THE

HISTORY OF FREEMASONRY

Its Antiquities, Symbols, Constitutions, Customs, Etc.

Embracing an Investigation of the Records of the Organisations of the Fraternity in England, Scotland, Ireland, British Colonies, France, Germany, and the United States.

Derived from Official Sources.

By ROBERT FREKE GOULD, Barrister-at-Law,
Past Senior Grand Deacon of England;
Author of "The Four Old Lodges," "The Atholl Lodges," Etc.

VOLUME III.

LONDON:
THOMAS C. JACK, 45 LUDGATE HILL.
1884.

CONTENTS.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

THE

HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES OF FREEMASONRY.

CHAPTER XII.

EARLY BRITISH FREEMASONRY.

ENGLAND.—I.

MASONIC TRADITION—SIR CHRISTOPHER WREN—PAPAL BULLS—ANNUAL ASSEMBLIES.

"BETWEEN the region of fancy and the province of authenticated history lies a border-land of tradition, full of difficulties, which can neither be passed without notice, nor ever, perhaps, very clearly or finally explained."[1] Upon many of the questions which it would be most interesting to decide, no conclusion whatever is attainable. The historian knows very little of the real facts; of the lives of his personages only a contemptibly small fragment has been preserved. No doubt, if his imagination be strong, he will piece together the information he has, and instinctively shape for himself some theory which will combine them all; though, if his judgment be as strong as his imagination, he will hold very cheap these conjectural combinations, and will steadfastly bear in mind that, as an historian, he is concerned with facts and not with possibilities.[2] Some, indeed, instead of employing those tests of credibility which are consistently applied to modern history, attempt to guide their judgment by the indications of internal evidence, and to assume that truth can be discovered by "an occult faculty of historical divination." Hence the task they have undertaken resembles an inquiry into the internal structure of the earth, or into the question, whether the stars are inhabited? It is an attempt to solve a problem, for the solution of which no sufficient data exist. Their ingenuity and labour can result in nothing but hypothesis and conjecture, which may be supported by analogies, and may sometimes appear specious and attractive, but can never rest on the solid foundation of proof.[3]

It is too often forgotten that "in traditional truths, each remove weakens the force of

[1] C. Elton, Origins of English History, p. 7.

[2] See Professor Seeley, History and Politics, Macmillan's Magazine, Aug. 1879.

[3] Lewis, An Inquiry into the Credibility of the Early Roman History, 1855, vol. i., p. 13.

the proof; and the more hands the tradition has successively passed through, the less strength and evidence does it receive from them." This it is necessary to recollect, because, to use the words of a learned writer, we "find amongst some men the quite contrary commonly practised, who look on opinions to gain force by growing older. Upon this ground, propositions, evidently false or doubtful enough in their first beginning, come by an inverted rule of probability to pass for authentic truths; and those which found or deserved little credit from the mouths of their first authors are thought to grow venerable by age, and are urged as undeniable."[1]

In closing the mythico-historical period of *English* Freemasonry at the year 1717,[2] I have been desirous of drawing a sharp line of division between the legendary or traditionary, and the authentic histories of the craft. The era, however, immediately preceding that of the formation of a Grand Lodge, is the most interesting in our annals, and its elucidation will necessarily claim attention, before we pass on to an examination of the *records* of later date.

Although, for convenience sake, the year 1717 is made to mark the epoch of authentic —*i.e.*, officially accredited—Masonic history, the existence in England of a widely-diffused system of Freemasonry in the first half of the seventeenth century is demonstrable, whence we shall be justified in concluding that for its period of origin in South Britain, a far higher antiquity may be claimed and conceded.

The present chapter will deal with what may be termed the "floating traditions" of the Society, and by carefully examining the sources of authority upon which they rest, and the argumentative grounds (if any) by which their authenticity is supported, I shall attempt to lay a sure foundation for the historical inquiry—properly so called—upon which we shall next enter.

It has been observed "that a great part of the labour of every writer is only the destruction of those that went before him," the first care of the builder of a new system being to demolish the fabrics which are standing. As the actual history of Freemasonry, like that of any other venerable institution, is only to be derived from ancient writings, the genuineness and authenticity of such documents are only determinable by a somewhat free handling of authorities; and whoever attempts to explain the meaning of a writer would but half discharge his task did he not show how much other commentators have corrupted and obscured it.

It is difficult in a work of this description not to write too little for some, and too much for others; to meet the expectations of the student, without wearying the ordinary reader; or to satisfy the *few* that may be attracted by a desire for instruction, without repelling the *many* whose sole object is to be amused.

Some friends, upon whose judgment I place great reliance, have warned me against attempting to deal exhaustively with a subject flux and transitory, or at least until more light has been cast upon it by the unceasing progress of modern research. That more might be accomplished in a longer course of years devoted to the same study I admit, yet, as remarked by Hearne, "*it is the business of a good antiquary, as of a good man, to have mortality*

[1] John Locke, Essay on the Human Understanding, book iv., chap. xvi., § 10. "This is certain, that what in one age was affirmed upon slight grounds, can never after come to be more valid in future ages by being often repeated" (*Ibid.*, § 11).

[2] *Ante*, Chap. I., p. 2

always before him."[1] It is unwise to amass more than one can digest, and having undertaken a work, to go on searching and transcribing, and seeking new supplies when already overburdened, must inevitably result in that work being left unfinished.

In the present chapter, I shall somewhat depart from the arrangement hitherto observed, or at least attempted, of keeping the subjects discussed distinct and separate from one another. To the student of Masonic antiquities there is nothing more bewildering than to find scattered over the compass of a large book isolated allusions to particular subjects, which he must group together for himself, if he wishes to examine any set of them as a whole.

The slight variation of treatment it is now proposed to adopt, which, after all, is more nominal than real, will not, however, be productive of any inconvenience. The general subject to be examined is Masonic tradition *in its relation to the facts of history*, and though several legends or fables will pass under review, the evidence by which these are traceable to their respective sources of origin is in many cases identical, and one tradition is frequently so interwoven with another, that the only way of testing their real value and importance is by subjecting them to a common and a searching scrutiny. Although I use the expression "Masonic tradition" in its widest sense, as covering all the information respecting the *past* of Freemasonry that has descended to us, whether handed down by oral relations or professedly derived from "Records of the Society"—of which we are told a great deal, but see very little—the qualification by which it is followed above will remove any uneasiness that might otherwise be excited.

No attempt will be made to follow the beaten road of those voluminous plodders of Masonic history, who make Masons of every man of note, from Adam to Nimrod, and from Nimrod to Solomon, down to the present day; nor shall I seriously discuss the statements, made in all good faith by writers of reputation, that Masonry was introduced into Britain A.M. 2974 by "E-Brank, king of the Trojan race," and into Ireland by the prophet Jeremiah; that 27,000 Masons accompanied the Christian princes in the Crusades; and that Martin Luther was received into the Society on Christmas night, 1520, just fifteen days after he had burned the Pope's Bull.[2] These and kindred creations of the fancy I shall dismiss to the vast limbo of fabulous narrations.

In the history of Freemasonry there are no speculations which are worthy of more critical investigation than its conjectural origin, as disclosed in the "Parentalia," and the common belief that this derivation was attested by the high authority of a former Grand Master of the Society.[3]

I shall therefore carefully examine the grounds upon which these speculations have arisen, and as the theory of "travelling Masons," by which so many writers have been misled, owes

[1] The Rambler, No. 71, Nov. 20, 1750. The following prayer, found amongst his papers after his decease, and now preserved in the Bodleian Library, exemplifies Hearne's character as much, perhaps, as any anecdote that has descended to us: "Oh, most gracious and mercifull Lord God . ·. . ·. I continually meet with most signal instances of this Thy Providence, and one act yesterday, when I *unexpectedly met with three old MSS.*, for which, in a particular manner, I return my thanks" (Aubrey, Letters written by Eminent Persons, and Lives of Eminent Men, 1813, vol. i., p. 118).

[2] *Cf.* Book of Constitutions, 1738; Multa Paucis, p. 45; Dalcho, Masonic Orations, Appendix, p. 56; and Freemason, March 10, 1880, and July 2, 1881.

[3] *Ante*, Chaps. I., p. 3, and VI., p. 257. See also the *Times* of June 26, and the *Pall Mall Gazette* of Oct. 20, 1879. Although the pretensions of the Freemasons are mildly ridiculed in these leading journals, Wren's grand-mastership is accepted by both!

its general acceptance to the circumstance that it was esteemed to be the opinion of a great *Freemason*, as well as a great architect, the evidence upon which the *opinion* has been ascribed to Wren, as well as that connecting him *in any shape* with the Masonic craft, will be considered at some length.

"The road to truth, particularly to subjects connected with antiquity, is generally choaked with fable and error, which we must remove, by application and perseverance, before we can promise to ourselves any satisfaction in our progress. Because a story has been related in one way for an hundred years past is not, alone, sufficient to stamp it with truth; it must carry, on the face of it, the appearance of probability, and if it is a subject which can be tried by the evidence of authentic history, and by just reasoning from established *data*, it will never be received by an enlightened mind on the *ipse dixit* of any one."[1]

The common belief in Wren's membership of the Society of Freemasons rests upon two sources of authority. Historically, the general impression derives what weight it may possess from the importance that is attached to an obscure passage in Aubrey's "Natural History of Wiltshire," and traditionally (or masonically) the acceptance of the "legend," and its devolution from an article of faith into a matter of conviction, is dependent upon our yielding full credence to statements in Dr Anderson's Constitutions of A.D. 1738, which are quite irreconcilable with those in his earlier publication of 1723. The "Natural History of Wiltshire," originally commenced in 1656, and of which the last chapter was written on April 21, 1686, was the author's first literary essay. He subsequently made some additions, but none of a later date than 1691. In 1675 it was submitted to the Royal Society; subsequently Dr Plot[2]—curator of the Ashmolean Museum, and author of the "Natural History of Staffordshire"—was requested by Aubrey to prepare it for the press. This, however, he declined to do, but strongly urged the writer "to finish and publish it" himself. The work remained in MS. until 1847, when it was *first* printed, under the editorial supervision of John Britton.[3] The original MS. was never removed from Oxford, but a fair copy was made by the author and presented to the Royal Society. Of the Oxford MS., Britton says, "Being compiled at various times, during a long series of years, it has a confused appearance from the numerous corrections and additions made in it by Aubrey." The same authority continues:—"So far as Aubrey's own labours are concerned, the Royal Society's copy is the most perfect; but the notes of Ray, Evelyn, and Tanner were written upon the Oxford MS.,

[1] Dalcho, Masonic Orations, II., p. 37. This passage is only one of many wherein the principles on which masonic investigation should be conducted are clearly and forcibly enunciated. Yet, as showing the contradiction of human nature, the talented writer poses to at least an equal extent as an example of learned credulity. *E.g.*, in the first Oration we read, "It is *well known* that immense numbers of Free-masons were engaged in the Holy Wars;" in the second, that the "archives of the 'sublime institutions' are records of very ancient date, and contain, besides the evidence of the origin of Masonry, many of the great and important principles of science;" and in the Appendix, that the 27,000 masons who took part in the Crusades, "while in Palestine, discovered many important masonic manuscripts among the descendants of the ancient Jews"!!

[2] Dr Robert Plot, born 1640, chosen F.R.S. 1677, became one of the secretaries of the Royal Society, 1682; was appointed first keeper of the Ashmolean Museum by the founder, 1683; and soon after nominated Professor of Chemistry to the University. He was also Historiographer Royal, Secretary to the Earl Marshal, Mowbray Herald Extraordinary, and Registrar of the Court of Honour; died April 30, 1696. His chief works are the "Natural Histories of Oxfordshire (1677) and Staffordshire (1686). It was his intention to have published a complete Natural History of England and Wales, had his time and health permitted so laborious an undertaking.

[3] John Aubrey, The Natural History of Wiltshire, edited by John Britton, 1847, Editor's Preface

after the fair copy was made, and have never been transcribed into the latter." Aubrey's remarks upon the Freemasons are given by Mr Halliwell in two separate but consecutive paragraphs, at page 46 of the explanatory notes attached to the second edition of the "Masonic Poem" (1844). This writer copied from the Royal Society manuscript, where the second paragraph appears as a continuation of the first.[1] This is not the case in the Oxford or original MS. There, the first paragraph, commencing "Sir William Dugdale told me," is written on folio 73, whilst the second, upon which Mr Halliwell based his conclusion "that Sir Christopher, in 1691, was enrolled among the members of the fraternity," forms one of the numerous *additions* made by Aubrey, and is written on the back of folio 72.[2] As the last chapter of the history was written in 1686, a period of at least five years separates the passage in the *text* from the *addendum* of 1691, but the original entry in the body of the work is probably far older than 1686[3]—the date of publication of Dr Plot's "Natural History of Staffordshire"—yet, whilst it may be fairly concluded that Plot must have seen Aubrey's general note on the Freemasons before his own work was written, which latter in turn Aubrey could not fail to have read prior to the entry of his memorandum of 1691, there is nothing to show that either the one or the other was in the slightest degree influenced by, or indeed recollected, the observations on the Freemasons which immediately preceded his own.

The Oxford copy of the "Natural History of Wiltshire" was forwarded by Aubrey to John Ray, the botanist and zoologist, September 15, 1691, and returned by the latter in the October following. It was also sent to Tanner, afterwards Bishop of St Asaph, in February 1694.[4] In 1719 Dr Rawlinson printed the dedication and preface as *addenda* to "Aubrey's History of Surrey."[5] These he doubtless copied from the original. The transcript in the Royal Society Library was quoted by Walpole in the first chapter of his "Anecdotes of Painting" (1762), and Warton and Huddesford refer to the original in the list of Aubrey's manuscripts at Oxford, in a note to the "Life of Anthony à Wood." The only other notice I have met with —prior to 1844—of the masonic entry or entries in Aubrey's unprinted work occurs in Hawkins' "History of Gothic Architecture"[6] (1813), but it merely alludes to Papal bulls said to have been granted to Italian architects, and does not mention Wren. I have examined both manuscripts, the original in the Bodleian Library; and the fair copy at Burlington House, by permission of the Council of the Royal Society. The latter has on the title page "Memoires of Naturall Remarques in the County of Wilts," by Mr John Aubrey, R.S.S., 1685; but as the memorandum of 1691, as well as the earlier entry relating to the Freemasons, duly appears in the text, it will be safer to believe in their contemporaneous transcription, than to assume that the copy, like the original, received additions from time to time.[7]

[1] Mr Halliwell has omitted the square brackets in the second paragraph of the Royal Society copy, which should read—"Memorandum. This day [May the 18th, being Monday, 1691, after Rogation Sunday] is a great convention," etc.

[2] Aubrey wrote on one side of the page only, until he had completed his history.

[3] The allusion to the Freemasons occurs at p. 99 of the *printed* work (Natural History of Wiltshire), and there are 126 pages in all.

[4] John Britton, Memoirs of John Aubrey, F.R.S., 1845, p. 62.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 92.

[6] P. 148, citing Antiquarian Repertory, iii. 45. This reference being inexact, I have been unable to verify it, and have vainly searched the work quoted for the passage given by Hawkins.

[7] The allusion to the Freemasons appears at p. 277 of the Royal Society MS., and at p. 276 three pages are inserted conformably with Aubrey's rough note on the back of fol. 72 of the Oxford copy.

The following extracts are from the Oxford or original MS.[1]:—

["NATURALL HISTORIE OF WILTSHIRE"—PART II.—MS. IN THE BODLEIAN LIBRARY.]

Reverse of Fol. 72.

1691.

Mdm, this day [May the 18th being after Rogation Sunday[2] Monday] is a great convention at St Paul's church of the Fraternity of the Accepted ~~Free~~-Masons: where S[r] Christopher Wren is to be adopted a Brother: and S[r] Henry Goodric . . . . of y[e] Tower, & divers others—There have been kings, that haue been of this Sodalitie.

Fol. 73.

S[r] William Dugdale told me many years since, that about Henry the third's time, Patents the Pope gave a Bull or diploma to a Company of Freemasons Italian Architects to travell up and downe over all Europe to build Churches. From those are derived the *Fraternity of* Adopted-Masons. *Free-Masons.* They are known to one another by certayn Signes & ~~Marks~~ and Watch-words: it continues to this day. They have Severall Lodges in severall Counties for their reception: and when any of them fall into decay, the brotherhood is to relieve him &c. The manner of their Adoption is very formall, and with an Oath of Secrecy.

As already observed, Aubrey's memorandum of Wren's approaching initiation was not printed or in any way alluded to until 1844. It can therefore have exercised no influence whatever in shaping or fashioning the belief (amongst Masons) which, from 1738 onwards, has universally prevailed as regards the connection of the great architect with the ancient craft. Indeed, the statements of Aubrey (1691) and Anderson (1738) are mutually destructive. If Wren was only "accepted" or "adopted" in 1691, it is quite clear that he could not have been Grand Master at any earlier date; and, on the other hand, if he presided over the Society in the year 1663, it is equally clear that the ceremony of his formal admission into the fraternity was not postponed until 1691. I shall now proceed to examine the question chronologically, dealing with the evidence in order of time—*i.e.*, time of publication. According to this method of procedure, the entries in the Aubrey MSS. will be considered last of all, at which stage I shall enter upon a review of the whole subject, and conclude with an expression of the views which, in my judgment, are fairly deducible from the evidence before us.

In proceeding with the inquiry, whilst it is constantly necessary to bear in mind that masonic writers of the last century—with whose works, in the first instance, we are chiefly concerned, were altogether *uninfluenced* by the singular entries in the Aubrey MSS., yet we should be on our guard not to assume too confidently that none of the Fellows of the Royal Society who joined the fraternity between 1717 and 1750 were aware that one of their own number—Aubrey was chosen an F.R.S. in 1663—had recorded in a manuscript work

[1] During my visit to the Bodleian Library in 1880, the late Mr W. H. Turner was at the pains of instituting a careful, though fruitless search amongst the papers of Anthony à Wood, in order to ascertain whether Aubrey's *Addendum* of 1691 had been inspired by any information from his friend.

[2] The words "after Rogation Sunday," "Accepted," "Patents," "Freemasons," and "Adopted-Masons," here printed in smaller type, are interlineated in the original; the words here printed in italics are there underlined.

(which he deposited in their own library), the approaching initiation into Masonry of a former President of the Royal Society. It is improbable that so curious a circumstance was wholly unknown to Dr Desaguliers, Martin Folkes, Martin Clare, or Richard Rawlinson, all Fellows of the Royal Society, and zealous Freemasons.[1] If we admit the probability of some one[2] or more of these distinguished *brethren* having perused the manuscript in question, it affords negative evidence, from which we may not unfairly conclude that the allusion to Wren failed to make any impression upon them.

In next proceeding to adduce the evidence upon which the belief in Wren's membership of the fraternity has grown up, I shall, in the first instance, cite the Constitutions of 1723, as presenting an authoritative picture of the condition of Freemasonry in that year. It may, however, be premised that the Grand Lodge of England—established in 1717—was then in the sixth year of its existence. Philip, Duke of Wharton, was the Grand Master, and Dr Desaguliers his Deputy.

The earliest "Book of Constitutions" was published by Dr James Anderson, conformably with the direction of the Grand Lodge, to which body it was submitted *in print* on January 17, 1723, and finally approved. It was the joint production of Anderson, Desaguliers, and the antiquary, George Payne, the two last named of whom had filled the office of Grand Master. Payne compiled the "Regulations," which constitute the chief feature of this work; Desaguliers wrote the preface; and Anderson digested the entire subject-matter.

This official book speaks of "our great Master Mason Inigo Jones;" styles James I. and Charles I. "Masons," and proceeds as follows:—

"After the Wars were over, and the *Royal Family* restor'd, true *Masonry* was likewise restor'd; especially upon the unhappy Occasion of the *Burning* of LONDON, *Anno* 1666; for then the City Houses were rebuilt more after the *Roman* stile, when King Charles II. founded the present St PAUL'S Cathedral in *London* (the old *Gothick* Fabrick being burnt down), much after the style of St PETER'S at *Rome*, conducted by the ingenious Architect, Sir CHRISTOPHER WREN.

"Besides the Tradition of old Masons now alive, which may be rely'd on, we have much reason to believe that King Charles II. was an *accepted Free-Mason*, as everyone allows he was a great Encourager of the *Craftsmen*.

"But in the Reign of his Brother, King James II., though some *Roman* Buildings were carried on, the *Lodges of Freemasons* in London much dwindled into Ignorance, by not being duly frequented and cultivated."

In a footnote Dr Anderson speaks of the Sheldonian Theatre, Oxford, "as having been designed and conducted also by Sir Christopher Wren, the King's Architect."

William III. is termed "that *Glorious Prince*, who by most is reckon'd a *Free-Mason*;" and having cited an opinion of Sir Edward Coke, Dr Anderson says:—

"This quotation confirms the tradition of *Old Masons*, that this most learned *Judge* really belong'd to the Ancient Lodge, and was a *faithful Brother*."

The text of the original "Book of Constitutions" thus concludes:—

[1] Dr Desaguliers was Grand Master 1719, and Deputy Grand Master 1722-3 and 1725; Folkes was Deputy Grand Master in 1724, and Clare in 1741; Rawlinson was a Grand Steward in 1734.

[2] It is hardly within the limits of possibility that Rawlinson could have appropriated the dedication and preface of this work without perusing the work itself?

"And now the *Free-born* BRITISH NATIONS, disentangled from foreign and civil Wars, and enjoying the good Fruits of Peace and Liberty, having of late much indulg'd their happy Genius for Masonry of every sort, and reviv'd the *drooping Lodges* of *London*. This fair *Metropolis* flourisheth, as well as other Parts with several worthy *particular* Lodges, that have quarterly *communication*, and an annual *Grand Assembly* wherein the *Forms* and *Usages* of the most ancient and worshipful Fraternity are wisely propagated, and the *Royal Art* duly cultivated, and the *cement* of the Brotherhood preserv'd: so that the whole *Body* resembles a well built *Arch*."[1]

It will be seen by the above extracts, that whilst various kings of England, the celebrated architect Inigo Jones, and even a learned judge, are included in the category of Freemasons, Sir Christopher Wren is only mentioned in a professional capacity. From which it may safely be inferred, that the triumvirate charged with the preparation of the first code of laws, and the first items of masonic history, published by authority, had at that time no knowledge of his ever having been a member of the Society. Dr Mackey indeed thinks, that "this passing notice of him who has been called the 'Vitruvius of England,' must be attributed to servility;" but with all due respect to the memory of this diligent lexicographer, I am of opinion—for reasons which will hereafter appear in fuller detail—that the English Freemasons of 1717-23 had no reason to believe in Wren's connection with their Society,[2] also, that if at any time during the building of St Paul's Cathedral he had been "accepted" as a Freemason, all recollection of so important a circumstance as the initiation or affiliation of the "King's Architect," would not have totally died out in the subsisting lodges of masons, within the short span of six or seven years, which, according to Anderson (in his subsequent publication of 1738), elapsed between Wren's cessation of active interest in the lodges, and the so-called Revival of 1717.[3] It is important, moreover, to note, that the Constitutions of 1723 record no break in the career of prosperity, upon which the craft had embarked after the accession of William III.

