vellum, in the original Roll form. Price, One Guinea each.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS.

	£	s.	d.
The Masonic Genius of Robert Burns, by Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson, Drawing-room edition, extra illustrations	5	0	
Caementaria Hibernica, by Dr. W. J. Chetwode Crawley, Fasciculus I., Fasciculus II., and Fasciculus III. A few complete sets only for sale. Prices may be obtained on application to the Secretary.			
Caementaria Hibernica, Fasciculus III., a few copies available	1	1	0
The Orientation of Temples, by Bro. W. Simpson, uniform in size to bind with the <i>Transactions</i> ...	2	6	
British Masonic Medals, with twelve plates of illustrations	1	1	0
Six Masonic Songs of the Eighteenth Century. In one volume	2	6	
Q.C. Pamphlet No. 1: Builder's Rites and Ceremonies; the Folk-lore of Freemasonry. By G. W. Speth	1	6	

BINDING.

Members returning their parts of the *Transactions*, to the Secretary, can have them bound in dark blue Canvas, lettered gold, for 6/- per volume. Cases can be supplied at 3/- per volume, date or number of volume should be specified.

MEMBERSHIP MEDAL.

Brethren of the Correspondence Circle are entitled to wear a membership Medal, to be procured of the Secretary only. In Silver Gilt, engraved with the owner's name, with bar, pin and ribbon, as a breast jewel. 10/6 each.

Quatuor Coronati Lodge,

NO. 2076, LONDON.



SECRETARY:

LIONEL VIBERT, P.A.G.D.C.

OFFICE, LIBRARY AND READING ROOM:

27, GREAT QUEEN STREET, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.2.