Between 1723 and 1738, though a large number of masonic books and pamphlets were published, in none of these is Wren alluded to as a Freemason. He is not so styled in the Constitutions of 1726, and 1730 (Dublin), which were reprinted by the late Mr Richard Spencer in 1871, nor is his connection with the craft in any way hinted at by Dr Francis Drake, the Junior Warden of the Grand Lodge of York, in his celebrated oration of 1726.

Smith's "Pocket Companion" for 1735, 1736, 1737, and 1738,[4] though they contain much masonic information, describe Charles II. as "that mason king," and refer to William III. as "with good reason believed to have been a Free-Mason," merely designate the late surveyor general, "that excellent architect, Sir Christopher Wren."

The newspapers during the same period (1723-38)—with the exceptions to be presently noticed—at least so far as my research has extended, are equally silent upon the point under

[1] The Constitution of the Freemasons, 1723, pp. 40, 43, 47, 48.

[2] In a former chapter ("The Statutes relating to the Freemasons," *ante*, vol. i., p. 352), I have drawn attention to the scrupulous care with which the Constitutions of 1723 were compiled.

[3] Even taking Aubrey's *prediction* as a *fact*, and further assuming that Sir Christopher never attended another masonic meeting after his reception in 1691, is it credible that so remarkable an occurrence *could* have been entirely forgotten in 1717?

[4] In the 1736 and subsequent editions the title is enlarged to "The Freemason's Pocket Companion. By W. Smith, a Freemason."

consideration, and there is no reference to Wren in the Rawlinson MSS. at the Bodleian Library.

Sir Christopher died on February 25, 1723; and in the *Postboy*, No. 5243, from February 26 to February 28 of that year, appears an obituary notice of Wren and an advertisement of the "Book of Constitutions." The same paper in the next number (5244) gives a more elaborate notice, consisting of twenty-eight lines, enumerating all the offices held by the deceased. The *Postboy*, No. 5245, from March 2 to March 5, has the following:—"London, March 5, this evening the corpse of that worthy FREE MASON, Sir Christopher Wren, Knight, is to be interr'd under the Dome of St Paul's Cathedral." A similar announcement appears in the *British Journal*, No. 25, March 9, viz.:—"Sir Christopher Wren, that worthy Free Mason, was splendidly interr'd in St Paul's Church on Tuesday night last."

I find in my notes sixteen notices in all of Wren's death or burial, occurring between February 26 and March 9, 1723. Four are copied from the *Postboy*, and a similar number from the *Daily Post*. Two each from the *British Journal*, the *Weekly Journal* or *Saturday's Post*, and the *Weekly Journal* or *British Gazetteer*. Single notices are given in the *London Journal* and the *Postman*.

In none of these, except as above stated, is Sir Christopher designated a "Freemason," and this expression is not again coupled with his name, in any newspaper paragraph that I have seen, of earlier date than 1738.

It will be observed that the journal, announcing *in the first instance*, that Wren was a "Freemason," had been previously selected as the advertising medium through which to recommend the sale of the "Book of Constitutions,"[1] and it is hardly to be wondered at that the editor of the *Postboy* should have deemed a title so lavishly bestowed by Dr Anderson upon the persons and personages of whom he had occasion to speak, including Inigo Jones, a predecessor of Wren in the office of Surveyor General, would be fitly applied to designate the great man whose funeral obsequies he was announcing.

That a single paper only—the *British Journal*, No. 25—reprinted the statement given in the *Postboy*, will surprise the readers of old newspapers, for if there is one circumstance more than another which renders an examination of these records especially fatiguing, it is the wearisome repetition by journals of later date, of nearly every item of intelligence published in a London newspaper.

Passing from this branch of the inquiry, the importance of which I do not rate very highly, I shall next present an extract from a work, published in 1730, that will be again, on its own merits or demerits, considered at a later stage of this history. "The terms," says Samuel Prichard, "of Free and Accepted Masonry (as it now is) has [*sic*] not been heard of till within these few years; no constituted Lodges or Quarterly Communications were heard of till 1691, when lords and dukes, lawyers and shopkeepers, and other inferior tradesmen, porters not excepted, were admitted into this mystery or no mystery."[2] It will be seen that stress is

[1] The Postboy, No. 5243. Commenting upon the passage in the *Postboy*, No. 5245, Mr W. P. Buchan observes: "Is it true that Wren was really a 'Freemason' *before his death*? And, if so, when and where did he become one? At page 595 of the *Graphic* for 19th December 1874, we are told that the Duke of Edinburgh is a mason, but I fear this is a mistake; consequently, if the latter scribe is not infallible as regards a living celebrity, I feel justified in doubting the veracity of the former respecting a dead one."

[2] Samuel Prichard, Masonry Dissected, 1730, pp. 6, 7.

here laid on some great Masonic event having occurred in 1691, which is so far corroborative of Aubrey's memorandum. This notion may indeed have suggested itself to Prichard from the fact that, in 1729, the Grand Lodge of England, in its official list of lodges, showed the date of constitution of the senior lodge, formerly the old Lodge of St Paul, as 1691; or, on the other hand, this entry in the engraved list may be viewed as confirmatory of the statement in "Masonry Dissected"?

Elsewhere, I have expressed an opinion that the date of 1691, as given in the official calendar for 1729, may denote that in this year original No. 1,[1] formerly the old Lodge of St Paul (*now* Antiquity), from being an *occasional* became a *stated* lodge, and Aubrey's statement respecting Wren's "adoption," I instanced as strengthening this hypothesis. If, indeed, Prichard's observations are entirely put on one side, as being inspired by the calendar of 1729, there yet remains the inquiry—must not this date of 1691, officially accorded to the senior lodge thirty-eight years after its original establishment *as computed by the Grand Officers*,[2] point at least to some remarkable event connected with its history? On the other hand, however, it may be fairly contended that nothing very extraordinary could have taken place in 1691, since all recollection of it had died out before 1723,[3] and though slightly anticipating the sequence of my argument, I may here conveniently add, that it would be contrary to all reason and experience for a tradition to hybernate for at least twenty-one years (1717-38) and then suddenly return to full life and reality.

Between 1730 and 1738, the newspapers of the time contain very frequent references to Freemasonry. Many of these were preserved by Dr Rawlinson, and may be seen in the curious collection of Masonic scraps, entitled the "Rawlinson MSS.," in the Bodleian Library. These I have carefully examined, and the passing allusions of the learned collector, to contemporaneous events of a Masonic character, I have in each case verified wherever a date is named, or a journal cited, and the reference is sufficiently plain and distinct to enable me to trace it in the newspaper files at the British Museum. Furthermore, I have searched these files with more or less particularity from the year 1717 down to 1738 and later, and though I have met with numerous dissertations on Freemasonry, squibs, catechisms, and the like, nowhere, prior to 1738 save in the two journals of 1723, already cited, have I found any mention of Wren as a Freemason.[4] That this belief did not exist in 1737 is, I think, plainly evidenced by the "Pocket Companion" for 1738, printed according to invariable usage slightly in advance, and which, like its predecessors and successors, was a summary of all the facts, fancies, and conjectures *previously published* in reference to Freemasonry. Had

[1] The Four Old Lodges, 1879, p. 46.

[2] I am far from suggesting that the period of formation of our oldest English lodge (present No. 2) was rightly determined in 1729. The masonic authorities appear to have proceeded on no principle whatever in the dates of constitution they assigned to lodges. Thus, the lodge at "St Rook's Hill," near Chichester, No. 65 in the numeration of 1729-39, was duly chronicled in the official calendars as having been established "in the reign of Julius Cæsar." In the *Weekly Journal, or British Gazetteer* (No. 264, April 11, 1730), however, is the following: "A few days since, their Graces the Dukes of Richmond and Montagu, accompanied by several gentlemen, who were all Free and Accepted Masons, according to ancient custom, form'd a lodge upon the top of a hill near the Duke of Richmond's seat, at Goodwood in Sussex, and made the Right Hon. the Lord Baltimore a Free and Accepted Mason."

[3] The date of publication of the first "Book of Constitutions."

[4] Numerous extracts from the *St James Evening Post*, ranging from 1732 to 1738, were reprinted by Mr Hughan in the *Masonic Magazine*, vol. iv., 1876-77, pp. 418, 472, 518, but in none of these is there any allusion to Wren.

there, at that time, been a *scintilla* of evidence to connect Wren with the fraternity, the worthy knight, without doubt, would have figured in that publication as a Freemason.

I shall now proceed to show how the fable originated, and in the first instance, before examining the "Constitutions" of 1738, two extracts from the Minutes of Grand Lodge claim our attention:—

"February 24, 1735.—Bro. Dr Anderson, formerly Grand Warden, represented that he had spent some thoughts upon some alterations and additions that might fittly be made to the Constitutions, the first Edition being all sold off.

"Resolved—That a committee be appointed ∴ ∴ ∴ to revise and compare the same, and, when finished, to lay the same before Grand Lodge."

"March 31, 1735.—A motion was made that Dr James Anderson should be desired to print the names (in his new Book of Constitutions) of all the Grand Masters that could be collected from the beginning of Time; with a list of the Names of all Deputy Grand Masters, Grand Wardens, and the brethren who have served the Craft in the Quality of Stewards."

The new edition of the "Constitutions" was published in 1738, and we are informed therein that in 1660 Charles II. approved the choice of the Earl of St Albans as Grand Master; that in 1663 this nobleman appointed Sir John Denham Deputy Grand Master, and Sir Christopher Wren (slightly antedating his knighthood) and Mr John Webb,[1] Grand Wardens. I shall proceed to give some extracts from this work, premising that by all authorities alike, whether *in* or *out* of the craft, the Constitutions edited by Dr Anderson have been regarded as the basis of Masonic history.

"Gilbert Sheldon, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, an excellent Architect, shew'd his great skill in designing his famous *Theatrum Sheldonianum* at *Oxford*, and at his Cost it was conducted and finished by Deputy WREN and Grand Warden WEB.

"And the *Craftsmen* having celebrated the Cape-stone, it was open'd with an elegant oration by Dr South, on 9th July 1669. D. G. M. WREN built also that other *Master Piece*, the pretty *Musæum* near the *Theatre*, at the Charge of the University. Meanwhile—

"London was rebuilding apace; and the Fire having ruin'd St *Paul's* Cathedral, the KING with *Grand Master* Rivers, his architects and craftsmen, Nobility and Gentry, Lord Mayor and Aldermen, Bishops and Clergy, etc., in due Form levell'd the *Footstone* of New St Paul's, designed by D. G. Master Wren, A.D. 1673, and by him conducted as *Master of Work* and Surveyor, with his Wardens Mr *Edward Strong*, Senior[2] and Junior, under a Parliamentary Fund.

"Upon the death of Grand Master Arlington, 1685, the *Lodges* met and elected Sir Christopher Wren GRAND MASTER, who appointed

[1] Preston, *et hoc genus omne*, who have blindly copied from Anderson, are well described by the worthy they persist in styling Grand Warden: "Some are so far in love with vulgarly receiv'd reports, that it must be taken for truth, whatsoever related by them, though nor head, nor tail, nor foot, nor footstep in it oftentimes of reason or common sense" (John Webb, The Most Notable Antiquity of Great Britain, vulgarly called Stonehenge, 1655, p. 108).

[2] Edward Strong, the elder, died in 1723, aged 72; consequently he was only 22 years of age in 1673. It is improbable that his *son* Edward was born until some years after the footstone was levelled. As will presently appear, the credit of having laid the foundation-stone of St Paul's Cathedral is claimed for *Thomas* Strong by his brother Edward, in the latter's "Memoir of the Family of Strong," given in Clutterbuck's "History and Antiquity of the County of Hertford," 1815, vol. i., p. 167

Mr Gabriel Cibber } *Grand Wardens.* { and whilst carrying on St Paul's, he annually
Mr Edward Strong } { met those Brethren that could attend him, to
keep up good old *Usages*, till the Revolution."

The "Constitution Book" goes on to say that King William III. was privately made a *Free-Mason*, and that he approved the choice of Grand Master Wren; that in 1695 the Duke of Richmond became Grand Master, Wren being Deputy, and the Edward Strongs, Senior and Junior, Grand Wardens respectively; and again records Sir Christopher's elevation to the Grand Mastership in 1698.

The official record proceeds:—

"Yet still in the *South* (1707) the Lodges were more and more disused, partly by the Neglect of the *Masters* and *Wardens*, and partly by not having a *Noble Grand Master* at *London*, and the annual Assembly was not duly attended. G. M. Wren, who had design'd St Paul's, *London*, A.D. 1673, and as *Master* of *Work* had conducted it from the *Foot-stone*, had the Honour to finish that noble *Cathedral*, the finest and largest *Temple* of the *Augustan* stile except *St Peter's* at *Rome;* and celebrated the *Cape-stone* when he erected the Cross on the Top of the Cupola, in July A.D. 1708.[1]

"Some few years after this Sir *Christopher Wren* neglected the office of *Grand Master*, yet the *Old Lodge* near St Paul's, and a few more, continued their stated meetings."

In the Constitutions of 1738 we learn for the first time that Wren was a Freemason, this volume, it must be recollected, having been written by the compiler of the earlier Constitutions, Dr James Anderson; that the Sheldonian Theatre, Oxford, was opened masonically; that King Charles II. laid the foundation-stone of St Paul's; and that Wren continued as Grand Master until after 1708, when his neglect of the office "caused the Lodges to be more and more disused."

It is somewhat remarkable that *not one* of the foregoing statements can be cited as an historical fact.

I do not propose multiplying evidence to invalidate the testimony of this work, but it may be shortly stated that among the English Grand Masters Dr Anderson gravely enumerates Austin the Monk, St Swithin, St Dunstan, Henry VII., and Cardinal Wolsey; whilst of "Foreigners," who have attained that high office, he specifies Nimrod, Moses, Solomon, Nebuchadnezzar, and Augustus Cæsar!!

Between 1738 and 1750 there is nothing to chronicle which bears upon the present inquiry, but in the latter year appeared the following work:—"PARENTALIA; OR, MEMOIRS OF THE FAMILY OF THE WRENS. But Chiefly of Sir Christopher Wren, compiled by his son Christopher: Now published by his grandson Stephen Wren, Esq.; with the care of Joseph Ames, F.R.S. London, MDCCL."

Two passages in this publication demand our attention. These occur at p. 292 and p. 306 respectively, the latter being the opinion *ascribed* to Wren in respect of the origin of Freemasonry, and the former, the statement of his son Christopher with regard to certain occurrences, about which there is a great diversity of testimony. The remarks attributed to Sir

[1] According to Edward Strong, *senior*, in the "Memoir" before alluded to, the last stone of the lanthorn on the dome of St Paul's was laid by himself, October 25, 1708. Christopher Wren also claims the honour of having laid the "highest or last stone," but fixes the date of this occurrence at 1710 (Parentalia, or Memoirs of the Family of the Wrens, MDCCL., p. 292).

Christopher are given in full in an earlier chapter,[1] and I shall proceed to adduce the remaining extract from the "Parentalia," which will complete the stock of evidence derivable from this source. At p. 292, the subject being sundry details connected with the erection of St Paul's Cathedral, there appears:—"The first Stone of this *Basilica* was laid in the Year 1675, and the Works carried on with such Care and Industry, that by the Year 1685 the Walls of the Quire and Side ailes were finished, with the circular North and South Porticoes; and the great Pillars of the Dome brought to the same Height; and it pleased God in his Mercy to bless the *Surveyor* with Health and Length of Days, and to enable him to compleat the whole Structure in the Year 1710 to the Glory of his most holy Name, and Promotion of his divine Worship, the principal Ornament of the Imperial Seat of this Realm[2] *Majestas convenit ista deo.* The highest or last Stone on the Top of the Lantern, was laid by the Hands of the *Surveyor's* son, *Christopher Wren* deputed by his Father, in the Presence of that excellent Artificer M^r^ Strong, his Son, and other *Free and Accepted Masons*, chiefly employed in the Execution of the Work."

Before, however, commencing an analysis of the two extracts from the "Parentalia," it will be desirable to ascertain upon what authority they have come down to us.

In his "Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century," John Nichols[3] observes, "the last of M^r^ Ames's literary labours, was the drawing up the 'Parentalia' in one volume folio, from the papers of M^r^ Wren. The title sets forth that they were published by Stephen Wren, with the care of Joseph Ames."

In the view that the work we are considering was virtually the compilation of Joseph Ames, Nichols has been followed by Elmes, whose two biographies of Wren,[4] together with those in the "Biographia Britannica" and the "Parentalia," contain everything of an authentic character in the life of Sir Christopher that has descended to us. As it is my purpose to show the gradual accretion of error that has taken place owing to the progressive influence of successive publications, I postpone for the present a full consideration of those statements wherein Elmes has copied from Masonic writers, and shall merely adduce in this place his comments upon the "Parentalia," as a work of authority. It is described by this writer as "Ames's miserable compilation, published under the name of Stephen Wren." Altogether, according to Elmes, the "Parentalia" is a very bungling performance. Numerous errors and inaccuracies are pointed out, especially in the matter of dates.

Thus it is shown that a letter from Wren to Lord Broucker was written in 1663, and not in 1661; that to a paper read before the Royal Society the year 1658, instead of 1668, had been assigned; and that mistakes occur in the accounts both of Sir Christopher's appointment as surveyor-general, and his receiving the honour of knighthood; and such expressions occur as—"the 'Parentalia,' with its usual carelessness or contempt of correctness in dates;" and "This is not, by many, the only or the greatest falsification of dates by Ames."[5]

In spite, however, of the combined authority of Nichols and Elmes, I am of opinion that

[1] *Ante*, Chap. VI., p. 257.

[2] Ovid's Fast, l. i.

[3] Born 1745; edited the *Gentleman's Magazine* from 1778 until his death in 1826. He was the author or editor of at least sixty-seven works, of which the one cited in the text was begun in 1782, but recast and enlarged in 1812-15.

[4] James Elmes, Memoirs of the Life and Works of Sir Christopher Wren, 1823; Sir Christopher Wren and his Times, 1852.

[5] Memoirs of Wren, 1823, pp. 139, 217, 241, 242, 255, 263, 317, and 440.

Ames's labours in connection with the "Parentalia" were strictly of an editorial character, and that the actual writer or compiler was Christopher Wren, only son of the architect. I have arrived at this conclusion from an examination of the original manuscript of the work,[1] which appears to be in the handwriting of Christopher Wren, and as the title page shows at the foot, was prepared for publication six years before the death of the compiler—

C. W. IULY J74J

Christopher Wren, the only son of the great architect by his first marriage, was born February 16, 1675, and died August 24, 1747, aged 72. "He had made antiquity, which he well understood, his particular study, and was extremely communicative." He wrote and published, in 1708, a learned work,[2] which he dedicated to his brethren of the Royal Society, containing representations of many curious Greek medallions and ancient inscriptions, followed by legends of imperial coins from Julius Cæsar to Aurelian, with their interpretations, and an appendix of Syrian and Egyptian kings and coins, all collected by himself. He also wrote the MS. life of his father in Latin,[3] and arranged the documents for the "Parentalia," which were afterwards published by his son Stephen, assisted by Joseph Ames.[4] We find, therefore, that the memoirs or opinions of Sir Christopher Wren, come down to us, recorded by his son, a learned antiquary, at the age of 66, when his father had been just eighteen years in his grave.

The first observation to be made on the passage at p. 306 of the "Parentalia," commencing, "He [Wren] was of opinion (as has been mentioned in another place)," is, that this sentence in brackets refers to a memorial of Sir Christopher in his own words, to the Bishop of Rochester, in the year 1713, from which I shall give two extracts[5]:—

"This we now call the *Gothick* manner of Architecture (so the *Italians* call'd what was not after the *Roman* Style), though the *Goths* were rather Destroyers then Builders: I think it should with more reason be call'd the Saracen-style: for those People wanted neither Arts nor Learning, and after We in the West had lost Both, we borrow'd again from Them, out of their

[1] By permission of the Council of the Royal Society, in whose library it is preserved, having been presented by Mr Stephen Wren, Feb. 21, 1759. I am also indebted to Mr Reginald Ames for an opportunity of inspecting many family documents, including various memoranda in the handwriting of Joseph Ames, F.R.S., which bears no kind of similarity to the penmanship of the Royal Society MS. So far as I can form an opinion, the "Parentalia" was written by the same hand as fol. 136 of the Lansdowne MSS., No. 698; of which MS. Elmes (Sir Christopher Wren and his Times, pp. 414-419) remarks: "It is in the handwriting of Christopher, the eldest son of the great architect, and is countersigned by the latter thus—'Collata, Oct^r. 1720, C. W.'" As this manuscript will again claim our attention, it will be sufficient to observe that the portion attributed to Sir Christopher was evidently written by the same hand as the rest of the MS.

[2] Christophori Wren, Numismatum Antiquorum Sylloge, Populis Græcis, Municipiis et Coloniis Romanis cusorum, ex Cimeliarcho Editoris (London, 1708, 4to).

[3] Lansdowne MSS., No. 698, fol. 136. This is really a series of memoranda, wherein Christopher Wren appears to have recorded some of the leading events in the life of his father. These notes or jottings were printed by Elmes in his later work (1852).

[4] Elmes, Memoirs, 1723, p. 355. I take the opportunity of stating that the conclusion expressed at an earlier portion of this work regarding the authorship of this extract, is no longer tenable. When Note 1, p. 257 (Chap. VI.), was penned, I had not seen the MS. of the "Parentalia."

[5] These I have transcribed from the MS. in the library of the Royal Society, where they appear in Part ii., § 7. As they are similarly placed in the printed book (Parentalia, p. 297), without variation of terms, the impression that the work was ready for the press in the lifetime of Christopher Wren is confirmed.

Arabick-Books, what they with great diligence had translated from the *Greeks*. *They* were Zealous in their Religion, and wherever they Conquer'd (which was with amazing rapidity), erected Mosques and Caravansaras in hast, which oblig'd them to fall into another Way of Building; for they Built their Mosques Round, disliking the Christian Form of a Cross."[1]

"The *Saracen* Mode of Building seen in the *East* soon spread over *Europe*, and particularly in *France;* the Fashions of which Nation we affected to imitate in all ages, even when we were at enmity with it."[2]

In the preceding quotations I have given everything in Wren's actual memorial, which may tend to throw any light upon the *opinion* of the great architect, as recorded by his son. It will be noticed that the Freemasons are not alluded to, at first hand, by Sir Christopher, therefore we have no other choice than to accept the evidence—*quantum valeat*—as transmitted by his son. It is true that the language employed is not free from ambiguity, and it might be plausibly contended that the authority of the architect was not meant to cover the entire dissertation on the Freemasons. Still, on the whole, we shall steer a safe course in accepting the passage in the "Parentalia," as being Christopher Wren's *recollection* of his father's opinion, though tinctured insensibly by much that he may have heard and read during the twenty years that elapsed between the death of the architect and the compilation of the family memoir.

From neither of the extracts from the "Parentalia" are we justified in drawing an inference that Wren was a Freemason. The passage at p. 292 of that work[3] contains the only allusion to the English Society, wherein, indeed, Mr Edward Strong is described as a "Free and Accepted Mason," though it may well have been, that had the worthy master mason noticed this statement in the autobiography which we shall consider a little later, *three* contradictions instead of *two*, might have appeared between the testimonies of the elder Strong and the younger Wren.

If Sir Christopher was ever admitted into the society of Freemasons—whether we fix the event according to the earlier date given by Dr Anderson or the later one of John Aubrey, is immaterial—his son Christopher must have known of it, and I shall next consider the extreme improbability, to say the least, of the latter having neglected to record any details of such an occurrence with which he was acquainted. Christopher Wren, elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1693, at the early age of eighteen, though not admitted until 1698, must have frequently met Dr Plot, who was on very intimate terms with his father; and it is quite within the limits of probability that he was also personally acquainted with both Ashmole and Aubrey.[4]

With the writings of these three antiquaries, however, it may be confidently assumed he was familiar, the references to the elder Wren are so frequent, that without doubt Ashmole's "Diary" and "Antiquities of Berkshire," and Aubrey's "Natural History of Surrey"—all published, it must be recollected, before 1720—were read with great interest by the architect's family. If we go further, and admit the possibility of Sir Christopher being a Freemason, the entries in the "Diary," and the learned speculations in regard to the origin of the society prefixed to the "Antiquities of Berkshire,"[5] must (on the supposition above alluded to) have necessarily led to his having expressed agreement or disagreement with the remarks of his

[1] Parentalia MS., pp. ⅓⅛, ⅓⅛. [2] *Ibid.*, p. ⅓⅓. [3] *Ante*, p. 13.
[4] Ashmole, Plot, and Aubrey died in 1692, 1696, and 1697 respectively. [5] Edited by Dr Rawlinson.

friend Plot in 1686,[1] and it may also be as safely inferred that the statements in Ashmole's posthumous work (1719) would have been minutely criticised, in connection, it may well have been, with the proceedings of the Grand Lodge of England, then just two years established.

But putting conjecture aside, Christopher Wren amongst "his brethren of the Royal Society," to whom he dedicated his own book, must have constantly met Dr Richard Rawlinson—writer of the memoir of Ashmole, containing the description of Freemasonry in the "Antiquities of Berkshire"—and I think it in the highest degree probable, that the latter, who for reasons stated elsewhere, I conceive to have perused both versions of Aubrey's manuscript history, must have satisfied himself of the inaccuracy of the statement relating to Wren, by personal inquiry of the architect or his son.

It would, on the whole, appear probable that Christopher Wren knew of, but rejected, the statement of John Aubrey, and indeed in my judgment we may safely go further, and conclude, that the omission of any reference whatever to the *prediction* of 1691, is tantamount to an assurance, that in the opinion of his son and biographer, there was no foundation whatever, in fact, for any theory with regard to Wren's membership which had been set up.

The real importance of the passage at p. 306 of the "Parentalia" arises from the fact of its being in general agreement with all the other theories or speculations relating to the origin of Freemasonry, which have been traced or ascribed to writers or speakers of the seventeenth century. The next point—a very remarkable one—is the singular coincidence of the three versions attributed to Dugdale, Wren, and Ashmole respectively, possessing the common feature of having been handed down by evidence of the most hearsay character.

The earliest mention of the "travelling bodies of Freemasons," who are said to have erected all the great buildings of Europe, occurs in the "Natural History of Wiltshire," and appears to have been written a few years before 1686.[2] Aubrey here says:—"S^{r} William Dugdale[3] *told me* many years since." In the "Parentalia," as we have seen, Christopher Wren records the belief of his father under the expression—"He [Wren] was of opinion;" and it only remains to be stated, that in a similar manner are we made acquainted with the views of Elias Ashmole on the same subject. In the memoir of Ashmole in the "Biographia Britannica," appears a letter from Dr Knipe, of Christ Church, Oxford, from which I extract the following:—"What from Mr Ashmole's collection *I could gather* was, that the report of our Society taking rise from a Bull granted by the Pope in the reign of Henry III. to some Italian architects, to travel over all Europe to erect Chapels, was ill-founded. Such a Bull there was, and those architects were masons. But this Bull, *in the opinion of the learned M^{r} Ashmole*, was confirmative only, and did not by any means create our fraternity, or even establish them in this kingdom."[4]

[1] Plot, Natural History of Staffordshire, p. 316.

[2] As the text of the Oxford copy of this MS. was completed in 1686, it is evident, from the position of fol. 73 *ante*, p. 6), that Aubrey's original remarks on the Freemasons were penned at some previous time. This inference is strengthened by the absence in the MS. of any allusion to the observations of Dr Plot on the same subject in his "Natural History of Staffordshire," published in 1686; a copy of which, Elias Ashmole records in his diary, was presented to him by the author on May 23d of that year.

[3] Sir William Dugdale was born in 1605, and died Feb. 10, 1686. His daughter, Elizabeth, was the third wife of Elias Ashmole, who was married to her Nov. 8, 1668. In the compilation of his chief work, The "Monasticon Anglicanum," Dugdale received much assistance from John Aubrey.

[4] The above extract is thus prefaced: "Taken from a book of letters communicated to the author of this life, by

In the preceding extracts we meet with at the best but *secondary* evidence of opinions entertained by three eminent authorities. It is almost certain, however, that these may be traced to a single source. For the purposes of this inquiry, it is immaterial to consider whether Dugdale acquired his information from Ashmole, or *vice versâ*. Substantially their speculations were identical, as will more clearly appear if any reader takes the trouble to compare Aubrey's note of Sir William Dugdale's statement[1] with the memoir of Ashmole, from the pen of Dr Rawlinson, given in Ashmole's posthumous work, the "Antiquities of Berkshire" (1719). The following extract must have largely influenced Dr Knipe in 1747, when he communicated with Dr Campbell, the writer of the title "Ashmole" in the "Biographia Britannica," and though, in all probability, both Knipe and Rawlinson drew from the same fount, viz., the Ashmole Papers, yet it may be fairly assumed that as many rivulets of information still flowing during the early residence at Oxford of the latter, must have become dried up half a century later—during which period, moreover, the reputation of Dr Rawlinson as a scholar and an archæologist had been firmly established—the younger commentator, himself a Freemason, is scarcely likely to have recorded his impression of the origin of Freemasonry believed in by Ashmole, without previously conferring with the eminent antiquary and topographer who had so long ago preceded him in the same field of inquiry.

"On October 16 [1646] he [Ashmole] was elected a Brother of the Company of Free Masons, with Collonel *Henry* Mainwaring, of *Kerthingham*[2] in *Cheshire*, at *Warrington* in *Lancashire*, a Favour esteemed so singular by the Members, that Kings themselves have not disdain'd to enter themselves into this Society, the original Foundation of which is said to be as high as the Reign of King *Henry* III., when the Pope granted a *Bull, Patent*, or *Diploma*,[3] to a particular Company of *Italian Masons* and *Architects* to travel over all *Europe* to build Churches. From this is derived the Fraternity of *Adopted Masons, Accepted Masons*, or *Free Masons*, who are known to one another all over the World by certain Signals and Watch Words known to them alone. They have several Lodges in different Countries for their Reception; and when any of them fall into Decay, the Brotherhood is to relieve him. The manner of their Adoption, or Admission, is very formal and solemn, and with the Administration of an Oath of Secrecy, which has had better Fate than all other Oaths, and has been ever most religiously observed, nor has the World been yet able, by the inadvertence, surprise, or folly of any of its Members, to dive into this Mystery, or make the least discovery."[4]

The memoir of Ashmole, upon which I have just drawn, is followed by no signature, nor does the title-page of the work disclose the name of the editor. There appears, however, no reason to doubt that the work was edited, and the memoir written, by Dr Richard Rawlinson[5] (of whom more hereafter), and the latter, therefore, whilst open to examination and criticism, possesses the credibility which is universally accorded to the testimony of a well-informed contemporary.

Dr Knipe of Christ Church" (vol. i., MDCCXLVII., p. 224, note E). In the *second* edition of the "Biographia Britannica" (Andrew Kippis, 1778), the writer of the title "Ashmole" is stated to have been Dr Campbell (the author of "Hermippus Redivivus"), "who, it is much to be regretted, did not contribute after Vol. iv."

[1] *Ante*, p. 6.

[2] Kermincham.

[3] As the word "Diploma" is omitted in the Royal Society's copy of the Aubrey MS., it is tolerably clear that Dr Rawlinson derived his information from the Oxford copy.

[4] Elias Ashmole, Antiquities of Berkshire, Preface by Dr Rawlinson, p. vi.

[5] "Prefixed to the 'Antiquities of Berkshire,' was a short account of the author, drawn up by Dr Rawlinson" (Athenæ Oxonienses, 3d ed., vol. iv., p. 363).

Rawlinson is known to have purchased some of Ashmole's and Sir William Dugdale's MSS.,[1] and that Aubrey's posthumous work, "The History of Surrey," was published under his editorial supervision, has been already stated. He was also an F.R.S.—having been elected together with Martin Folkes and John Theophilus Desaguliers in 1714—and it is in the highest degree probable, that the Royal Society's copy of the Aubrey manuscript, constituted one of the sources of information whence he derived his impression of the early origin of the Freemasons. Nay, we may, I think, go further, and safely assume that whatever was current in masonic or literary circles—at London or Oxford—respecting the life or opinions of Ashmole, Rawlinson was familiar with,[2] and in this connection his silence on the purely personal point of Wren's "adoption," possesses a significance which we can hardly overrate.

The sketch of Masonic history given in the "Parentalia," though somewhat enlarged, is to the same purport, and we may conclude that it was derived from the same source.[3]

At this point of our research, and before passing in review the further evidence by which the belief in Wren's initiation is supported, it will be convenient to examine with some particularity the theory of Masonic origin with which his name is associated.

It should be carefully noted that the reported *dicta* of Dugdale, Ashmole, and Wren, though characterised by trifling discrepancies, agree in the main, and especially on the point of Papal favours having been accorded to *Italian* architects. This consensus on the part of the three *English* authorities, to whom the early mention of Bulls is traced or ascribed, we should keep carefully in view, whilst examining the learned speculations to which the subject has given rise in Germany.

In an earlier part of this work[4] it has been mentioned that the tradition of the *Steinmetzen* having obtained extensive privileges from the Popes, has been current in German annals from very early times. In a series of articles recently communicated to the *Freemason* by Mr G. W. Speth, to which I must refer the curious reader,[5] this subject has been very ably discussed, and it is contended with much force that, as the Constitutions of the Steinmetzen were confirmed by the Emperors of Germany, it is equally reasonable to conclude that they were submitted to the Popes. "In 1518," says Mr Speth,[6] "the lodge at Magdeburgh petitioned their Prince for a confirmation of their ordinances, declaring their willingness to alter any part, always excepting the chief articles, which had been confirmed by *Papal and Imperial authority*. The Strassburg Lodge, during their quarrel with the Annaberg Lodge, wrote in 1519 that the abuse of four years' apprenticeship had been put an end to by his *Holiness the Pope* and his *Majesty the Emperor*. We also find that the quarrel came to an end after the Strassburg Master had forwarded to the Duke of Saxony attested copies of the Papal

[1] John Nicholls, Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century, 1812-15, vol. v., p. 489. Ashmole's library was sold March 5, 1694 (*Ibid.*, vol. iv., p. 29).

[2] It will be observed that Drs Rawlinson and Knipe—both, as I conceive, mainly basing their conclusions upon Ashmole's Papers—differ as to the Bull of Henry III.'s time having been the origin of the Society. Upon this point it may be briefly noticed, that whilst the former wrote at a period (1719) when many were living who must have been conversant with the opinions he records, the latter (1747)—fifty-five years after Ashmole's death—expresses himself in such a cautious manner as to convey the impression that he failed to grasp the meaning of the papers he was examining.

[3] *Cf.* Transactions, Royal Institute of British Architects, 1861-62; G. E. Street, Some Account of Gothic Architecture in Spain, 1865, p. 464; and Gwilt, Encyclopædia of Architecture, 1876, p. 130.

[4] *Ante*, Chap. III., p. 176.

[5] Freemason, Jan. 20, Feb. 3, and Feb. 10, 1883.

[6] Citing Heideloff and Klose.

and Imperial privileges which they possessed, and that the *original* documents were produced for the inspection of the Saxon deputies at Strassburg."

Whilst, however, fully conceding the extreme probability, to say the least, of privileges or confirmations having been granted by the Popes to the Steinmetzen,[1] I am unable to follow Kloss, when he says, "the statement concerning the 'travelling masons,' attributed to Wren, should arouse all the more suspicion the closer we investigate the surrounding circumstances, the incredibility of which is at once evident, and the more we consider the possibility of the facts narrated. We may, therefore, ascribe the whole tradition thus *put into the mouths* of Ashmole and Wren to an attempt at adorning the guild legends, which may be based on the Papal confirmations really granted to the German Stonemasons in 1502 and 1517."

As it is the habit of commentators to be silent, or at most very concise, where there is any difficulty, and to be very prolix and tedious where there is none, this attempt by Kloss to solve one of the greatest problems in Masonic history, will bespeak our gratitude, if it does not ensure our assent. It will be seen that the value of the evidence upon which the story hangs, is made to depend upon credible tradition rather than written testimonies, and whilst Kloss admits that the statements *ascribed* to Ashmole and Wren may have had some foundation in fact (otherwise the tradition would not have been credible); on the other hand, he finds a motive for their assertion in the anxiety of the historians of Masonry to embellish the "Legend of the Guilds." I am afraid, however, that if as witnesses the mouths are to be closed of Dugdale, Ashmole, and Wren, this must necessitate the excision of the story of the "Bulls" from our traditionary history.

It appears to me that however much the *authenticity* of the three statements whereupon rests the theory of Papal Bulls may be impugned, their *genuineness* is not open to dispute.[2]

The earliest in point of date, that of Sir William Dugdale, I shall now proceed to examine, premising that the medium through which it has come down to us, *viz.*, the testimony of Aubrey, will be hereafter considered. Assuming, then, for present purposes, that Dugdale *meant* what he is reported to have *said*,[3] we find—if the actual words are followed—that, according to his belief, "*about* Henry the Third's time, the Pope gave a Bull or *Diploma*[4] to a company of Italian Architects to travell up and downe over all Europe to build Churches." The sentence is free from ambiguity except as regards the allusion to Henry III. That the recipients of the Bull or Diploma were Italian architects, and their function the construction of churches, is plain and distinct, but the words, "Henry the Third's Time," are not so easily interpreted. On the one hand, these may simply mean that Papal letters were given between

[1] Although reliance has naturally been placed upon the research of writers who have diligently explored the German archives, it might well happen that an exhaustive search amongst the neglected records of our own country would open up many channels of information leading to very different conclusions.

[2] "A genuine book is that which was written by the person whose name it bears as the author of it. An authentic book is that which relates matters of fact as they really happened. A book may be genuine without being authentic; and a book may be authentic without being genuine" (Dr Watson, Bishop of Llandaff, An Apology for the Bible, 1796, p. 33).

[3] Dr Johnson observes: "It has been my settled principle that the reading of the ancient books is probably true. . ·. . ·. For though much credit is not due to the fidelity, nor any to the judgment, of the first publishers; yet they who had the copy before their eyes were more likely to read it right than we who read it only by imagination" (Johnson's Works, 1818, vol. i., p. 255). Similarly, we shall do best if we consider what Aubrey actually records, rather than vainly speculate upon what Dugdale may have had *in his mind* when expressing his opinion of the Freemasons.

[4] It must not be lost sight of, that in his original note of Dugdale's words, Aubrey also uses the word "Patents."

1216 and 1272, in which case a solution of the problem must be looked for in the history of *Italy;* whilst on the other hand, they may closely associate the reign of King Henry III.[1] with the occurrence described, and indicate that in the annals of that period of English history, will be found a clue to the explanation we are in search of.

The latter supposition, on the face of it, the more probable of the two, is fully borne out by the circumstances of Henry's reign, as narrated by the most trustworthy historians.

The Papal authority in England stood at its highest when this prince succeeded to the throne. An Interdict had been laid on the kingdom in 1208, and in 1211 John was not only excommunicated but deposed, and that sentence was pronounced with the greatest solemnity by the Pope himself. The king's subjects were not only all absolved from their oath of allegiance, but were strictly forbidden to acknowledge him in any respect whatever as their sovereign, to obey him, or even to speak to him.[2] On May 15, 1213, John knelt before the legate Pandulf, surrendered his kingdom to the Roman See, took it back again as a tributary vassal, swore fealty, and did liege homage to the Pope.[3] "Never," says Mr Green, "had the priesthood wielded such boundless power over Christendom as in the days of Innocent the Third (1198-1216) and his immediate successors."[4] This Pontiff set himself up as the master of Christian princes, changed the title of the Popes, which had hitherto been Vicar of Peter, to Vicar of Christ, and was the author of the famous comparison of the Papal power to the sun, "the greater light," and of the temporal power to the moon, "the lesser light." At the death of John (1216) the concurrence of the Papal authority being requisite to support the tottering throne, Henry III. was obliged to swear fealty to the Pope, and renew that homage to which his father had subjected the kingdom. Pope Honorius III. (1216-27), as feudal superior, declared himself the guardian of the orphan, and commanded Gualo to reside near his person, watch over his safety, and protect his just rights.[5] The Papal legate therefore took up his residence at the English court, and claimed a share in the administration of the realm as the representative of its overlord, and as guardian of the young sovereign.[6] "In England," says Mr Green, "Rome believed herself to have more than a spiritual claim for support. She regarded the kingdom as a vassal kingdom, and as bound to its overlord. It was only by the promise of a heavy subsidy that Henry in 1229 could buy the Papal confirmation of Langton's successor."[7]

During the reign of this king the chief grievances endured by his subjects were the

[1] It is not likely that Dugdale referred to Henry III. (1039-56), the most absolute of the *Emperors*, who, in the Western Church, was obeyed as a dictator, and nominated the Popes. No less than four German Popes chosen by him succeeded each other. *Cf.* L. Ranke, History of the Popes, translated by Sarah Austin, 1840, vol. i., p. 26; Sir Harris Nicholas, The Chronology of History, 1833, p. 225; and H. Chepmell, A Short Course of History, 2d series, 1857, vol. i., p. 17.

[2] A. Bower, History of the Popes, 1766, vol. vi., p. 202.

[3] J. R. Green, History of the English People, 1881, vol. i., p. 236. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 254.

[5] Dr Lingard, History of England, 1849, vol. ii., p. 387. At the Council of Bristol, Nov. 11, 1216, Lewis of France and his adherents were excommunicated, and that prince, after the rout of his partisans at Lincoln and the defeat of his fleet, consented to leave the kingdom (Nicholas, The Chronology of History, p. 240; Chepmell, A Short Course of History, p. 161).

[6] Green, History of the English People, 1881, vol. i., p. 250.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 268. Bulls of Pope Honorius III. to Henry (March 14, 1244) enjoin greater impartiality and forbearance towards his subjects, and (April 27, 1226) forbid his assisting Raymond of Toulouse, or making war with the King of France (Royal Letters, *temp.* Hen. III., Rolls Series, 1862, vol. i., Appendix v.).

usurpations and exactions of the Court of Rome. All the chief benefices of the kingdom were conferred on Italians, great numbers of whom were sent over at one time to be provided for; and the system of non-residence and pluralities was carried to an enormous height. The benefices of the Italian clergy in England amounted to 60,000 marks a year,[1] a sum which exceeded the annual revenue of the Crown itself. The Pope exacted the revenues of all vacant benefices, the twentieth of all ecclesiastical revenues without exception, the third of such as exceeded 100 marks a year, and half of those possessed by non-residents. He claimed the goods of all intestate clergymen, advanced a title to inherit all money gotten by usury, and levied benevolences upon the people. When the king, contrary to his usual practice, prohibited these exactions, he was threatened with excommunication.[2]

"The general indignation," says Mr Green, "at last found vent in a wide conspiracy. In 1231, letters from 'the whole body of those who prefer to die rather than be ruined by the Romans,' were scattered over the kingdom by armed men; tithes gathered for the Pope or the foreign priests were seized and given to the poor; the Papal collectors were beaten and their Bulls trodden under foot."[3] Sir Robert Thwinge, a knight of Yorkshire, who, by a Papal provision had been deprived of his nomination to a living in the gift of his family, became the head of an association formed to resist the usurpations of the Court of Rome.[4] The Papal couriers were murdered, threatening letters were addressed to the foreign ecclesiastics, and for eight months the excesses continued. Henry at length interposed his authority, and Thwinge proceeded to Rome to plead his cause before the Pontiff. He was successful, and returned with a Bull, by which Gregory IX. (1227-41) authorised him to nominate to the living which he claimed.[5]

There can be no reasonable doubt, that at a period when the Papal influence was dominant throughout the realm, when the King of England had to pay heavily to ensure the confirmation by the Pope of Archbishop Langton's successor, and when, as we have seen, the right of a lay patron to present to a living was only successfully vindicated under colour of a Roman Bull, the authority of the supreme Pontiff must have been constantly invoked in the smaller concerns of human life of which history takes but little notice. In a previous chapter I have shown that in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, so great was the demand for Papal seals and letters in the city of London, that their counterfeit production must have amounted to a profitable industry.[6]

It is on record, moreover, that a great forgery of Bulls and other documents, professing to emanate from the Papal chancery, was carried on in Rome itself; and privileges of question-

[1] According to a Bull of Innocent III., published in Rymer's "Fœdera," vol. i., p. 471, the amount is stated not to have exceeded 50,000 marks.

[2] J. Tyrell, History of England, 1700, vol. ii., pt. ii., book viii., p. 836; and T. Keightley, History of England, 1839, vol. i., p. 209; The Student's Hume, 1862, p. 147.

[3] Green, History of the English People, vol. i., p. 269.

[4] "Besides the usual perversions of right in the decision of controversies, the Pope openly assumed an absolute and uncontrolled authority of setting aside, by the plenitude of his apostolic power, all particular rules, and all privileges of patrons, churches, and convents" (Hume and Smollett, History of England, continued by the Rev. T. S. Hughes, 1854, vol. ii., p. 21).

[5] Lingard, History of England, vol. ii., p. 417. *Cf.* Milman, History of Latin Christianity, 1864, vol. vi., p. 87; and Wilkins, Concilia, i. 269.

[6] *Cf. Ante*, Chap. VII., p. 370; and Riley, Memorials of London, pp. 495, 583.

able character were often produced by persons whose interests they favoured, as the results of a visit to the Holy See.

Richard of Canterbury, A.D. 1187, after denouncing persons who attempted to pass themselves off as bishops by counterfeiting "the barbarism of Irish or Scottish speech," goes on to complain of spurious Bulls, and orders that the makers and users of such documents shall be periodically excommunicated.[1] Innocent III. alludes frequently to these forgeries, of which a manufactory was in his time discovered at Rome; and he exposes some of the tricks that were practised—such as that of affixing to a forgery a genuine Papal seal taken from a genuine deed, the erasure of some words and the substitution of others.[2] The canons, however, of later councils testify that the system of forgery long survived these exposures and denunciations.[3]

In my judgment, the practice of applying in nearly every situation of life for Papal sanction or confirmation, must have been at its height during the reign of Henry III.,[4] and there is evidence beyond what I have already adduced, to favour the supposition that this usage was especially prevalent in the British Islands.

The Papal authority in England had been vastly strengthened by the sanction which Pope Alexander II.—who was the mere tool of Hildebrand—had been made to give to the expedition of William of Normandy. Nor was it diminished during the pontificate of Hildebrand—the type of papalism in its loftiest aims, as well as in its proudest spirit—who, as Gregory VII., was Pope from 1073 to 1085, though his influence on the affairs of the Roman Church had been paramount for nearly twenty years before he assumed the tiara. "There is only one name in the world," said Gregory, "that of the Pope. He has never erred, and he never will err. He can put down princes from their thrones, and loose their subjects from their oaths of allegiance." This Pontiff claimed to be liege-lord of Denmark, Hungary, and England; and for a while he had Philip I. of France as his trembling slave, and Henry IV. of Germany a ruined suppliant at his mercy.[5]

When the English throne was seized by Stephen of Blois—between whom and the Earl of Gloucester, natural son of Henry I., a dispute had occurred as to which should precede in swearing allegiance to the Empress Matilda—the prospect of favour to the church and submission to the Roman See, induced Innocent II. to confirm his title, to send his benediction in a Bull, and to take the usurper under the special protection of St Peter.[6] In the charter subsequently granted at Oxford by Stephen to the Church, particular mention is made of the confirmation of his title by the Pope.

[1] Rev. J. C. Robertson, History of the Christian Church, 1866, vol. iii., p. 581. [2] *Ibid.*

[3] *E.g.*, Conc. Salisburg., A.D. 1281, c. xvii.; Conc. Leod., A.D. 1287, c. xxxi.

[4] The supply of these documents kept pace with the demand for them, and it was said that a Papal emissary, named Martin, came over in this reign "with a parcel of blank Bulls, which he had the liberty to fill up at discretion." Matthew Paris will not allow so hard an imputation upon the Pope, though he records that Innocent IV., in 1243, sent the King of England a *provisional* Bull of pardon, that in case he should happen to lay violent hands upon any ecclesiastics and fall under the censure of the canons, he might receive absolution upon submitting to the customary penance! (Collier, Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, ed. 1840, vol. ii., pp. 499, 503).

[5] Gregory, on being chosen Pope, had the election *ratified* by Henry IV. In the year 1076, at the Councils of Worms and Rome respectively, the Pope was deposed by the Emperor, and the Emperor excommunicated by the Pope. During the following year, however, at Canossa, Henry is said to have remained three days and three nights barefooted in the snow before Gregory would condescend to see him!

[6] Collier, Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain (F. Barham), 1840, vol. ii., p. 213.

The supremacy of the Popes over all temporal sovereigns was maintained by Adrian IV., who, on visiting the camp of Frederic Barbarossa, haughtily refused to give the kiss of peace, until the Emperor elect had submitted to hold the stirrup of his mule in the presence of the whole army. Adrian, who was the only English Pope, granted the lordship of Ireland to Henry II. in a Bull which declared *all islands* to belong to St Peter.[1]

The murder of Thomas à Becket in 1170 still further conduced to augment the Papal influence in England. Henry II. submitted to the authority of the Papal legates, and having sworn on the relics of the saints that he had not commanded nor desired the death of the archbishop, and having also made various concessions to the Church, he received absolution from the legates, and was confirmed in the grant of Ireland made by Pope Adrian.[2]

Although in a later chapter, some remarks will be offered upon the fact, that both York and those portions of southern Scotland most closely associated with the early legends of the craft, were originally comprised within the boundaries of Saxon Northumbria, it will be convenient, nevertheless, at this stage—as showing that the Papal *influence* extended throughout the whole of Britain—to briefly notice the ancient subordination in ecclesiastical matters of the prelates of the northern kingdom to the Archbishop of York. Pope Paschal II. (1099-1118) in his Bull to the Bishops of Scotland, orders them to receive Gerhard, the newly-consecrated Archbishop of York, as their metropolitan, and pay him due submission. Calixtus II. (1119-1124), to whom John, Bishop of Glasgow, appealed against his suspension by Thurstan, Archbishop of York, was threatened with its *confirmation*, unless within thirty days he made submission to his metropolitan. Honorius II. (1124-1130) wrote to the King of Norway to restore Ralph, Bishop of the Orcades, consecrated by the Archbishop of York, and subject to his jurisdiction, to the privileges and revenues of the bishopric. Even later still, "William the Lion," King of Scotland, in a letter to Pope Alexander III. (1159-1181),[3] informs that Pontiff that the churches of Scotland were anciently under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan see of York; that the king had thoroughly examined this title, and found it supported by unquestionable records, together with the concurrence of living evidence. He therefore desires the Pope to discourage all attempts at innovation, and that things may be thoroughly settled upon the old basis.[4]

Although numerous examples of Papal Bulls, Confirmations, and Indulgences are to be found in our ecclesiastical and county histories, the absence in many instances of any index whatever, and in all cases—except in works of comparatively recent date—of references calculated to facilitate investigation, renders the search for these ancient writings a formidable as well as a wearisome undertaking. Furthermore, whilst if the

[1] Upon this Bull (1155) Collier remarks: "We may observe how far the Popes of that age stretched their pretensions upon the dominions of princes; for here we see the Pope very frankly presents King Henry with the crowns of the Irish kings, commands their subjects upon a new allegiance, and enjoins them to submit to a foreign prince as their lawful sovereign" (*Op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 257).

[2] Chepmell, A Short Course of History, 2d series, vol. i., pp. 332-347; The Student's Hume, p. 118. At the Council of Avranches, May 21, 1172, Henry II. was absolved from the murder of Thomas à Becket, after swearing to abolish all the unlawful customs established during his reign (Nicholas, Chronology of History, p. 238).

[3] As William only became King in 1165, and Alexander died in 1181, the latter must have been written within the period covered by these two dates.

[4] Dugdale, Monasticon Anglicanum, 1830, vol. vi., pt. iii., pp. 1185, 1186, 1188; Collier, Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, vol. ii., p. 190.

grants and confirmations of diocesans and metropolitans are included in the general category of these instruments, their name is *legion*, yet apart from the lists of charters given in such works as Rymer's "Fœdera," Dugdale's "Monasticon" and "History of St Paul's," Drake's "Eboracum," the various chronicles, the annals of the different monastic orders, and the like, no very extensive collection of Papal or episcopal documents of the class under examination will be found in any single work, nor has it been the practice of even our most diligent antiquaries to do more than record the result of their own immediate inquiries. So uniform is this rule, that the occasional mention of an Indulgence, such, for example, as that granted by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1244 (to be presently noticed), in aid of the construction of Salisbury Cathedral,[1] and copied by one writer from another, as a singular and noteworthy occurrence, has led many persons to believe that a search for privileges of this nature, among the records of building operations carried on in countries other than our own, would be alone likely to yield any profitable result. Even in the latest edition of Dugdale's famous "Monasticon" the *index* merely refers the reader to a solitary Indulgence of forty days granted in 1480, by the Archbishop of York, "to all who should visit the Lady Chapel at Oseny Abbey, either in pilgrimage or devotion, or should bestow any of their goods upon it."[2]

The following are examples of privileges and confirmations emanating from the Roman See:

"1124-1130. The goods, possessions, and rents of the Provost and Canons of the Collegiate Church of Beverley, *confirmed* by a Bull of Pope Honorius II.[3]

"1181-1185. The charter of the 'Great Guild of St John of Beverley of the Hanshouse,' *confirmed* by a Bull of Pope Lucius III.[4]

"Jan. 26, 1219. An *Indulgence* of 40 days given by Pope Honorius III. to those who assist at the translation of the body of Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury.[5]

"1252. A pardon for release of xl. days' penance, sent out by Pope Innocent IV., to those assisting at the Sustentation of St Paul's Cathedral.[6]

"1352-62. An Indulgence of two years and two quarters granted by Pope Innocent VI. 'to the liberal contributors' to the construction of the Cathedral of York.[7]

"1366. One year's Indulgence granted by Urban V. to 'the Christian benefactors' of the same fabric."[8]

Three Papal confirmations relating to the Chapter of the Cathedral of St Peter of York are given by Sir W. Dugdale, one from Alexander [III.] confirming a charter granted by William Rufus; the others from Popes Innocent IV. and Honorius III., ratifying privileges conferred by English prelates.[9]

[1] W. Dodsworth, Historical Account of the Episcopal See and Cathedral Church of Salisbury, 1814, p. 134; quoted by Britton in his "Architectural Antiquities," and thence passed on by numerous later writers without any reference to the original authority.

[2] Vol. vi., p. 250, *note*, citing Harleian MS., No. 6972, fol. 89.

[3] G. Poulson, Beverlac: Antiquities and History of Beverley in Yorkshire, 1829, vol. ii., p. 524. "King Athelstane, in the thirteenth year of his reign, made and ordained the Church of Beverley collegiate." It was afterwards "spared by William I., who bestowed lands upon the church, and confirmed its privileges" (*Ibid.*, p. 14, citing a Latin MS. in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, entitled "De Abbatia Beverlaci").

[4] Smith, English Gilds, p. 153. This Bull, which *confirms* the charter of an English *craft* guild, is given in its entirety at the conclusion of this summary.

[5] Rymer, Fœdera (Record edition), vol i., p. 154.

[6] Sir W. Dugdale, History of St Paul's Cathedral, 1716, p. 14.

[7] Drake, Eboracum, p. 475. [8] *Ibid.* [9] Dugdale, Monasticon Anglicanum, vol. vi., p. 1178.

Innocent IV. appears to have been a liberal dispenser of Papal favours. Marchese records that an Indulgence was granted by this Pontiff to all those who would contribute to the building of the church "di S. S. Giovanni e Paolo" at Venice;[1] and a Bull of the same Pope specified that "those who undertook the Crusade, or contributed to the relief of the Holy Land, were to have the benefit of their Indulgence extended *proportionably to the value of their money.*"[2]

The privileges and possessions of the Monastery of Glastonbury were confirmed by no less than six Popes between the beginning of the twelfth and the close of the thirteenth century—by Calixtus, Innocent, and Lucius (1119-1145), each the Second, and by Alexander, Honorius, and Nicholas (1159-1280), each the Third, of their respective names.[3] For fuller information respecting the class of document we have been considering, I must refer the reader to the works already quoted from, and to those below noted,[4] and shall next proceed to give some examples of Indulgences granted by English prelates.

These are very numerous, and appear in the varied form of Indulgences, Confirmations, and Letters Hortatory. For the most part, they granted a commutation of forty days' penance, and were generally issued in aid of the construction or the repair of an ecclesiastical edifice.

Thus in 1137 the Cathedral of St Peter at York having been destroyed by fire, an Indulgence was granted soon after by Joceline, Bishop of Sarum, setting forth, that "whereas the metropolitical Church of York was consumed by a new fire, and almost subverted, destroyed, and miserably spoiled of its ornaments, therefore to such as bountifully contributed towards the re-edification of it, he released to them forty days of penance injoyned."[5]

The work, however, must have languished, as there were similar Indulgences published by Bishop Walter Grey in 1227, and by Archbishops William de Melton in 1320, and Thoreseby at a still later period.[6]

In 1244 an Indulgence of forty days was granted by the Archbishop of Canterbury to such as should give their aid "to the new and wonderful structure of the church of Sarum, which now begins to rise, and cannot be completed with the same grandeur without the assistance of the faithful."[7]

The earliest Indulgence in aid of the sustentation of St Paul's Cathedral was granted by Hugh Foliot, Bishop of Hereford, in 1228, and the last—if we except one sent from Simon, a cardinal of Rome, affording "C. Days release" in 1371—by Roger, Bishop of Salisbury, in 1316.[8]

Between 1228 and 1316, the number of Indulgences, confirmations of Indulgences, and

[1] Vincenzo Marchese, Lives of the most Eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects of the Order of St Dominic, translated by the Rev. C. P. Meehan, 1852, p. 73, citing "Bullarium Ord. Præd.," vol. i., p. 166.

[2] Collier, Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, 1840, vol. ii., p. 535.

[3] Dugdale, Monasticon Anglicanum, 1830, vol. i., p. 36.

[4] For three letters of Pope Gregory X., confirming the privileges of sundry Scottish churches (1274-75), and an Indulgence granted by Nicholas V. in recognition of the labours and expenses of William, Bishop of Glasgow (1451), see W. Hamilton, Description of the Sheriffdoms of Lanark and Renfrew, 1831, pp. 176, 178, 198 (Maitland Club, Glasgow). Many Bulls of Innocent III. (1198-1216) are given in the first volume of Rymer's "Fœdera," and forty-one instruments of this class, granted by his immediate successors, Honorius III. (1216-27) and Gregory IX. (1227-41), will be found collected in "Royal Letters, *temp.* Henry III.," 1862, vol. i., Appendix V. (Chronicles of Great Britain, Rolls Series).

[5] Drake, Eboracum, p. 473. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 475. [7] Dodsworth, *loc. cit.*

[8] Sir W. Dugdale, History of St Paul's Cathedral, 1716, pp. 12, 13.

Letters Hortatory granted "to all those, as being truly sorry for their sins, and confess'd, should afford their helps to this pious work," was very great.

In 1240 an Indulgence was procured—from whom it is not said—by Roger, surnamed Niger, then Bishop of London, of forty days' pardon to all such as come with devotion to the Cathedral.[1]

In 1244—Roger having been canonized in the interim—the Indulgence was, by Walter, Bishop of Norwich, made to extend "to those who should either for devotion's sake visit the tomb of the saint, or give assistance to the magnificent fabrick."[2]

From this date scarcely a year passed without similar favours having been held out, in order "to stir up the people to liberal contributions;" and Dugdale mentions "*another* letter Hortatory" having been issued by John, Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1281, "affording the same number of days for Indulgence as the other Bishops had done." In this letter, as well as in those of similar tenor from the Bishops of Hereford (1276) and Norfolk (1283), the Indulgence is expressly granted, "for the old and new work." "Nay," says Dugdale, "not only the contributors to this glorious structure were thus favoured, but the solicitors for contributions, and the *very mechanicks themselves* who laboured therein."[3]

The confirmation of an English *craft* guild by Pope Lucius III. has been already noticed, and will now be more closely examined. As a ratification by the Pope of municipal privileges, already confirmed by an English king, it is *sui generis*—at least so far as my researches have extended, yet the absence of further documentary evidence of a like character by no means warrants the conclusion, that the men of Beverley were exceptionally favoured by the Roman Pontiff. It is but natural to suppose that the crafts, as well as the guilds and fraternities, in those early days, must have regarded the confirmation of their privileges by the Pope, as consolidating their liberties and cementing their independence. Nor will the silence on this point, of our antiquaries or of local historians, militate against such an hypothesis. The confirmation of Pope Lucius was apparently unknown to the compilers of Rymer's "Fœdera,"[4] and Poulson's "Beverlac,"[5] although the charter of Archbishop Thurstan is given in both these works, and a copy of it was only discovered amid the neglected rolls in the Record office, through the careful search of the late Mr Toulmin Smith.[6] "Amongst the few returns," says this diligent investigator, "remaining in the Record office of those that were made under the Writ of Richard II.[7] from the craft guilds, is one from the 'Great Guild of St John of Beverley of the Hanshouse.'" It gives some interesting charters, the earliest of which is expressed to be from Thurstan, Archbishop of York, to the men of Beverley, granting "all liberties, with

[1] Sir W. Dugdale, History of St Paul's Cathedral, 1716, pp. 12, 13.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.* No less than twenty-five Indulgences—generally of forty days' release from penance—were granted between 1239 and 1288, to the single Priory of Finchdale. See Charters of the Priory of Finchdale, 1837, pp. 169-191 (Publications of the Surtees Society); and Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain during the Middle Ages, Rolls Series, Annales Monastici, vol. iv., 1869, p. 414.

[4] Record edition, 1816, vol. i., p. 10.

[5] Vol. i., p. 51. It is also worthy of observation that the Letters-patent of Richard II. are not set forth in this elaborate and interesting work.

[6] English Gilds, p. 150.

[7] *Ante.*, Chap. VII., p. 347. "Of the returns made under the Writ [of Richard II.]," says Mr Toulmin Smith, "a more complete and characteristic example, or one more historically valuable, could not be given than the return from Beverley" (English Gilds, p. 150).

the same laws that the men of York have in that city."[1] This charter is followed by another, granted by Archbishop William, the successor of Thurstan, confirming, though in different words, the substance of the former charter, and granting free burgage to the town and burgesses, and that they shall have a guild merchant, and the right of holding pleas among themselves, the same as possessed by the men of York.

Then follows a confirmation of the charters of the two Archbishops by Pope Lucius III. in words of which the following is a translation:—

"Lucius, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, to his beloved children, the men of Beverley, Greeting and Apostolic Benediction. The charge which we have undertaken moves us to listen, and readily to yield, to the right wishes of those who ask; and our well known kindness urges us to do so. And because we make the Redeemer of all men propitious to us when we give careful heed to the just demands of the faithful in Christ, therefore, beloved children in the Lord, giving ready assent to what you ask, your Liberties, and the free customs which Thurstan and William of happy memory, Archbishops of York, are known to have piously and lawfully granted to you, as is found in authentic writings made by them, which have been confirmed by our dearest son in Christ, Henry, the illustrious king of the English, We do, by our apostolic authority, confirm; and by the help of this present writing, we do strengthen: decreeing that no man shall disregard this our confirmation, or be so rashly bold as to do aught against it. And if any one dares to do this, let him know that he will bring down on himself the wrath of Almighty God, and of the blessed Peter and Paul, Apostles. Dated, xiij. Kalends of September [20th August]."[2]

In Beverley there was also a guild of Corpus Christi, the main object of which was, as in York, to have a yearly procession of pageants. It was like the York guild, made up of both clergy and laity. The ordinances begin by stating that the "solemnity and service" of Corpus Christi were begun, as a new thing, by command of Pope Urban IV. and John XXII.[3]

It has been already shown, that many circumstances combine to render the era of Henry III. especially memorable as a period when the ascendant of the Pope was at its zenith in these islands. Henry has been termed "the first monarch of England who paid attention to the Arts," and to his munificence are ascribed the most beautiful works of the mediæval age which we possess.[4] If, then, we consider the partiality of Henry III. for foreigners, the constant communication with Rome, and that so large a portion of the English benefices were held at that period by Italians, it may be fairly assumed, that these circumstances must have materially influenced the employment in England of the artists of southern Europe.

[1] Smith, English Gilds, p. 151; Rymer, Fœdera, 1816, vol. i., p. 10; Poulson, Beverlac: Antiquities and History of Beverley in Yorkshire, 1829, vol. i., p. 51. Thurstan was chosen Archbishop of York A.D. 1114, and died 1139. In the chronological index to Rymer, this charter is said to have been granted A.D. 1132.

[2] Smith, English Gilds, p. 153. No year is given, but the Lucius who made this charter must have been the third of that name; for Henry, "rex Anglorum," is spoken of as if then living, and this can only refer to Henry II., whose reign began in 1154, and ended in 1189. Lucius the *Second* died in 1145.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 154. "It is usually stated that Urban, alone, founded this celebration. He was Pope from August 1261 to October 1264. John was Pope from August 1316 to December 1334" (*Ibid.*). "*Anno* 1481, Sept. 18. There was an Indulgence of forty days granted to all who should contribute their charity towards the relief and sustentation of the fraternity or guild of Corpus Christi, ordained and founded in the city of York" (Drake, Eboracum, p. 246).

[4] Sir R. Westmacott, Observations on the Progress of the Art of Sculpture in England in Mediæval Times (Archæological Journal, vol. iii., 1846, p. 198).

Whether or not the opinion expressed by Dugdale was the result of his own inductions, or a mere embodiment of the prevalent belief—narrated to him in good faith during one of his visitations—is indeterminable, and in a sense, immaterial, that is to say, up to this point of the inquiry, though in the observations that follow, the possibility of the latter hypothesis will alone be considered.

From the point of view, therefore, that Dugdale, in his various heraldic visitations and perambulations of counties, may, and in all probability did, become conversant with many old customs akin to those described by Dr Plot as existing in the *moorlands* of Staffordshire, it is desirable to examine upon what foundations the belief he notices could have been erected. The history of the Papacy, at a period synchronizing with the reign of Henry III. of England, affords the information we seek.

The great religious event of the Pontificate of Innocent III.,[1] the foundation of the Mendicant Orders, perhaps perpetuated, or at least immeasurably strengthened, the Papal power for two centuries. Almost simultaneously, without concert, in different countries, arose two men wonderfully adapted to arrest and avert the danger which threatened the whole hierarchal system.[2] These were the fiery Spaniard, St Dominic, styled "the burner and slayer of heretics," and the meek Italian, St Francis of Assisi, called by Dante "the splendour of cherubic light." They were the founders of the Dominican and the Franciscan Orders, which sprang suddenly to life at the opening of the thirteenth century, and whose aim it was to bring the world back within the pale of the Church.

The followers of St Francis were formed into an Order, with the reluctant assent of Pope Innocent III. in 1210, and the Dominicans were similarly established in 1215. Both bodies were confirmed by a Bull of Honorius III. in 1223, and the partiality shown towards them by the Popes so increased the number of Mendicant Orders that, in the Second Council of Lyons (A.D. 1274), it was thought necessary to confine the institution to the Dominicans, the Franciscans, the Carmelites, and the Augustinians, or Hermits of St Augustin.[3] The members of these four orders were called friars, in contradistinction to the Benedictine Monks and the Augustine Canons. Each of these mendicant bodies had its General.

The reputation of the friars arose quickly to an amazing height. The Popes, among other extraordinary privileges, allowed them the liberty of *travelling* wherever they pleased, of conversing with people of all ranks, of instructing the youth and the people in general, and of hearing confessions without reserve or restriction.[4] On the whole, two of these mendicant institutions—the Dominicans and the Franciscans—for the space of near three centuries,

[1] Innocent was elected Pope 1198, laid England under an interdict 1208, declared John deposed 1212, received his submission 1213, and died 1216. Henry III. became King in 1216, and died 1272.

[2] Milman, History of Latin Christianity, 1864, pp. 8, 50; Green, History of the English People, vol. i., p. 255.

[3] The Franciscans, called by their founder *Fraterculi*, or *Fratres Minores* (Minor Friars), received in England the name of *Grey Friars*, from the colour of their habit. The Dominicans, at first termed *Preaching Friars*, were afterwards styled *Major Friars*, in contradistinction to the Franciscans, and in England *Black Friars*. The Carmelites were the *White Friars*. The Augustinians, of which body Martin Luther was a member, were the *Austin Friars*.

[4] Horace Walpole says: "The friars, *freres*, or brothers, united priesthood with monachism; but while the monks were chiefly confined to their respective houses, the friars were wandering about as preachers and confessors. This gave great offence to the secular clergy, who were thus deprived of profits and inheritances. Hence the satyric and impure figures of friars and nuns in our old churches" (Walpoliana, vol. i., No. IX.). *Cf. Ante.*, chaps. III., p. 166, and VI., p. 306.

appear to have governed the European Church and State with an absolute and universal sway. Mosheim says, "what the Jesuits were, after the reformation of Luther began, the same were the Dominicans and Franciscans from the thirteenth century to the times of Luther—the soul of the whole Church and State, and the projectors and executors of all the enterprises of any moment."[1] They filled, during this period, the most eminent, civil, and ecclesiastical stations, for although both Dominic and Francis had intended that their followers should eschew ecclesiastical dignities,[2] we find, before the end of the century, many Franciscan and Dominican Bishops, and even a Franciscan Pope.[3] The two Orders grew with wonderful rapidity, and in the middle of the thirteenth century the Franciscans possessed about 8000 convents and nearly 200,000 monks. They gradually forsook their early austerity, gathered riches, established a gorgeous ritual, and made their chief seat, Assisi, a centre of Christian art. From the name of their Church in this town, "Portiunicula," arose the phrase *Portiunicula Indulgence*, from the frequency with which indulgences were granted to, and disseminated by, this order.[4]

As with the followers of St Francis, so with those of St Dominic. The extreme plainness which was at first affected in the dwellings and churches of the two Orders was soon superseded by an almost royal splendour of architecture and decoration. They had ample buildings and princely houses.[5]

The foundation in Italy of the Franciscan and the Dominican Orders coincides strangely enough, as is pointed out by Marchese, with the period when architecture underwent a change, and "the imitation of the antique was abandoned for the Gothic," or, as he prefers to term it, "the Teutonic style."[6] The same writer observes, "that religious enthusiasm, which was kindled in the hearts not only of the Italian people but in those of the Ultramontanes also, is very discernible in the vast number of edifices which in those days arose, as it were, by enchantment in the cities, hamlets, and rural districts of Spain and Italy."[7] In 1223 Fra Giovanni, a Dominican of Bologna, appealed to the people of Reggio for means to enable him to erect a convent and church of his Order there. Then was repeated what was witnessed a few centuries before, when the Benedictines commenced the erection of their church at Dive. Men, women, and children—noble and plebeian—absolutely carried the materials for the sacred edifice, which, under the direction of a certain Fra Jacopino of the same Order, was finished

[1] Mosheim, Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern, 1863, vol. ii., p. 194.

[2] Acta Sanctorum, Aug. 4, p. 487. Lists of the Kings and Nobles of the Order, of the "Generals," and of the Provincial Heads in England, are given in the "Monumenta Franciscana," vol. i., pp. 534-541 (Chronicles of Great Britain and Ireland, Rolls Series). The fact that royal personages obtained admission into the ranks of the Grey Friars is consistent with the analogy sought to be established in the text, and may have given rise to that portion of the masonic tradition, which declares that "kings have not disdain'd to enter themselves into this society"! Popes Nicholas IV. (1288-92) and Sixtus IV. (1471-84) are numbered amongst the "Generals" of the Franciscans.

[3] Robertson, History of the Christian Church, 1866, vol. iii., p. 592.

[4] Dr Milner says: "The friars intruded themselves into the dioceses and churches of the bishops and the clergy, and, by the sale of *Indulgences*, and a great variety of scandalous exactions, perverted whatever of good order and discipline remained in the Church" (History of the Church of Christ, 1847, vol. iii., p. 170).

[5] Robertson, *loc. cit.*; Milner, History of the Church of Christ, vol. iii., p. 157.

[6] *Cf.* Milman, History of Latin Christianity, vol. vi., p. 587.

[7] Marchese, Lives of the most Eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects of the Order of St Dominic, translated by the Rev. C. P. Meehan, 1852, pp. 8, 30.

in the brief term of three years.[1] "This zeal for church-building," says Marchese, "required a great number of architects, stonemasons, engineers, and other persons competent to superintend the works, and the new Orders, on this account, received many skilful persons into their ranks."

According to the Abbè Bourassè,[2] the architects of the Dominicans followed one style, whilst those of the Franciscans adopted another, but he neither discloses the source whence he derived his information, nor specifies what constituted the styles peculiar to the respective Orders. In the opinion, however, of Marchese, the Franciscans, who, in the magnificence of their temples, very often equal, and indeed surpass, every other Order, "either for want of architects, or being desirous to avail themselves of extern talent, neither in the thirteenth nor fourteenth century employed any architect *of their own body* to erect any edifice of importance."[3] This writer suggests therefore that as the Dominicans commonly had architects[4] in their communities, it is likely that the Franciscans must have had recourse to some member of the rival brotherhood.

The Black Friars of St Dominic made their appearance in England in 1221, and the Grey Friars of St Francis in 1224; both were received with the same delight.[5] "At London," says Mr Green, "they settled in the shambles of Newgate; at Oxford they made their way to the swampy ground between its walls and the stream of Thames. *Huts* of mud and timber, as mean as the huts around them, rose within the rough fence and ditch that bounded the Friary."[6] In London the first residence of the Franciscans was in "Stynkinge Lane," in the parish of St Nicholas in Macello, but ere long, grant after grant was made of houses, lands, and messuages in the same quarter, and in the reign of Edward I. they possessed a noble church—300 feet long, 95 wide, and 64 high—with pillars of marble.[7]

At Oxford, in 1245, the Grey Friars enlarged their boundaries, and began to build new houses, whilst the Black Friars left their house in the Jewry and entered a new dwelling by the great bridge.[8]

Within thirty years after the arrival of the Grey Friars in England their numbers, in this country alone, amounted to 1242; they counted forty-nine convents in different localities. With equal rapidity they passed into Ireland and Scotland, where they were received with the same favour, thus presenting an instance of religious organisation and propagandism unexampled in the annals of the world.[9]

[1] Marchese, Lives of the most Eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects of the Order of St Dominic, translated by the Rev. C. P. Meehan, 1852, p. 31. During the erection of the Church of St Peter at Dive, the monk Aimone wrote to his brethren of the Abbey of Tutbury in England thus: "It is truly an astonishing sight to behold men who boast of their high lineage and wealth, yoking themselves to cars, drawing stones, lime, wood, and all the materials necessary for the construction of the sacred edifice. Sometimes a thousand persons, men and women, are yoked to the same car, so great is the burden; and yet the profoundest silence prevails" (Comte de Caumont, Histoire Sommaire de l'Architecture Religieuse, Militaire et Civile au Moyen Age, chap. viii., p. 176). *Cf.* Muratori, Italicarum Rerum Scriptores, vol. viii., p. 1007; Parentalia, p. 306; Levasseur, Histoire des Classes Ouvrières en France, vol. i., p. 326; and *ante*, Chaps. IV., p. 197, and V., p. 258.

[2] Marchese, vol. i., p. 73. [3] *Ibid.*

[4] Of the Dominicans, Marchese observes: "In truth, no other Order has reared a grander or more numerous body of painters, *architects*, painters of glass, intarsiatori, and miniaturists" (Preface, p. xxviii.).

[5] Green, History of the English People, p. 256. [6] *Ibid.*

[7] Milman, History of Latin Christianity, 1864, vol. vi., p. 44.

[8] Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages, Rolls Series, Annales Monastici, vol. iv., 1869, pp. 93, 94.

[9] Monumenta Franciscana, Charters and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland, Rolls Series, vol. i., 1858, Preface, p. xli.

In 1234 John, Abbot of Osney, became a Franciscan, and in 1246 Walter Mauclerc, Bishop of Carlisle, assumed the habit of the Dominicans.[1] A general chapter of the Franciscans was held at Worcester in 1260, and of the Dominicans, at Oxford, in 1280; Edward I. being present at the latter.[2]

The Dominicans, who ceased to be Mendicants in 1425, held wealthier benefices than were possessed by any other Order. At the period of the dissolution of monasteries there existed in England fifty-eight houses of this Order, and sixty-six of the Grey Friars.[3] The most learned scholars in the University of Oxford at the close of the thirteenth century were Franciscan Friars, and long after this period the Grey Friars appear to have been the sole support and ornament of that university.[4] Repeated applications were made from Ireland, Denmark, France, and Germany, for English friars.[5]

The "History of the Friars" is alike remarkable, from whatever point of view it may be regarded, and, as the editor of the "Monumenta Franciscana" has well observed, deserves the most careful study, not only for its own sake, as illustrating the development of the intellect of Europe previous to the Reformation, but as the link which connects modern with mediæval times.[6] The three schoolmen, of the most profound and original genius, Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, and Occham, were English friars. On the Continent the two Orders produced, in Italy, Thomas Aquinas, author of the "Summa Theologiæ," and Bonaventura; in Germany, Albertus Magnus—said by some writers to have invented Gothic architecture, revived the symbolic language of the ancients, and given new laws to the Freemasons;[7] and in Spain, Raymund Lully, to whose chemical inquiries justice has not yet been done, and who, whilst his travels and labours in three-quarters of the globe are forgotten, is chiefly recollected as a student of alchemy and magic, in which capacity, indeed, he is made to figure as an early Freemason, by a few learned persons, who find the origin of the present Society in the teachings of the hermetic philosophers.

No effort of the imagination is required to bring the rise and development of the Mendicant Orders into harmony with the floating traditions from which either Dugdale or Wren—even if we assume the latter to have *formed* the opinion ascribed to him at least a century before it was *recorded* by his son—may have formulated their accounts of the origin of Freemasonry. The history, moreover, of the Franciscan and Dominican Orders seems to lend itself to the hypothesis of Ashmole, as related by Dr Campbell, on the authority of Dr Knipe—"Such a Bull there was," *i.e.*, a Bull incorporating the Society in the reign of Henry III.—"but this Bull, in the opinion of the learned Mr Ashmole, was *confirmative* only, and did not by any means create our fraternity, or even establish them in this kingdom."[8] The Dominican Order, as we have already seen, was *confirmed* by a Bull of Honorius III. in 1223,[9] but it had

[1] Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages, Rolls Series, Annales Monastici, vol. iv., 1869, pp. 82, 94.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 284, 446.

[3] Dugdale, Monasticon Anglicanum, ed. 1830, vol. vi., pp. 1482, 1502.

[4] Warton, History of English Poetry, ed. 1840, vol. ii., p. 89.

[5] Monumenta Franciscana, vol. i., pp. 93, 354, 365, 379. [6] Preface, p. lix.

[7] Heideloff, Bauhütte des Mittelalters, p. 15; Winzer, Die Deutschen Bruderschaften, p. 54; Findel, History of Freemasonry, p. 59.

[8] Biographia Britannica, 1747, *tit.* Ashmole, *ante*, p. 16.

[9] Heldman says: "In the time of Henry III., the English masons were protected by a Bull of (probably) Honorius III." (Die drei Aeltesten Geschichtlichen Denkmale, p. 342).

planted an offshoot in England two years previously. I shall not contend that the speculative theology of the schoolmen has exercised any direct influence upon the speculative masonry of which we are in possession. Such a supposition, however curious and entertaining, lies outside the boundaries of this discussion,[1] yet the fact that Roger Bacon, a Franciscan, Albertus Magnus and Raymond Lully, Dominicans, have been claimed in recent times as members of the craft,[2] should not be lost sight of, it being, to say the least, quite as credible that the persons from whom Dugdale derived his information, may have been influenced by the general history of the chief Mendicant Orders, as that writers of two centuries later should have found in certain individual friars the precursors of our modern Freemasons.

The coincidences to which I shall next direct attention are of unequal value. Some are of an important character, whilst others will carry little weight. But, unitedly, they constitute a body of evidence, which, in my judgment, fairly warrants the conclusion, that the idea of travelling masons having been granted privileges by the Popes germinated in the history of the Franciscan and Dominican Orders.

These friars were *Italians*—among them were many architects—commingled with *French, Germans, Flemings*, and others.[3] They procured Papal Bulls for their encouragement, and particular privileges; they travelled all over Europe, and built churches; their government was regular, and, where they fixed near the building in hand, they made a camp of huts. A General[4] governed in chief. The people of the neighbourhood, either out of charity or commutation of penance, gave the materials and carriage.

In the preceding paragraph I have closely paraphrased the statement in the "Parentalia" as being the fullest of the series, though, if we turn to that of Dugdale, as being the original from which the opinions of Ashmole and Wren were derived, the same inference will be deducible.

Connected in men's minds, as the Freemasons were, with the erection of churches and cathedrals, the portion of the tradition which places their origin in these travelling bodies of Italians, is not only what we might expect to meet with, but it possesses what, without doing violence to language, may be termed *some foundation* in fact.[5] For the earliest masons we must search the records of the earliest builders, and whilst, therefore, it is clear that this class of workmen had been extensively employed by the Benedictines, the Cistercians, and the

[1] Of St Francis, Mr Brewer observes: "Unlike other and earlier founders of religious orders, the requisites for admission into his fraternity point to the better educated, not to the lower classes. 'He shall be *whole of body* and prompt of mind; not in debt; *not a bondsman born; not unlawfully begotten;* of good name and fame, and competently learned'" (Monumenta Franciscana, Preface, p. xxviii.).

[2] See the Masonic Encyclopædias; and observations on the Rosicrucians, *post*.

[3] *Cf.* The statements attributed to Dugdale, Ashmole, and Wren, *ante*, Chaps. VI., p. 258, and XII., pp. 6, 17.

[4] The General of the Franciscans was elected by the Provincials and Wardens in the chapter of Pentecost, held every third year, or a longer or a shorter term as the General thought fit. He was removable for insufficiency. A general chapter of the Dominicans was held yearly (Fosbroke, British Monachism, 1802, vol. i., p. 72 *et seq.*).

[5] Attention is pointedly directed by Marchese to the numerous ecclesiastical structures erected in the *thirteenth* century, not only in Italy, but in France, Germany, England, and Belgium, who cites, *inter alia*, the basilica of S. Francesco di Assisi, A.D. 1228; the duomo of Florence, 1298; that of Orvieto, 1290; S. Antonio di Padova, 1231; the Campo Santo di Pisa, 1278; S. Maria Novella in Florence, 1279; S. Croce, built in 1294; to which period also belong SS. Giovanni and Paolo, and the Church of the Frari in Venice. Outside Italy, he names the cathedrals of Cologne, Beauvais, Chartres, Rheims, Amiens, Brussels, York, Salisbury, Westminster, Burgos, and Toledo, as all belonging to the *first half* of the thirteenth century (Lives of the most Eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects of the Order of St Dominic, 1852, Preface, p. xxv.).

RIGHT HONOURABLE THE EARL OF ZETLAND

PROVINCIAL GRAND MASTER OF N. RIDING

NORTH AND EAST RIDINGS

Carthusians, all of which had a footing in England long before the era of the Franciscans and Dominicans; on the other hand, the latter Orders can fairly claim to rank as links in the chain, by which, if at all, the Freemasons of the Middle Ages can be connected with their congeners, the actual constructors of those marvels of operative skill, the temples, of a more remote antiquity.

Dugdale, Ashmole, and Wren very probably derived their information much in the same manner as their several opinions have been passed on to later ages. Somebody must have told Dugdale what Aubrey's pen has recorded, it matters not who, and whether a mason or otherwise is equally immaterial. The members of a secret society are rarely conversant with its origin and history, and unless the Freemasons of the sixteenth century were addicted to the study of Masonic antiquities, in a degree far surpassing the practice of their living descendants—of whom not one in a hundred advances beyond a smattering of ritual and ceremonial—they could have had little or nothing to communicate beyond the tradition as it has come down to us.

I conceive that about the middle of the sixteenth century certain leading incidents in the history of the Friars had become blended with the traditionary history of the Freemasons, and I think it not improbable that the "letters of fraternity,"[1] common in the thirteenth century—as well as before and after—of which those of the Friars had a peculiar sanctity,[2] may have potently assisted in implanting the idea, of the *brotherhood* of Freemasons having received Papal favours through the medium of the *Italians*, who were travelling over Europe and building churches. Colour is lent to this supposition by the fact, already noticed, that in 1387 "a certain *Friar preacher*,[3] Brother William Bartone by name, gave security to three journeymen cordwainers of London, that he would make suit in Rome for a confirmation of their fraternity by the Pope."[4] If this view of the case be accepted, the Dugdale-Aubrey *derivation* of the Freemasons from certain wandering Italians would be sufficiently explained.

Although, in the opinion of some respectable authorities, the only solution of the problem under consideration is to be found in the Papal Writings,[5] of which at various times the Steinmetzen were the recipients, it appears to me, that the supporters of this view have failed to realise the substantial difficulties of making out their case, or the lengths to which they must go, in order to even plausibly sustain the theory they have set up. In the first place, the belief in Papal Bulls having been granted to the Freemasons, is an *English* and not a *German* tradition. Secondly, the privileges claimed for the Steinmetzen rest upon two distinct sources of authority—one set, the *confirmations* of Popes Alexander VI. and Leo X. in 1502

[1] "There were 'letters of fraternity' of various kinds. Lay people of all sorts, men and women, married and single, desired to be enrolled in spiritual fraternities, as thereby enjoying the spirituall prerogatives of pardon, indulgence, and speedy despatch out of purgatory" (Fosbroke, British Monachism, 1802, vol. ii., p. 53, citing Smith, Lives of the Berkeley Family, MS. iii., 443).

[2] Piers Plowman, speaking of the day of judgment, says:

> "A poke full of pardon, ne provincial letters
> Though ye be founden in the fraternitie of the iiii. orders" (fol. xxxviii. *b.*).

[3] The origin of this term, as applied to distinguish a member of the Dominican Order, is thus explained by Fosbroke: "When the Pope was going to write to Dominick on business, he said to the notary, 'Write to Master Dominick and the preaching brethren;' and from that time they began to be called the *Friars Preachers*" (British Monachism, vol. ii., p. 40, citing Jansenius, Vita Dominici, l. i., c. vi., p. 44).

[4] Riley, Memorials of London, p. 495; *ante*, Chap. VII., p. 370.

[5] *I.e.*, Bulls, Briefs, Charters, Confirmations, Indulgences, Letters—in a word, every possible written instrument by which the will of the Supreme Pontiff was proclaimed to the laity.

and 1517, are supported by credible tradition; the other set, the *Indulgences*[1] extending from the time of Nicholas III. to that of Benedict XII. (1277-1334), repose on no other foundation than unverified assertion.

Now, in order to show that Dugdale's statement to Aubrey was based on the Papal confirmations of 1502 and 1517, proof must be forthcoming, that the first antiquary of his age not only recognised the Steinmetzen as the parents, or at least as the precursors, of the Freemasons, but that he styled the former *Italians*, and made a trifling mistake of three centuries in his chronology! True, the anachronism disappears if we admit the possibility of his having been influenced by the legendary documents of earlier date (1277-1334)—though, as a matter of fact, since the masons of southern Germany only formed themselves into a *brotherhood* in 1459, no Papal writing of earlier date can have been sent to them—but the error as to nationality remains, and under both suppositions, even adding the *Indulgence* of Cologne[2] (1248), it is impossible to get over the circumstance, that Dugdale speaks of a *Society* or *body* of men who were to travel over Europe and build churches. The Steinmetzen, indeed, built churches, but the system of travelling—which, by the way, only became obligatory in the *sixteenth* century[3]—was peculiar to the *journeymen* of that association, and did not affect the *masters*, to whom, in preference to their subordinates, we must suppose the Pope's mandate to travel and erect churches, would have been addressed.

Except on the broad principle, that "an honest man and of good judgment, believeth still what is told to him, and that which he finds written," I am at a loss to understand how the glosses of the Germans have been so readily adopted by English writers of reputation.[4]

The suggestion of Dr Kloss, that the tradition of the "Bulls" was fabricated for the purpose of adorning the "legend of the guilds," and fathered upon Ashmole and Wren—on the face of it a very hasty induction from imperfect *data*—may be disposed of in a few words.

Kloss evidently had in his mind Dr Anderson's "Constitutions" of 1723 and 1738, the "Memoir" of Ashmole in the "Biographia Britannica," 1747, and Wren's opinion, as related in the "Parentalia," 1750. The "Guild" theory, as it has since been termed, was first broached in the publications of Dr Anderson, by whom no doubt the legends of the craft *were* "embellished," somewhat, in the process of conversion into a simple traditionary history. Still, in the conjecture that the story of the "Bulls" was prompted by, and in a measure grew out of, the uncritical statements in the "Constitutions," his commentator has gone far astray, as this tradition has come down on unimpeachable authority from 1686, and probably dates from the first half of the seventeenth century. From the works already cited, of 1747 and 1750 respectively, Kloss no doubt believed that the opinions of Ashmole and Wren acquired publicity, and as the earlier conception of Sir William Dugdale was then entombed in MS., the conclusions he drew were less fanciful than may at first sight appear. The statement attributed to Wren can claim no higher antiquity, as printed matter, than 1750; and though the opinion of Ashmole appears to have first seen the light in 1719, Preston, in his quotation from Dr

[1] *Ante*, Chaps. III., p. 176, and XII., p. 18.

[2] *Ante*, Chap. III., p. 177.

[3] Brentano, On the History and Development of Gilds, p. 89.

[4] Mr Papworth says: "From a comparison of the circumstances, Dugdale's information most probably referred to the "Letters of Indulgence" of Pope Nicholas III. in 1278, and to others by his successors, as late as the fourteenth century, granted to the lodge of masons working at Strasbourg Cathedral" (Transactions, Royal Institute of British Architects, Dec. 2, 1862).

Rawlinson's memoir of that antiquary, prefixed to the "Antiquities of Berkshire," published in 1719, not only omits the passage relating to the *origin* of the Freemasons, but deprives the excerpt he presents of any apparent authority, by introducing it as a mere statement by "the writer of Mr Ashmole's life, *who was not a mason.*"[1]

The tradition we have examined forms one of the many historical problems, for the complete solution of which no sufficient materials exist. Yet as no probability is too faint, no conjecture too bold, or no etymology too uncertain, to escape the credulity of an antiquarian in search of evidence to support a masonic theory; writers of this class, by aid of strained and fanciful analogies, have built up some strange and incredible hypotheses, for which there is no manner of foundation either in history or probability. "Quod volumus, facile credimus:" whatever accords with our theories is believed without due examination. It is far easier to believe than to be scientifically instructed; we see a little, imagine a good deal, and so jump to a conclusion.

Returning from the dissertation into which I have been led by the statement in the "Parentalia," the next evidence in point of time bearing on Wren's membership of the Society, is contained in a letter written July 12, 1757, by Dr Thomas Manningham, a former Deputy Grand Master (1752-56) of the earlier or constitutional Grand Lodge of England, in reply to inquiries respecting the validity of certain additional *degrees* which had been imported into Holland. This document, found in the archives of the Grand Lodge of the Netherlands in 1868, was shortly afterwards published by Mr S. H. Hertzveld of the Hague.[2] The letter runs:—"These innovations are of very late years, and I believe the brethren will find a difficulty to produce a mason acquainted with any such forms, twenty, nay, ten years. My own father has been a mason these fifty years, and has been at Lodges in Holland, France, and England. He knows none of these ceremonies. Grand Master Payne, who succeeded Sir Christopher Wren, is a stranger to them, as is likewise one old brother of ninety, who I conversed with lately. This brother assures me he was made a mason in his youth, and has constantly frequented lodges till rendered incapable by his advanced age," etc.

"Here," says a valued correspondent,[3] "are three old and active masons, who must have been associated with Sir Christopher Wren, and known all about his masonic standing, with whom Dr Manningham was intimately associated, and who must have given him correct information as to Wren, in case he had it not of his own knowledge."

The genuineness of the Manningham letter has been disputed. On this point I shall not touch. Where Hughan, Lyon, and Findel, are in accord, and the document has received the "hall-mark" of their approval, I am unwilling on light grounds to *reject* any evidence deemed admissible by such excellent authorities.

Still, if we concede to the full the genuineness of the letter, the passage under examination will, on a closer view, be found to throw no light whatever upon the immediate subject of our inquiry. The fact—if such it be—of Sir Richard Manningham[4] (the father

[1] Illustrations of Masonry, 1792, p. 213.

[2] In the "Vrijmetselaars Yaarbookje," the parts referring to the above letter were kindly sent me by Mr Hertzveld. The letter is printed *in extenso* by Findel, p. 315, and in the *Freemasons' Magazine*, vol. xxiv., p. 148.

[3] Mr S. D. Nickerson, Secretary, Grand Lodge of Massachusetts.

[4] According to the register of Grand Lodge, Sir Richard Manningham was a member of the lodge "at the Horne," Westminster, in 1723 and 1725.

of the writer) having been, in 1757, "fifty years" a member of the craft, and the assurance of the "old brother of ninety," that he had been "made a mason in his youth," are interesting, no doubt, as increasing the aggregate of testimony which bears in favour of the masonic proceedings from 1717 onwards, having been continued without break from a much earlier period. But with Wren, or the circumstances of his life, they have nothing to do.

The expression "Grand Master Payne, who *succeeded* Sir Christopher Wren, *is* a stranger to them," is both inaccurate and misleading. In the first place, he did *not* succeed Wren, and the statement, besides carrying its own condemnation, shows on the face of it, that it was based on the "Constitutions" of 1738. Secondly, the word "*is*," as applied to Payne in July 1757, is singularly out of place, considering that he died in the previous January, indeed, it seriously impairs the value of Dr Manningham's recollections in the other instances where he permits himself the use of the present tense.

The memoir of Wren in the "Biographia Britannica" which appeared in 1763, was written by Dr Nicolls, and merely deserves attention from its recording, without alteration or addition, the items of masonic information contained in the two extracts from the "Parentalia," already given. There are no further allusions to the Freemasons, nor is the subject of the memoir represented to have been one of that body.

The fable of Wren's Grand Mastership—inserted by Anderson in the "Constitutions" of 1738—was repeated, with but slight variation, in all subsequent issues of that publication to which a history of masonry was prefixed.[1] It was also adopted by the schismatic Grand Lodge of 1753, as appears from the "Ahiman Rezon," or "Book of Constitutions," published by the authority of that body in 1764. Laurence Dermott, the author or compiler of the first four editions of this work[2]—and to whose force of character and administrative ability must be attributed the success of the schism, and the triumph of its principles—agrees with Anderson that Wren was Grand Master, and that he neglected the lodges, but endeavours "to do justice to the memory of Sir Christopher by relating the real cause of such neglect." This he finds in the circumstance of his dismissal from the office of surveyor general, and the appointment of Mr Benson. "Such usage," he argues, "added to Sir Christopher's great age, was more than enough to make him decline all public assemblies; and the master masons then in London were so much disgusted at the treatment of their old and excellent Grand Master, that they would not meet nor hold any communication under the sanction of his successor." "In short," he continues, "the brethren were struck with a lethargy which seemed to threaten the London Lodges with a final dissolution."[3]

As Wren was not superseded by Benson until 1718, the year *after* the formation of the Grand Lodge of England, at which latter period (1717) occurred the so-called "revival of Masonry," the decay, if one there was, preceding and not succeeding that memorable event, we need concern ourselves no further with Dermott's hypothesis, though I cite it in this place,

[1] The last of these appeared in 1784, and no later edition was published by the *first* Grand Lodge of England during the remainder of its separate existence (1784-1813). After the union (1813) the historical portion was omitted.

[2] *I.e.*, those of 1756, 1764, 1778, and 1787.

[3] Ahiman Rezon; or, a Help to a Brother, 1764, p. xxiii. "The famous Sir Christopher Wren, Knight, Master of Arts, formerly of Wadham College, Professor of Astronomy at Gresham and Oxford, Doctor of the Civil Law, President of the Royal Society, Grand Master of the Most Antient and Honourable Fraternity of Free and Accepted Masons, Architect to the Crown, who built most of the churches in London, *laid the first stone* of the glorious Cathedral of St Paul, and lived to finish it" (*Ibid.*).

because the "Ahiman Rezon" has been regarded as a work of great authority, and its very name has been appropriated by many Grand Lodges to designate their books of Constitutions.

"The Compleat Freemason, or *Multa Paucis* for Lovers of Secrets," an anonymous work published in 1764 or the previous year, has been followed in many details by Preston and other writers of reputation.[1] In this publication, the number of legendary Grand Masters is vastly enlarged. Few Kings of England are excluded, the most noticeable being Richard I. and James II. We are here told that "the King, with Grand Master Rivers, the Architects, Craftsmen, Nobility, Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Bishops, levelled the Footstone of St Paul's Cathedral in due Form, A.D. 1673." Also, that "in 1710, in the eighth year of the reign of Queen Anne, our worthy Grand Master Wren, who had drawn the Design of St Paul's, had the Honour to see it finished in a magnificent Taste, and to celebrate with the Fraternity, the Capestone of so noble and large a Temple." We learn further, that masonry, which in the reign of James II. "had been greatly obstructed, and no Lodges frequented but those in or near the places where great works were carried on," after the accession of William and Mary (1689),[2] "made now again a most brilliant appearance, and numbers of Lodges were formed in all parts of London and the suburbs." Sir Christopher Wren, "by the approbation of the King from this time forward, continued at the head of the Fraternity," but after the celebration of the capestone in 1710, "our good old Grand Master Wren, being struck with Age and Infirmities, did, from this time forward, [1710] retire from all Manner of Business, and, on account of his Disability, could no more attend the Lodges in visiting and regulating their Meetings as usual. This occasioned the Number of regular Lodges to be greatly reduced; but they regularly assembled in Hopes of having again a noble Patron at their Head."[3]

Preston, in his "Illustrations of Masonry,"[4] of which twelve editions were published during his lifetime—the first in 1772, the last in 1812—follows Anderson in his description of Wren's official acts as Grand Master, but adduces much new evidence bearing upon Sir Christopher's general connection with the craft, which, if authentic, not only stamps him as a Freemason, but also as an active member of the Lodge of Antiquity. Preston, whose masonic career I shall at this stage only touch upon very briefly, having published the first edition of his noted work in 1772, delivered a public course of lectures at the Mitre Tavern in Fleet Street in 1774, and the 15th of June in the same year having attended the "Lodge of Antiquity" as a visitor, the members of that lodge not only admitted him to membership, but actually elected him master at the same meeting. According to his biographer, Stephen Jones, "he had been a member of the Philanthropic Lodge at the Queen's Head, Gray's Inn Gate, Holborn, above six years, and of several other lodges

[1] *Multa Paucis* has two important statements, which will be hereafter examined—one, that *six* lodges were present at the "revival" in 1717; the other, that Lord Byron (1747-52) neglected the duties of his office. The latter, copied into the "Pocket Companions" and works of a like character, has been accepted by eminent German writers, and held to account in some degree for the great schism by which the masons of England were, for more than half a century, arrayed in hostile camps. See Kloss, Geschichte der Freimaurerei in England, Irland, und Schotlland, 1848, p. 157; and Findel, History of Freemasonry, p. 174.

[2] "The King was soon after made a Free-Mason in a private Lodge; and, as Royal Grand Master, greatly approved of the choice of Grand Master Wren" (Multa Paucis, p. 78).

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 75, 78, 81, 82.

[4] Styled by Findel, "one of the best and most extensively known works in the masonic literature of England."

before that time, but he was now taught to consider the importance of the office of the first master under the English Constitution."[1] It will form part of our inquiry to examine into the composition of this Lodge before Preston became a member, for although during his mastership, which continued for some years, it made a great advance in reputation, and in 1811 exceeded one hundred in number, including many members of both Houses of Parliament, the brilliancy of its *subsequent* career will not remove the doubts which suggest themselves, when Preston recounts traditions of the lodge, which must have slumbered through many generations of members, and are inconsistent and irreconcilable with its comparatively humble circumstances during whatever glimpses are afforded us of its early history. Nor are our misgivings allayed by Preston's method of narration. Comparing the successive editions of his work, we find such glaring discrepancies, that, unless we believe that his information was acquired, as he imparts it, piecemeal, or, like Mahomet and Joseph Smith, each fresh effort was preceded by a special revelation, we must refuse credence to statements which are unsupported by authority, contradictory to all known testimony, and even inconsistent with each other.

The next edition of the "Illustrations" published after Preston's election to the chair of the Lodge of Antiquity appeared in 1775, where, at p. 245, this Masonic body is referred to as "the old Lodge of St Paul, over which Sir C. Wren presided during the building of that structure."

According to the same historian,[2] in June 1666, Sir Christopher Wren, having been appointed Deputy under the Earl of Rivers, "distinguished himself more than any of his predecessors in office in promoting the prosperity of the few lodges which occasionally met at this time,* [particularly the old Lodge of St Paul's, now the Lodge of Antiquity, which he patronized upwards of eighteen years."[3]]

A footnote—indicated in the text at the place where an asterisk (*) appears above—adds, "It appears from the records of the Lodge of Antiquity that Mr Wren, *at this time*, attended the meetings regularly, and that, during his presidency, he presented to the lodge three mahogany candlesticks, at that time truly valuable, which are still preserved and highly prized as a *memento* of the esteem of the honourable donor."

Preston follows Anderson in his account of the laying of the foundation stone of St Paul's by the king, and states that, "during the whole time this structure was building, Mr Wren acted as master of the work and surveyor, and was ably assisted by his wardens, Mr Edward Strong and his son."[4] In a note on the same page we read, "The mallet with which the king levelled this foundation stone *was lodged by Sir Christopher Wren* in the old Lodge of St Paul, now the Lodge of Antiquity, where it is still preserved as a great curiosity."[5]

"In 1710," says Preston, "the last stone on the top of the lantern was laid by Mr Christopher Wren, the son of the architect. This noble fabric ∴ ∴ was begun and completed

[1] Freemasons' Magazine, 1795, vol. iv., p. 3.

[2] Illustrations of Masonry, 1792, p. 219.

[3] The passage within crotchets, and the footnote by which it is followed above, are not given in the editions for 1781 and 1788, and appear for the *first time* in that for 1792.

[4] Illustrations of Masonry, 1792, p. 228.

[5] In the two preceding editions the words in italics do not appear, and the note simply runs: "The mallet with which this foundation-stone was laid, is now in the possession of the Lodge of Antiquity in London, and preserved there as a great curiosity" (Illustrations of Masonry, 1781, p. 214; 1788, p. 226).

in the space of thirty-five years by one architect—the great Sir Christopher Wren; *one principal mason*—Mr Strong; and under one Bishop of London."[1]

It will be seen that Preston's description of the completion of the cathedral, does not quite agree with any other version of this occurrence which we have hitherto considered. The "Constitutions" of 1738 date the event in 1708, *imply* that Wren himself laid the last stone, and are silent as to the presence of Freemasons. The "Parentalia" alters the date to 1710, deposes the father in favour of the son, *implies* that Wren was absent, and brings in the Freemasons as a leading feature of the spectacle. "Multa Paucis" follows the "Constitutions" in allowing Wren "to see" his work "finished," leaves the question open as to by whom the stone was laid, adopts the views of the "Parentalia" as to the year of the occurrence and the presence of the Freemasons, and goes so far as to make Sir Christopher participate in the Masonic festivities with which the proceedings terminated.

Preston, in this particular instance, throws over the "Book of Constitutions," and pins his faith on the narrative of Christopher Wren in the "Parentalia," though it should not escape our notice that he omits to reproduce the statement in the latter work relating to the presence of the Freemasons, which, of all others, it might be expected that he would. I may here briefly remark, that whilst claiming as "Freemasons" and members of the Lodge of Antiquity, several persons connected with Wren in the construction of St Paul's, no connection with the Masonic craft is set up on behalf of the architect's son,[2] nor does Preston allude to him throughout his work, except in the passage under examination. This, whilst establishing with tolerable certainty that in none of the records from which the author of the "Illustrations of Masons" professed to have derived his Masonic facts concerning the *father*, was there any notice of the *son*, at the same time lands us in a fresh difficulty, for in the evidence supplied by the "Parentalia," written, it may be assumed, by a non-Mason, we read of the Strongs and *other Free and Accepted Masons* being present at the celebration of the capestone in 1710, a conjunction of much importance, but which, assuming the statement of Christopher Wren to be an accurate one, is passed over *sub silentio* by William Preston.

The next passage in the "Illustrations," which bears on the subject of our inquiry, occurs where mention is made of Wren's election to the presidency of the Society in 1685. The account is word for word with the extract already given from the "Constitutions" of 1738, but to the statement that Wren, as Grand Master, appointed Gabriel Cibber and Edward Strong his wardens, Preston *adds*, "both these gentlemen were members of the old Lodge of St Paul with Sir Christopher Wren."[3]

Throughout the remainder of his remarks on the condition of Masonry prior to 1717, Preston closely follows the "Constitutions" of 1738. He duly records the initiation of William III. in 1695, the appointment as Grand Wardens of the two Edward Strongs, and concludes with the familiar story of the decay of Freemasonry owing to the age and infirmities of Sir Christopher drawing off his attention from the duties of his office.

[1] Illustrations of Masonry, 1792, pp. 236, 237. It will be seen that Preston wholly ignores *Thomas* Strong, the elder brother of Edward Strong, senior.

[2] *Query*, Does Christopher Wren owe this immunity, to the consideration that his membership of the society might have been awkward to reconcile, with the *theory* of the lodges having languished from about 1710 to 1717, owing to the neglect of his father?

[3] Illustrations of Masonry, 1792, p. 244. The above is shown as a footnote, and does not appear in the 1788 and earlier editions.

Arranged in order of time—*i.e.*, of publication—the *new* evidence given by Preston may be thus briefly summarised:—

In 1775 it is first stated that Wren presided over the old Lodge of St Paul's during the building of the cathedral.

Between 1775 and 1788 the only noteworthy circumstance recorded, is the possession by the Lodge of Antiquity of the "historic" mallet, employed to lay the foundation stone of St Paul's.

In 1792, however, a mass of information is forthcoming: we learn that Wren patronised the Lodge of Antiquity for eighteen years, that he presented it with three candlesticks during the period of his mastership, and "lodged" with the same body—of which Gabriel Cibber and Edward Strong were members—the "mallet" so often alluded to.[1]

I shall next quote from a memoir of the family of Strong,[2] compiled seven years before the appearance of the first book of "Constitutions" (1723), though not published until 1815. It is inscribed: "London, May the 12th, 1716. Memorandums of several works in masonry done by our family: viz., by my grandfather, Timothy Strong; by my father, Valentine Strong; by my brother, Thomas Strong; by myself, Edward Strong; and my son, Edward Strong."

Timothy Strong was the owner of quarries at Little Berrington, in Gloucestershire, and at Teynton, in Oxfordshire, in which many masons and labourers were employed. Several apprentices were also bound to him. He was succeeded in his possessions by his son Valentine, who built some fine houses, and dying at Fairford, in Oxfordshire, in 1662, was buried in the churchyard there, the following epitaph appearing on his monument:—

Here lyeth the body of Valentine Strong, Free Mason.
He departed this life
November the . . .
A.D. 1662.

Here's one that was an able workman long,
Who divers houses built, both fair and Strong;
Though Strong he was, a Stronger came than he,
And robb'd him of his life and fame, we see:
Moving an old house a new one for to rear,
Death met him by the way, and laid him here.

According to the "Memoir," Valentine Strong had six sons and five daughters.[3] All his six sons were bred to the mason's trade, and about the year 1665 Thomas, the eldest, "built

[1] In which *edition of* the "Illustrations" it was *first* stated that the cathedral was completed by *one principal mason*, I cannot at this moment say, nor is the point material.

[2] *Copied from a transcript of* the original MS. in the possession of John Nares, Esq., of John Street, Bedford Row (R. Clutterbuck, The History and Antiquity of the County of Hertford, 1815, p. 167). John Nares, a Bencher of the Inner Temple, was descended from Edward Strong the younger, through his daughter Susannah, wife of Sir John Strange, Master of the Rolls, whose daughter, Mary, married Sir George Nares, a Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, and bore him the above.

[3] *Viz.*, "Ann, Thomas, William, Elizabeth, Lucy (who died young), Sarah, Valentine, Timothy, Edward, John, and Lucy, the second of that name."

lodgings for scholars at Trinity College, Oxford, under the direction of Dr Christopher Wren, of Wadham College. In the year 1667, artificers were invited by Act of Parliament to rebuild the city of London; and accordingly, the aforesaid Thomas Strong provided stone at the quarries which he had the command of, and sent the same to London, and sold great quantities to other masons. He also took up masons with him to London to work with him, to serve the city in what they wanted in his way of trade. In the year 1675 he made the first contract with the Lords and others, the Commissioners for rebuilding the cathedral church of St Paul's in London, and on the 21st of June in that year *laid the first stone in the foundation with his own hand.*"[1]

Thomas Strong died in 1681, unmarried, leaving all his employment to his brother Edward, who he made his sole executor.

The "Memoir" continues, "about the year 1706 Edward Strong, *jun.*, began the lanthorn on the dome of St Paul's, London; and on the 25th of October 1708 Edward Strong, *sen.*, laid the last stone upon the same."[2]

It will be seen that the testimony of Edward Strong is directly opposed to that of Christopher Wren in the matter of the *last* stone. On this point their evidence is of equal authority, both were present at the occurrence they describe, and whilst on the one hand it may be contended that the claim of the younger Wren to have laid the stone has been admitted by later writers, on the other hand this is more than balanced by the opinion of Strong's relatives, as recorded on his monument *immediately after his decease.* As regards the *first* stone, however, in the testimony of Edward Strong, we have the only deposition of an *eye-witness* of the proceedings of 1675. Christopher Wren was but four months old when the foundation stone was laid, and without detracting in the slightest degree from his honesty and general accuracy of statement, it is impossible to accord what *he was told*,[3] a higher measure of belief than we yield to the evidence of a witness of equal veracity who describes *what he actually saw.*

Throughout the "Memoir" there is no reference to the "Lodge of St Paul," or the "Free and Accepted Masons," of which Preston and Christopher Wren respectively declare Edward Strong to have been a member.

Elmes, in his first biography of Wren,[4] alludes to Freemasonry at some length, cites Preston, from whom he largely quotes, as its best historian, and faithfully repeats the stories of Wren's Grand Mastership, of the mahogany candlesticks, of the mallet, and of the appointment of Edward Strong as Grand Warden. Happily he gives his authorities, which are the "Illustrations of Masonry," the "Ahiman Rezon," and Rees' "Cyclopædia," therefore we may

[1] Seymour, in his "Survey of London" (1734), describes Strong as laying the first stone, and Longland the second, on June 21, 1675.

[2] Upon the monument erected to the memory of Edward Strong in the Church of St Peter, at St Albans, he is described as "Citizen and Mason of London," and the inscription adds—"In erecting the edifice of St Paul's several years of his life were spent, even from its foundation *to his laying the last stone*; and herein equally with its ingenious architect, Sir Christopher Wren, and its truly pious diocesan, Bishop Compton, he shared the felicity of seeing both the *beginning* and *finishing* of that stupendous fabric" (Freemasons' Magazine, Oct. 8, 1864, p. 261, citing Peter Cunningham in the *Builder*).

[3] This refers to a manuscript (British Museum, Lansdowne MSS., No. 698), which will be presently examined. The "Parentalia," it will be recollected (*ante*, p. 13), does not state by whom the stone was laid.

[4] Memoirs of the Life and Works of Sir Christopher Wren, 1823, pp. 484, 485, 493.

safely pass on to a consideration of the points which are chiefly in dispute, and at the same time glean indiscriminately from the pages of his *two* biographies.[1]

Elmes cites "Clutterbuck's History of Hertford," containing the "Memoir of the Strongs," and in part reconciles the discrepant statements of Edward Strong and the younger Wren by making Sir Christopher lay the *first* stone of St Paul's, *assisted* by Thomas Strong, though the honour of laying the last stone, "with masonic ceremony," he assigns exclusively to the architect's son, who, he says, was "attended by his venerable father, Mr Strong, the master-mason of the cathedral, and the lodge of Freemasons, of which Sir Christopher was for so many years the acting and active master."[2]

This writer then proceeds to state that, "in the Lansdowne collection of manuscripts in the British Museum is one by the eldest son of Sir Christopher, countersigned by the great architect," which he cites in full, and describes as "a remarkable breviate of the life of one of the greatest men of any time."[3]

On the first leaf of the manuscript, at the top of the page, is scrawled, "Collata, Oct. 1720, C. W.," which, despite the authority of Elmes, I unhesitatingly pronounce to be in the same handwriting as the body of the MS. The entry, or entries, with which we are concerned are the following:—

1675. Novæ Basilicæ Dvi Paulæ Lon. Primum posuit lapidem:—1710. Supremum in Epitholio et *exegit*.

This memorandum, however, is somewhat oddly wedged in between entries of 1700 and 1718 respectively, and it is curious, to say the least, that all the other jottings, of which there are fifteen, are arranged in strict chronological order. This manuscript at most merely supplements the evidence of Christopher Wren, and tends to show that, in 1720—to use his own words in another place—"he was of opinion" that the first stone of St Paul's had been laid by his father. It is perhaps of more value in this inquiry from what it *does not* rather than from what it does contain, as the omission of any entry whatever under the year 1691 will justify the conclusion that Christopher Wren was aware of no remarkable event in his father's life having occurred at that date.

Passing over intermediate writers, by whom the same errors have been copied and re-copied with wearisome iteration, I shall next give an extract from a work of high authority and recent publication, and then proceed to summarize the leading points upon which our attention should be fixed whilst considering the alternative hypothesis with regard to Wren's "adoption" by the Freemasons in 1691, first launched by Mr Halliwell in 1844.

The Dean of St Paul's, in his interesting history of that cathedral, wherein he frequently gives Elmes and the "Parentalia" as his authorities, informs us that "the architect himself had the honour of laying the first stone (June 21, 1675). There was no solemn ceremonial; neither the King nor any of the Court, nor the Primate, nor the Bishop, nor even, it should seem, was Dean Sancroft or the Lord Mayor present. In the year 1710 Sir Christopher Wren, by

[1] The later of these is styled "Sir Christopher Wren and his Times," by James Elmes, 1853. It is "a new work in a more general and less technical style than the former" (Author's Preface).

[2] Elmes, Memoirs of the Life and Works of Sir Christopher Wren, 1823, pp. 353, 493; Sir Christopher Wren and his Times, 1852, pp. 281, 428.

[3] Chronologica Series, Vitæ et Actorum Dni Christopheri Wren, Eq. Aur., etc., etc. (British Museum, Lansdowne MSS., No. 698, fol. 136).

the hands of his son, attended by Mr Strong, the master mason, who had executed the *whole* work, and the body of Freemasons, of which Sir Christopher was an active member, laid the last and highest stone of the lantern of the cupola."[1]

A retrospect of the evidence from 1738 to 1823, or in other words from Anderson's "Constitutions" of the former year down to the publication of Elmes's first biography of Wren, shows that whilst Masonic writers,[2] without exception, have successively copied and enlarged the story of Wren's connection with the Society, their views acquire no corroboration, but on the contrary are inconsistent with all that has come down to us respecting the great architect in the writings of his contemporaries[3] and in the pages of the "Biographia Britannica."

The fable of Wren's Grand Mastership I shall not further discuss, except incidentally and in connection with the testimony of Preston, it being sufficiently apparent—as tradition can never be alleged for an absolute impossibility—that he could not have enjoyed in the *seventeenth* century a title which was only created in the second decade of the *eighteenth* (1717). It is also immaterial to the elucidation of the real point we are considering, whether Charles II., Thomas Strong, or the architect himself laid the first stone, or whether Edward Strong or the younger Wren laid the last stone of the cathedral.

Preston's statements, however, demand a careful examination. These are professedly based on *records* of the Lodge of Antiquity, and there is no middle course between yielding them full credence or rejecting them as palpable frauds. The maxim "Dolus latet in generalibus" occurs to the mind when perusing the earlier editions of the "Illustrations of Masonry." In 1775 Preston informs us "that Wren presided over the old Lodge of St Paul's during the building of the cathedral," and not until 1792, a period of seventeen years—during which *five* editions of his book were published—does he express himself in sufficiently clear terms to enable us to critically examine the value of his testimony. At last, however, he does so, and we read, "It appears from the *records* of the Lodge of Antiquity that Mr Wren at this time [1666] attended the meetings regularly,"[4] also that he patronized this lodge upwards of eighteen years. Now this statement is either a true or a false one. If the former, the Aubrey hypothesis of 1691 receives its *quietus;* if the latter, no further confidence can be reposed in Preston as the witness of truth. Next there is the evidence respecting the mallet and the candlesticks, which is very suggestive of the story of the "Three Black Crows," and of the progressive development of the author's imagination, as successive editions of his work saw the light. Finally there is the assertion that Gabriel Cibber and Edward Strong were members of the lodge.

These statements I shall deal with *seriatim*. In the first place, the regular attendance of Sir Christopher at the meetings of his lodge, is contradicted by the silence of all contemporary history, notably by the diary of Elias Ashmole, F.R.S., who, in his register of occurrences for 1682, would in all probability, along with the entry relating to the Feast at the Mason's Hall, have brought in the name of the then President of the Royal Society,[5] had he been (as

[1] Dr H. H. Milman, Annals of St Paul's Cathedral, 1869, pp. 404, 432. Strong is also described as the "master mason" who "assisted in laying the first stone and in fixing the last in the lantern" (*Ibid.*, p. 410).

[2] Constitutions, 1738; Multa Paucis; Ahiman Rezon; and the Illustrations of Masonry.

[3] Ashmole, Plot, Aubrey, Christopher Wren, and Edward Strong.

[4] Illustrations of Masonry, 1792, p. 219.

[5] "Nov. 30, 1681. Sir Christopher Wren chosen President [of the Royal Society], Mr Austine, Secretary, with Dr Plot, the ingenious author of the 'History of Oxfordshire'" (Evelyn, Diary, 1852, vol. ii., p. 161).

contended, an active member of the fraternity. Indeed, it is almost certain that Sir Christopher would himself have been present, or, at least, his absence accounted for;[1] whilst we may go further, and assume from Dr Plot's known intimacy with Wren—who is said to have written Chapter IX. of his "Natural History of Oxfordshire"[2]—that had the latter's interest in Freemasonry been of the extensive character deposed to by Preston, Plot would have known of it, whereas the language he permits himself to use in regard to the Freemasons in 1686[3] is quite inconsistent with the supposition that he believed either Wren or Ashmole[4] to be members of a Society which he stigmatised in such terms of severity.

The next reflection that suggests itself, is the inference to be drawn, if we believe Preston, that during the years over which Wren's membership of the lodge extended, the same records from which he quotes must have justified his constantly using the expression "Grand Master," as it is hardly conceivable that a member of the lodge holding the high position of President of the *Society* would invariably have his superior rank in the *craft* ignored in the minutes and proceedings of the *lodge*. As a matter of fact, however, we know that Wren could not have held, in the seventeenth century, a title which did not then exist, and the conclusion is forced upon us either that the "records" spoken of were as imaginary as the "Grand Mastership," or that their authority was made to cover whatever in the shape of tradition or conjecture filled Preston's mind when writing the history of his lodge.

The latter hypothesis is the more probable of the two. It is irrational to suppose that Preston, to strengthen his case, would have cited the authority of writings which did not exist. Some members, at least, of the Lodge of Antiquity, might have been in a position to contradict him, and an appeal to imaginary or lost documents would have been as senseless an insult to their understandings as it would to those of readers of these pages, were I to appeal to the "Book of Merlin" or the manuscripts sacrificed by "scrupulous brethren" (1720) as a proof of the Masonic Union of 1813.

In his use, however, of the word "records," the author of the "Illustrations" sets an example which has been closely followed by Dr Oliver,[5] and whenever either of these writers presents a statement requiring for its acceptance the exercise of more than ordinary credulity, it will invariably be found to rest upon the authority in the one case of an old *record*, and in the other of a *manuscript* of the Society.[6]

A learned writer has observed, "such is the power of reputation justly acquired that its

[1] The absence of Edward Strong, *senior*, from whose epitaph "Citizen and Mason of London" I assume to have been a member of the "Mason's Company," a view strengthened by the circumstance that Edward Strong, *junior*, certainly was one in 1724, is hard to reconcile with the positive assertion of Preston, that he was also a *Freemason!* The younger Strong was not a member of any lodge in 1723.

[2] Elmes, 1852, p. 409. [3] Natural History of Staffordshire, pp. 316-318.

[4] Dr Plot was first introduced to Ashmole in 1677 (through John Evelyn), and the latter appointed him the first curator of his museum in 1683. Ashmole's diary records: "Nov. 19, 1684. Dr Plot presented me with his book, De Origine Fontium, which he had dedicated to me. May 23, 1686. Dr Plot presented me with his Natural History of Staffordshire" (*Memoirs of* Elias Ashmole, published by Charles Burman, 1717).

[5] Styled by Mackey, in his "Encyclopædia of Freemasonry," "the most learned mason and the most indefatigable and *copious* masonic author of his age."

[6] "*Records* of the Society" are cited by Preston in proof of the initiations of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, and Henry VI.; and the latter, *on the same authority*, is said to have perused the ancient Charges, revised the Constitutions, and, with the consent of his council, honoured them with his sanction! (Illustrations of Masonry, 1792, pp. 189, 200. See also pp. 174, 184, 185).

blaze drives away the eye from nice examination." The success of the famous "Illustrations" was so marked, and its sale so great, as to raise the authority of the author beyond the range of criticism or detraction.[1] Some remarks, however, of Dr Armstrong, Bishop of Grahamstown, on the kindred aberrations of the late Dr Oliver, are so much in point that I shall here introduce them. After contending in a strain of severe satire that the Freemasons were not in the least joking, in what many men considered as a joke, the Bishop continues: "Look for instance at the Rev. G. Oliver, D.D. He is quite in earnest. There is really something wonderfully refreshing in such a dry and hard-featured an age as this to find so much imagination at work. After having pored through crabbed chronicles and mouldy MSS., with malicious and perverse contractions, ragged and mildewed letters, illegible and faded diaries, etc., *it is quite refreshing to glide along the smooth and glassy road of imaginative history.* Of course, where there is any dealing with the more hackneyed facts of history, we must expect a little eccentricity and some looseness of statement—we cannot travel quickly and cautiously too. Thus the doctor of divinity, before mentioned, somewhat startles us by an assertion respecting the destruction of Solomon's temple: 'Its destruction by the Romans, as predicted, was fulfilled in the most minute particulars; and on the same authority we are quite certain it will never be rebuilt.' He is simply mistaking the second temple for the first"![2]

Preston, like Oliver, may be justly charged with having written Masonic history negligently and inaccurately, and from unverified rumours. Indeed, their works almost warrant the conclusion that, by both these writers, the rules of historical evidence were deemed of so pliable a nature as to accommodate themselves to circumstances. Yet although it is affirmed by a great authority that "unless some boldness of divination be allowable, all researches into early history ∴ must be abandoned;"[3] when there is a want of solid evidence, a writer does not render his history true by treating the incidents as if they were real.

It will illustrate this last position if I pass to the story of the mallet and the candlesticks, as in Preston's time "still preserved, and highly prized as *mementos* of the esteem of the honourable donor." The statements that Charles II. levelled the foundation stone of the cathedral with the mallet, and that the fact of the candlesticks having been presented by Wren is attested by the *records* of the lodge, I shall pass over without further comment, and apply the few remarks I have to add in examining into the inherent probability of either mallet or candlesticks having been presented to the lodge by Sir Christopher. The question involves more than would appear at first sight, as its determination must either render the Aubrey prediction of no value, by proving that Wren was a Freemason before 1691, or by a contrary result, leaving us free to essay the solution of the alternative problem, unhampered by the confusion which at present surrounds the subject as a whole.

It appears from the "Illustrations of Masonry" that about fifty years after the formation of the Grand Lodge of England, a *tradition* was current in the Lodge of Antiquity that Wren

[1] Woodford says of Preston: "He may be fairly called the father of masonic history, and his work will always be a standard work for Masons. He was a painstaking and *accurate* writer; and though we have access to MSS. which he never saw, yet, on the whole, his original view of masonic history remains correct" (Kenning's Cyclopædia, p. 566). Although dissenting from this estimate of the enduring value of Preston's writings, I readily admit that, at the period of original publication, the "Illustrations of Masonry" was, by a long way, *the best book of its kind.*

[2] The Christian Remembrancer, No. lvii., July 1847.

[3] B. G. Niebuhr, History of Rome, 3d English ed., 1837, vol. i., p. 152.

had been at one time a member, and that certain articles still in its possession were presented by him. The importance of this—the first lodge on the roll—is much dwelt upon, and *more suo*, Preston silences all possible cavillers in the following words:—"By an *old record* of the Lodge of Antiquity it appears that the new Grand Master was *always* proposed and presented for approbation in that Lodge before his election in the Grand Lodge."[1]

Let us examine how these traditions are borne out by the existing records of the Grand Lodge of England.

The earliest minutes of this body, now preserved, commence in 1723, and in the first volume of these proceedings, are given lists of lodges and their members for the years 1725 and 1730, after which last date no register of members was again kept by the central authority until Preston's time, whose name appears in the earliest return of members from the LODGE OF ANTIQUITY,[2] to be found in the archives of the Grand Lodge. The first entry in the volume referred to runs as follows:—

"This Manuscript was begun the 25th November 1723," and it gives "a List of the Regular Constituted Lodges, together with the Names of the Masters, Wardens, and members of Each Lodge." The four lodges, who in 1717 founded the Grand Lodge, met in 1723:—

1. At the GOOSE AND GRIDIRON,[3] in St Paul's Churchyard.
2. At the QUEEN'S HEAD, Turnstile: *formerly* the CROWN, in Parker's Lane.
3. At the QUEEN'S HEAD, in Knave's Acre: *formerly* the APPLE TREE, in Charles St., Covent Garden.
4. At the HORNE, at Westminster: *formerly* the RUMMER and GRAPES, in Channel Row.

With the exception of Anthony Sayer[4]—the *premier* Grand Master—Thomas Morris and Josias Villenau, the first named of whom is cited in the roll of No. 3, and the others in that of No. 1,[5] *all* the eminent persons who took any leading part in the early history of Freemasonry, immediately after, what by a perversion of language has been termed "the Revival," were members of No. 4. In 1723 No. 1 had twenty-two members; No. 2, twenty-one; No. 3, fourteen; and No. 4, *seventy-one*. The three senior lodges possessed among them no member of sufficient rank to be described as "Esquire," whilst in No. 4 there were *ten* noblemen, *three* honourables, *four* baronets or knights, *seven* colonels, *two* clergymen, and *twenty-four* esquires. Payne, Anderson, and Desaguliers were members of this lodge.

It appears to me that if Wren had been at any time a member of No. 1, some at least of the distinguished personages who were Freemasons at the period of his death (1723) would have belonged to the same lodge. But what do we find? Not only are Nos. 1, 2, and 3 composed of members below the social rank of those in No. 4, but it is expressly stated in a publication of the year 1730, that "the first and oldest constituted lodge, according to

[1] Illustrations of Masonry, 1792, p. 257.

[2] This name was taken by the lodge in 1770. See "The Four Old Lodges," 1879, *passim*.

[3] Original No. 1 removed from the GOOSE AND GRIDIRON between 1723 and 1729, from which latter year (except for a short time whilst at the PAUL'S HEAD, Ludgate Street) its description on the list was the KING'S (or QUEEN'S) ARMS, St Paul's Churchyard, with the additional title, from 1760, of the WEST INDIA AND AMERICAN LODGE. In 1770 it became the LODGE OF ANTIQUITY. At the union in 1813, the two first lodges drew lots for priority, with the result of the *older* lodge—original No. 1—becoming No. 2, which number it still retains.

[4] Sayer was Grand Master in 1717, and S.G.W. in 1719.

[5] Thomas Morrice was J.G.W. in 1718, 1719, and 1721. Josiah Villeneau was S.G.W. in 1721. Both were members of No. 1, according to the lists of 1723 and 1725.

the Lodge Book in London," made a "visitation" to another lodge, on which occasion the deputation consisted of "operative Masons."[1]

To the objection that this fact rests on the authority of Samuel Prichard, I reply, that statements which are incidentally mentioned by writers, without any view to establish a favourite position, are usually those the most entitled to credit.

If, as Preston asserts, the Grand Master was always presented for the approbation of No. 1 *before* his election in Grand Lodge—an arrangement, by the way, which would have rendered nugatory the general regulations of the craft[2]—how came it to pass (not to speak of the singularity of the *first* Grand Master having been selected from the ranks of No. 3) that no member of the senior lodge was placed on the Masonic throne before the Society had "the honour of a noble brother at its head?" Are we to suppose that from an excess of humility or diffidence the brethren of this lodge passed a self-denying ordinance, or otherwise disqualified themselves, for the supreme dignity which (in Preston's view of the facts), we must conclude, would be pressed upon their acceptance?

The difficulty of reconciling Preston's statements with the early elections to the office of Grand Master, seems, indeed, to have been felt by Dr Oliver, who, unable to build an hypothesis on matter of fact, and make it out by sensible demonstration, forthwith proceeds to find a fact that will square with a suitable hypothesis. This is accomplished by making Desaguliers a member of No. 1, a supposition wholly untenable, unless we disbelieve the actual entries in the register of Grand Lodge, but which shows, nevertheless, that the secondary position actually filled by the lodge during the period of transition (1717-1723) between the *legendary* and the *historical* eras of the craft, must have appeared to Dr Oliver inconsistent with the pretensions to a supremacy over its fellows advanced by William Preston.

The early minutes of Grand Lodge furnish no evidence of any special privilege having been claimed by the masonic body, over which in later years it was Preston's fortune to preside. They record, indeed, that on May 29, 1733, the Master of the Lodge at the PAUL'S HEAD in Ludgate Street, asserted his right to carry the Grand Sword before the Grand Master; upon which occasion the Deputy Grand Master observed "that he (the D. G. M.) could not entertain the memorial without giving up the undoubted right of the Grand Master in appointing his own officers."[3] But the senior English Lodge met at the KING'S ARMS, St Paul's Churchyard, in 1733, and did not remove to the PAUL'S HEAD until 1735.

The tradition of the mallet[4] and candlesticks was first made known to the world, as we

[1] Masonry Dissected, by Samuel Prichard, late member of a constituted lodge, 1730. This pamphlet will be again referred to.

[2] When an *election* was necessary, it was ordered by the General Regulations of 1721, that "the new Grand Master shall be chosen immediately by ballot, every master and warden writing his man's name, and the last Grand Master writing his man's name too; and the man whose name the last Grand Master shall first take out, casually or by chance, shall be Grand Master for the year ensuing; and, *if present*, he shall be proclaimed, saluted, and congratulated, as above hinted, and *forthwith installed* by the last Grand Master, according to usage" (Article XXXIV.).

[3] Grand Lodge minutes.

[4] An inscription on a silver plate, let into the head of the mallet by order of the Duke of Sussex in 1827, records that with it "King Charles II. levelled the foundation-stone of St Paul's Cathedral A.D. 1673;" also its presentation to the "Old Lodge of St Paul's, by *Bro.* Sir Christopher Wren, R.W.D.G.M., Worshipful Master of the Lodge" (Freemasons' Magazine, May 26, 1866, p. 407). It is to be regretted that in this inscription—behind which few will care to go—there are no less than *six* misstatements!

have seen, after Preston became Master of the Lodge. Its authenticity, or in other words, the probability of its having been so jealously concealed from the public ear for upwards of a century, has now to be considered. At the outset of this history,[1] I quoted the *dictum* of a high authority, that "a tradition should be proved by authentic evidence, to be not of subsequent growth, but to be founded on a contemporary recollection of the fact recorded."[2] In this case the requisite proof that the tradition was derived from contemporary witnesses is forthcoming, *if* the numerous *records* whereupon Preston bases his statements are held to satisfactorily attest the facts they are called in aid of, without troubling ourselves to weigh the *pros* and *cons* which may be urged for and against their admission as evidence. Putting these aside, however, as the finger-posts of an imaginative history, we find the tradition rests upon the unsupported statement of a credulous and inaccurate writer—unable to distinguish between history and fable—and whose accounts of Locke's initiation, the Batt[3] Parliament, the admission of Henry VI., and of Henry VII. having presided in person over a lodge of Masters,[4] are alone sufficient to discredit his testimony. All historical evidence must indeed be tested by the canon of probability. If witnesses depose to improbable facts before a court of justice, their veracity is open to suspicion. The more improbable the event which they attest, the stronger is the testimony required. The same rules of credibility apply to historical as to judicial evidence.[5] In the present case a tradition is first launched—*to our actual knowledge*—nearly a century later than the events it inshrines, and a story improbable in itself, becomes even less credible, through the suspicious circumstances which surround its publication. The means of information open to the historian, his veracity, accuracy, and impartiality, here constitute a medium through which the evidence has come down to us, and upon which we must more or less implicitly rely. The immediate proof is beyond our reach, and instead of being able to examine it for ourselves, we can only stand at a distance, and by the best means in our power, estimate its probable value. This secondary evidence may sometimes rise almost to absolute certainty, or it may possess scarcely an atom of real weight.

As it is of little importance by what authority an opinion is sanctioned, if it will not itself stand the test of sound criticism, the veracity and accuracy of Preston, even if he is accorded a larger share of those qualities than I am willing to admit, will count for very little, in the judgment of all by whom the chief qualification of an historian is deemed to be "an earnest craving after truth, and an utter impatience, not of falsehood merely, but of error."[6]

The statement that in the reign of George I. masonry languished, owing to the age and infirmities of Sir Christopher Wren, "drawing off his attention from the duties of his office," is obviously an afterthought, arising out of the necessity of finding some plausible explanation of the embarrassing *fact* that such an earnest Freemason as, *after his death*, the great architect is made out to have been, should have so jealously guarded the secret of his early membership,

[1] *Ante*, Chap. I., p. 4.

[2] Lewis, On the Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion, p. 90.

[3] *Ante*, Chap. VII., p. 366, note 2.

[4] Illustrations of Masonry, 1792, pp. 162, 191, 199, 202.

[5] *Cf.* Lewis, On the Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics, 1852, vol. i., p. 291; and Taylor, Process of Historical Proof, 1828, pp. 57, 85.

[6] Dr Arnold, Lectures on Modern History, 1842 (viii.), p. 377. As all later writers follow Preston in his account of the early history of the Grand Lodge of England, it will be seen, as we proceed, that the value of his evidence cannot be too closely examined.

that it remained unsuspected even by his own family, and was quite unknown to the compilers of the first book of "Constitutions," including the many "learned brothers" called in to assist, some of whom no doubt were members of the lodge possessing the mallet and candlesticks on which so much has been founded. If this story had not been generally accepted by the historians of masonry,[1] I should pass it over without further comment. Together with other mythical history, we may safely anticipate that it will soon fall back into oblivion, but meanwhile, out of respect to the names of those writers by whom the belief has been kept alive, I shall briefly state why, in my judgment, the general opinion is altogether an erroneous one.

In the first place, assuming Wren to have been a Freemason at all—and in my opinion the evidence points in quite another direction—he would have had much difficulty in neglecting an *office*, which at the time named did not exist! Next, if we concede a good deal more, and grant the possibility of his being the leading spirit, by whatever name styled, of the Society; all that has come down to us in the several biographies of Wren, by writers other than those whose fanciful theories are merely supported by extravagant assertions, testifies to his complete immunity at the period referred to—1708-1717—from the ordinary infirmities of advanced age. He remained a member of Parliament until 1712. In 1713 he published his reply to the anonymous attacks made upon him in the pamphlet called "Frauds and Abuses at St Paul's." The same year he also surveyed Westminster Abbey for his friend, Bishop Atterbury, the Dean; and wrote an excellent historical and scientific report on its structure and defects, communicating his opinions on the best mode of repairing it, together with other observations.[2] An instance of his activity of mind in 1717—the year in which the Grand Lodge of England was established—is afforded by his reply to the commissioners for rebuilding St Paul's, who were bent on having a balustrade erected on the top of the church in opposition to the wishes of the great architect.[3] "The following year" (1718), says Elmes, "witnessed the disgraceful fall of Sir Christopher Wren in the 86th year of his age, and the 49th of his office as surveyor-general of the royal buildings;[4] his mental faculties unimpaired, and his *bodily health* equal to the finishing, as the head of his *office*,[5] the works he had so ably began."[6]

Wren lived *five* years longer, and employed this leisure of his age in philosophical studies. Among these, he overlooked part of his thoughts for the discovery of the longitude at sea, a review of some of his former tracts in astronomy and mathematics, and other meditations and researches.[7]

Having examined the question of Wren's alleged membership of the society, apart from the entry in the "Natural History of Wiltshire," the alternative supposition of his admission in 1691 will now be considered, and I shall proceed to analyse the statement of John Aubrey, which has been given in full at an earlier page.

[1] Anderson; the author of "Multa Paucis;" Dermott; Preston; Findel; etc., etc.

[2] Elmes, Memoirs of Sir Christopher Wren, 1823, pp. 505, 506. This report is given in the "Parentalia."

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 510.

[4] "1718 [April 26]. Exauctoratus est: Anno æt *octogesimo sexto*, et præfecturæ quæ operum regiorum *quadragesimo nono*" (British Museum, Lansdowne MSS., No. 698, fol. 136).

[5] The "office" Sir Christopher is *said* to have neglected certainly could not have been that of Surveyor-general.

[6] Elmes, Memoirs of Sir Christopher Wren, 1823, p. 510. Dean Milman says: "Wren, being still in *full possession of his wonderful faculties*, was ignominiously dismissed from his office of Surveyor of Public Works" (Annals of St Paul's Cathedral, 1869, p. 443).

[7] Elmes, Memoirs of Sir Christopher Wren, 1823, p. 513.

In my opinion, it is the sole shred of evidence upon which a belief in Wren's *admission* is, for a moment, entertainable, though its importance has been overrated, for reasons that are not far to seek.

The Aubrey *Memorandum*, as we have seen,[1] was not printed until 1844. Up to that period the statements in the "Constitutions" of 1738, that Sir Christopher was a Freemason, at least as early as 1663, had remained unchallenged. The new evidence appeared not to dislodge the fact itself, but merely to indicate that its date had been set too far backwards. The old tradition was, therefore, modified, but not overthrown; and, though the change of front involved in reality what might be termed a new departure in masonic history, writers of the craft saw only a confirmation of the old story, and the idea, that under the influence of a pre-existing belief in Wren's connection with Freemasonry, they were adopting a *rival theory*, utterly destructive of the grounds on which that belief was based, does not seem to have occurred to them.

The position of affairs may be illustrated in this way. Let us imagine a trial, where, after protracted and convincing evidence had been given in favour of the plaintiff, it had all to be struck out of the judge's notes, and yet the trial went on before the same jury? The Aubrey theory requires, indeed, to be discussed on its own merits, since it derives no confirmation from, and is in direct opposition to, the belief it displaced. Suppose, therefore, by the *publication* of Aubrey's *Memorandum* in 1844, the *first intimation* had been conveyed that Wren was a Freemason, would it have been credited? Yet, if the statement and inference are entitled to credence, *all* authorities placing the initiation at a date prior to 1691 are, to use the words of Hallam, *equally mendacious*. Down goes at one swoop the Andersonian myth, and with it all the improvements and additions which the ingenuity of later historians have supplied. The case would then stand on the unsupported testimony of John Aubrey—a position which renders it desirable to take a nearer view of his personal character and history.[2]

Aubrey was born at Caston Piers, in Wiltshire, March 12, 1626; educated at Trinity College, Oxford; admitted a student of the Middle Temple, April, 16, 1646;[3] and elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1662. He may be regarded as essentially an *archæologist*, and the first person in this country who fairly deserved the name. Historians, chroniclers, and topographers there had been before his time; but he was the first who devoted his studies and abilities to archæology, in its various ramifications of architecture, genealogy, palæography, numismatics, heraldry, etc. With a naturally curious and inquiring mind, he lost no opportunity of obtaining traditionary and personal information. So early as the days of Hearne, this peculiarity had procured for him the character of a "foolish gossip;" indeed, Ray, the distinguished naturalist, in one of his letters to Aubrey, cautions him against a too easy credulity. "I think," says Ray—"if you give me leave to be free with you—that you are a little inclinable to credit strange relations." Hearne speaks of him, "that by his intimate

[1] *Ante*, p. 5.

[2] Except when other references are given, the sketch which follows in the text is derived from Britton's "Memoir of Aubrey," 1845; the "Natural History of Wiltshire," 1847 (Preface); and the editorial notices prefixed to Aubrey's various works.

[3] In the same year Ashmole was initiated, and Sir Christopher Wren was entered as a fellow commoner at Wadham College, Oxford. "1646, Oct. 16. I was made a Freemason at Warrington in Lancashire" (Ashmole's Diary). "1646. Admissus in Collegio de Wadham Oxoniæ, commensalis generosus" (C. Wren in Lansdowne MS., No. 698).

acquaintance with Mr Ashmole, in his latter years, he too much indulged his fancy, and wholly addicted himself to the whimseys and conceits of astrologers, soothsayers, and suchlike ignorant and superstitious writers, which have no foundation in nature, philosophy, or reason." Malone observes: "However fantastical Aubrey may have been on the subjects of chemistry and ghosts, his character for veracity has never been impeached."

It may be doubted whether the contemptuous language applied towards Aubrey in the diary of Anthony à Wood, expresses the real sentiments of the latter whilst the two antiquaries were on friendly terms, and the article containing it seems to have been written so late as 1693 or 1694. Of Aubrey, Wood says: "He was a shiftless person, roving and magotie-headed, and sometimes little better than crazed; and, being exceedingly credulous, would stuff his many letters sent to A. W. with folliries and misinformations, which sometimes would guid him into the paths of errour."[1] Anthony à Wood also used to say of him when he was at the same time in company: "Look, yonder goes such a one, who can tell such and such stories, and I'le warrant Mr Aubrey will break his neck down stairs rather than miss him."[2]

Toland, who was well acquainted with Aubrey, and certainly a better judge than Wood, gives this character of him: "Though he was extremely superstitious, or seemed to be so, yet he was a very honest man, and most accurate in his account of matters of fact. But the *facts* he knew, not the reflections he made, were what I wanted."[3]

The Aubrey evidence consists of two items, which must be separately considered. The first, commencing "Sir William Dugdale told me many years ago," I accept as the *statement* of that antiquary, on the authority of an ear-witness, and its genuineness derives confirmation from a variety of collateral facts which have been sufficiently glanced at. The second is not so easily dealt with. If in both cases, instead of in one only, Sir William Dugdale had been Aubrey's informant, and the stories thus communicated were, each of them, corroborated by independent testimony, there would be no difficulty. The announcement, however, of Wren's approaching admission stands on quite another footing from that of the entry explaining the derivation of the Freemasons. Upon the estimate of Aubrey's character, as given above, we may safely follow him in matters of fact, though his guidance is to be distrusted when he wanders into the region of speculation. His anecdotes of eminent men exhibit great credulity, and are characterised by much looseness of statement.[4] Thus, he describes Dr Corbet, Bishop of Oxford, at a confir-

[1] Athenæ Oxonienses (Dr P. Bliss, 1813-20), vol. i., p. lx. Malone remarks: "This example of bad English and worse taste was written after twenty-five years' acquaintance" (Historical Account of the English Stage). As a contrast may be cited a very friendly letter from Aubrey to Wood, dated Sept. 2, 1694, preserved in the Bodleian Library, wherein he reproaches him for having "cut out a matter of forty pages out of one of his volumes, as also the index." He concludes: "I thought you so dear a friend, that I might have entrusted my life in your hands; and now your unkindness doth almost break my heart. So God bless you. 'Tuissimus.'—A."

Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. i., p. cxv.

[3] J. Toland, History of the Druids (R. Huddlestone), 1814, p. 159. Toland, one of the founders of modern deism, and the author of "Christianity not Mysterious" (1696), was born Nov. 30, 1669, and died March 11, 1722. By Chalmers he is styled "a man of uncommon abilities, and perhaps the most learned of all the infidel writers" (General Biographical Dictionary, vol. iv., p. 434).

[4] "It must be confessed that the authenticity, or at least the accuracy, of Aubrey's anecdotes of eminent men has been much suspected" (Saturday Review, Sept. 27, 1879, p. 383). Aubrey's "highly credulous nature" is referred to in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," and by Rees he is styled "a good classical scholar, a tolerable naturalist, and a most laborious antiquarian; but credulous and addicted to superstition" (New Cyclopædia, 1802-20).

mation, being about to lay his hand on the head of a man very bald, as turning to his chaplain and saying, "Some dust, Lushington—*to keepe his hand from slipping!*"[1] Two dreams of Sir Christopher Wren are related. In the year 1651, at his father's house in Wiltshire, he sees the battle of Worcester. In 1671, when lying ill at Paris, he dreamt that he was in a place where palm-trees grew, and that a woman in a romantic habit reached him dates. The next day he sent for dates, which cured him.[2] Dr Richard Nepier, Aubrey informs us, was a person of great abstinence, innocence, and piety. "When a patient, or querent, came to him, he presently went to his closet to pray, and told to admiration the recovery or death of the patient. It appears by his papers that he did converse with the angel Raphael, who gave him the responses."[3]

The Memorandum of 1691, it will be seen, comes to us on the sole authority of a very credulous writer, and, if we believe it, entails some curious consequences. To Aubrey's mere prediction of an approaching event, we shall yield more credence than his contemporaries did to the authenticity of his anecdotes. Thus affording an instance of our believing as a prophet one whom we might reasonably distrust as an historian.

Bayle says that a hearsay report should be recorded only in one of two cases—if it is very probable, or if it is mentioned in order to be refuted.[4] By another authority it is laid down that "a historical narrative must be well attested. If it is merely probable, without being well attested, it cannot be received as historical."[5] Judged by either of these standards, the belief that Wren was adopted a Freemason in 1691 being at once improbable and ill-attested, must fall to the ground.

The wording of the Memorandum is peculiar. On a certain day, Sir Christopher Wren "*is to be*"—not *was*—"adopted a brother." Two comments suggest themselves. The first, that even had *one* copy only of the manuscript been in existence, the *prediction* that a particular event was *about* to happen can hardly be regarded as equivalent to its *fulfilment*. The second, that in transferring his additional notes from the original manuscript to the fair copy, which may have happened at any time between 1691 and the year of his death (1697), Aubrey, who was on good terms with Wren, would have supplemented his meagre allusion to the latter's initiation by some authentic details of the occurrence, derived from the great architect himself, *had there been any to relate.*

Candour, however, demands the acknowledgment, that the transcription by Aubrey of his original entry may be read in another light, for although Wren's *actual* admission is not made any plainer, the repetition of the first statement—unless the fair copy was of almost even date with the later entries in the earlier MS., which is, I think, the true explanation—will at least warrant the conclusion, that nothing had occurred in the interval between the periods in which

[1] Aubrey, Lives of Eminent Men, 1813, vol. ii., p. 293.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 84, 85.

[3] Aubrey, Miscellanies upon Various Subjects, 1784, p. 223. According to the same authority, "Elias Ashmole had all these papers, which he carefully bound up. Before the responses stands this mark, viz., R. Ris., which Mr Ashmole said was *Responsum Raphaelis.*"

[4] General Dictionary, Historical and Critical, English Edition, 1734-38, *art.* "Baldus," note *c*. The same writer also points out the danger of trusting to hearsay reports in historical questions (*art.* "Chigi," note *g.*). Sir G. Lewis says: "All hearsay evidence, all evidence derived from the repetition of a story told orally by the original witness, and perhaps passed on orally through two or three more persons, is of inferior value, and to be placed on a lower degree of credibility" (On the Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics, 1852, p. 185).

[5] Lewis, On the Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics, p. 292.

the entries were respectively made, to shake the writer's faith in the credibility of his original announcement.

It has been said, that we must give up all history if we refuse to admit facts recorded by only one historian,[1] but in the problem before us, whilst there is the evidence of a single witness, he deposes to no *facts*. What, moreover, rests on the unsupported testimony of a solitary witness, must stand or fall by it, whether good, bad, or indifferent. Here we have what is at best a *prognostication*, respecting an eminent man, and it comes to us through the medium of a credulous writer whose anecdotes of celebrities are, by all authorities alike, regarded as the least trustworthy of his writings. Yet by historians of the craft it has been held to transform tradition into fact, and to remove what had formerly rested on Masonic legend to the surer basis of actual demonstration. "Who ever," says Locke, "by the most cogent arguments, will be prevailed upon to disrobe himself at once of all his old opinions, and turn himself out stark naked in quest afresh of new notions?"[2] The Aubrey memorandum, may, indeed, record a popular rumour, and its authority can be carried no higher; but even on this supposition, and passing over the weakness of its attestation, the event referred to as impending can only be rendered remotely probable, by clearing the mind of *all* that has been laid down by other writers on the subject of Wren's connection with the Society.

A commentator observes—"the very words which Aubrey uses, the terms he employs, the place of admission, the names of the co-initiates, all combine to show that we have here the only account on which we can safely rely. However it may interfere with other statements, however antagonise received dates, I feel convinced that Aubrey gives us the true chronology of Sir Christopher Wren's admission to the secrets and mysteries of Freemasonry."[3] With slight variation of language similar conclusions have been expressed by later masonic writers.[4]

Many of the arguments already adduced in refutation of the earlier hypothesis bear with equal force against the pretensions of its successor. For example, if Wren was a Freemason at all, the curious fact that his membership of the Society was unknown to the craft, or at least had passed out of recollection in 1723;[5] and the strictly operative character of the "Old Lodge of St Paul," in 1723, 1725, and 1730, are alike inexplicable under either hypothesis.

If Wren, Sir Henry Goodric, and other persons of mark, were really "adopted" at a "great Convention of the Masons" in 1691, the circumstance seems to have pressed with little weight upon the public mind, and is nowhere attested in the public journals. Such an event, it might be imagined, as the initiation of the king's architect, at a great convention, held in the metropolitan cathedral—the *Basilica* of St Paul—could not readily be forgotten. Nevertheless, this formal reception of a distinguished official (if it ever occurred) escapes all notice at the hands of his contemporaries, relatives, or biographers.

Sir Henry Goodric*ke*—associated with Wren in Aubrey's memorandum—a knight and baronet, was born October 24, 1642, married Mary, the daughter of Colonel W. Legg, and

[1] Dr Watson, An Apology for the Bible, 1796, p. 239.

[2] Locke, Essay on the Human Understanding, 1828, book iv., chap. xx., § 11.

[3] Freemasons' Magazine, March 7, 1863, p. 190.

[4] Findel, History of Freemasonry, p. 129; Fort, The Early History and Antiquities of Freemasonry, p. 139; Steinbrenner, Origin and Early History of Freemasonry, pp. 126, 133; The Four Old Lodges, p. 46. See, however, the title "Wren" in Kenning's "Cyclopædia."

[5] *I.e.*, in 1723, the date of publication of the first book of "Constitutions." The humble part played by the senior lodge in 1717 is also worthy of attention.

sister to George, Lord Dartmouth, but died without issue after a long illness at Brentford in Middlesex, March 5, 1705. He was Envoy Extraordinary from Charles II., King of England, to Charles II., King of Spain, Privy Councillor to William III., and a Lieutenant-General of the Ordnance. Newspapers of the time, and the ordinary works of reference, throw no further light upon his general career, nor—except in the "Natural History of Wiltshire"—is he mentioned in connection with the Freemasons or with Sir Christopher Wren.

In the preceding remarks, it has been my endeavour, to ascertain the general character of the sources, from which the belief in Wren's adoption has been derived, and to indicate how it came to assume the form in which it now exists. Originating with Anderson, it has nevertheless received so much embellishment at the hands of Preston, as to have virtually descended to us on his authority, with its vitality practically unimpaired by the discrepant testimony of John Aubrey. In both instances the story depends upon the authority of the narrator, and the word of the antiquary is, in my judgment, quite as trustworthy as that of the author of the famous "Illustrations of Masonry." Both witnesses appear to me to have been misled, the one by partiality for his lodge and pride in its history, the other by innate credulity.

When Preston began to collect materials for his noted work, which embraced an account of masonry in the century preceding his own, all memory of events dating so far backwards had perished, and no authentic oral traditions could have been in existence. The events he describes, are antecedent to the period of regular masonic history and contemporaneous registration; and it may I think be assumed with certainty, that the stories which he relates of Wren prove at most, that in the second half of the eighteenth century, they were *then* believed by the LODGE OF ANTIQUITY. "Unless," says Sir G. Lewis, "an historical account can be traced, by probable proof, to the testimony of contemporaries, the first condition of historical credibility fails."[1]

The first link in the chain of tradition—if tradition there was—had long ago disappeared, and despite Preston's asseverations to the contrary, there was no channel by which a contemporary record of any such events could have reached him.

Aubrey's memorandum has been sufficiently examined, but in parting with it I may remark, that his story of Wren's forthcoming adoption, appears to me quite as incredible as the other tales relating to the great architect, extracted from his anecdotes of eminent men.

It is quite certain, that what in one age was affirmed upon slight grounds, can never after come to be more valid in future ages by being often repeated. "All that is to be found in books is not built upon sure foundations, and a man shall never want crooked paths to walk in, wherever he has the footsteps of others to follow."[2] "Perhaps," says Locke, "we should make greater progress in the discovery of rational and contemplative knowledge, if we sought it in the fountain, in the consideration of things themselves, and made use rather of our own thoughts than other men's to find it; for we may as rationally hope to see with other men's eyes, as to know by other men's understandings."[3]

[1] An Inquiry into the Credibility of the Early Roman History, vol. i., p. 16.

[2] Locke, On the Conduct of the Understanding, § 20. "We take our principles at haphazard, upon trust, and without ever having examined them, and then believe a whole system, upon a presumption that they are true and solid; and what is all this but childish, shameful, senseless credulity" (*Ibid.*, § 12).

[3] Essay on the Human Understanding, book i., chap. iv., § 23.

The popular belief that Wren was a Freemason, though hitherto unchallenged, and supported by a great weight of authority, is, in my judgment, unsustained by any basis of well-attested fact. The admission of the great architect—at any period of his life—into the masonic fraternity, seems to me a mere figment of the imagination, but it may at least be confidently asserted, that it cannot be proved to be a reality.

General Assemblies.

As the question of legendary Grand Masters is closely connected with that of the "Annual Assemblies," over which they are said to have presided, the few observations I have to add upon the former of these subjects will be introductory of the latter, to the further consideration of which I am already pledged.[1]

According to the "Constitutions" of 1723, [Queen] "Elizabeth being jealous of any Assemblies of her Subjects, whose Business she was not duly appriz'd of, attempted to break up the *annual Communication* of *Masons*, as dangerous to her Government: But, as old Masons have transmitted it by Tradition, when the noble Persons her Majesty had commissioned, and brought a sufficient Posse with them at *York* on *St John's* Day, were *once admitted into the Lodge*, they made no use of Arms, and return'd the Queen a most honourable Account of the ancient Fraternity, whereby her political Fears and Doubts were dispell'd, and she let them alone as a People much respected by the Noble and the Wise of all the polite Nations."[2]

In the *second* edition of the same work, wherein, as we have already seen, Wren is first pronounced to have been a Mason and a Grand Master, Dr Anderson relates the anecdote somewhat differently. The Queen, we are now told, "hearing the Masons had certain *Secrets* that could not be reveal'd to her (for that she could not be *Grand Master*), and being jealous of all Secret Assemblies, sent an armed Force to break up their annual *Grand Lodge* at *York* on St John's Day, 27 Dec. 1561." The Doctor next assures us that—"This Tradition was firmly believ'd by all the old English Masons"—and proceeds: "But Sir Thomas Sackville, Grand Master, took Care to make some of the Chief Men sent, *Free-masons*, who, then joining in that *Communication*, made a very honourable Report to the Queen; and she never more attempted to dislodge or disturb them as a peculiar sort of Men that cultivated Peace and Friendship, Arts and Sciences, without meddling in the Affairs of Church or State."[3]

Finally, we read that "when Grand Master Sackville demitted, A.D. 1567, Francis Russell, Earl of Bedford, was chosen in the North, and in the South Sir Thomas Gresham."

Identical accounts appear in the later "Constitutions" for 1756, 1767, and 1784.

The story again expands under the manipulation of William Preston, who narrates it as an historical fact, without any qualification whatever, and it is conveniently cited in confirmation of there having been in still earlier times a Grand Lodge in York—a theory otherwise unsupported, save by "a record of the Society, written in the reign of Edward IV., *said* to have been in the possession of Elias Ashmole, and *unfortunately destroyed*"! Preston follows the "Constitutions" in making the Earl of Bedford and Sir Thomas Gresham succeed Sackville, but *adds*: "Notwithstanding this new appointment of a Grand Master for the South, the General

[1] *Ante*, Chap. II., p. 106.

[2] Dr James Anderson, The Constitutions of the Freemasons, 1723, p. 38.

[3] Anderson, The New Book of Constitutions, 1738, p. 80. Throughout this extract, the *italics* are those of Dr Anderson.

Assembly continued to meet in the city of York *as heretofore*, where all the records were kept; and to this Assembly appeals were made on every important occasion."[1]

The more historical version, and that preferred by Kloss, who rationalises this masonic incident, though he leaves its authenticity an open question, is, that *if* Elizabeth's design of breaking up a meeting of the Freemasons at York was frustrated by the action of "Lord" Sackville, "it does not necessarily follow that his lordship was present as an Accepted Mason," since "he may have been at the winter quarterly meeting of the St John's Festival as an enthusiastic amateur of the art of architecture, which history pronounces him actually to have been."[2] Although the *legend* is mentioned by numerous writers both in the last and present centuries, room was found for a crowning touch in 1843, which it accordingly received at the hand of Clavel, who, in his "Histoire Pittoresque de la Franc-Maçonnerie,"[3] not only gives full details of this meeting at York, but also an elegant copper-plate engraving representing the whole affair!! "Surely," as a hostile critic has remarked, "the 'three Black Crows' were nothing to this story of masonic tradition."[4]

Among the facts which Preston conceives to have become well authenticated by his own version of the Sackville tradition are the following: That a General or Grand Lodge was established at the city of York in the tenth century, and that no similar meeting was held elsewhere until after the resignation by Sir Thomas Sackville of the office of Grand Master in 1567; that a General Assembly and a Grand Lodge are one and the same thing; and that the Constitutions of the English Lodges are derived from the General Assembly (or Grand Lodge) at York.

These pretensions, though re-asserted again and again in times less remote from our own, are devoid of any historical basis, and derive no support whatever from *undoubted* legends of the craft.

The "Old Charges" or "Constitutions," now—and *pace* Preston, probably for several centuries—the only surviving *records of the early Society*, indeed inform us that *one* meeting was held at York, but the clauses in several of these documents which allude to *moveable* yearly assemblies, of themselves forbid the supposition that the annual convention took place only in that city.

The earliest of these old scrolls—the Halliwell and the Cooke MSS.—do not mention York at all. The next in order of seniority—the Lansdowne, No. 3 on the general list[5]—however, recites that Edwin obtained from his father, King Athelstane, "a Charter and Commission once every yeare to have Assembley within the Realme, *where they would within England*, ∴ ∴ and he held them an Assembly at Yorke, and there he made Masons and gave them Charges, and taught them the manners, and Comands the same to be kept ever afterwards."

MS. 11,[6] the Harleian, 1942, a remarkable text, has, in its 22d clause, "You shall come to the yearely Assembly, *if you know where it is*, being within tenne miles of youre abode." As a similar clause is to be found in MS. 31, the injunction in either case is meaningless, if the Annual Assemblies were invariably held at York. On this point the testimony of the "Old Charges" must be regarded as conclusive. I admit that the difficulty of extracting historical

[1] Illustrations of Masonry, 1792, pp. 174 (*note*), 205, 207.

[2] Kloss, Die Freimaurerei in ihrer Wahren Bedeutung, p. 299; Findel, History of Freemasonry, pp. 80, 110.

[3] Paris, 1843, p. 92, pl. 7. [4] Mr W. Pinkerton in *Notes and Queries*, 4th Series, vol. iv., p. 455.

[5] *Ante*, Chap. II., p. 61. Printed in full by Hughan in his "Old Charges," p. 33.

[6] See the corresponding numbers in Chap. II.; and Hughan's "Old Charges of British Freemasons," *passim*.

fact out of legendary materials is great, if not insuperable, yet where statements confessedly rest upon the insecure foundation of legend or tradition, the quality of the legendary or traditionary materials with which that foundation has been erected, becomes a fair subject for inquiry. We here find, according to the *written* legends in circulation many years before there was a Grand Lodge, that the masons of those times cherished a tradition of Prince Edwin having obtained permission for them to hold Annual Assemblies in any part of England; also that their patron presided at one of these meetings, which took place at York. This the Harris MS. rightly styles the *second* Assembly of Masons in England,[1]—St Alban, if we believe the Lansdowne and other MSS., having set on foot the first General Assembly of British Masons, though the *Annual* commemoration of this event, together with its celebration as a yearly festival, was the work of Prince Edwin.

As we have already seen,[2] the "Old Charges" require all to attend at the Assembly who are within a certain radius—fifty miles or less—of the place where it is holden; yet York escapes notice in these mandatory clauses, which, to say the least, is inconsistent with the fact of its being the one city where such meetings were always held.

The legends of Freemasonry have been divided into three classes, viz., Mythical, Philosophical, and Historical, and are thus defined:

I. The myth may be engaged in the transmission of a narrative of early deeds and events having a foundation in truth, which truth, however, has been greatly distorted and perverted by the omission or introduction of circumstances and personages, and then it constitutes the *mythical legend.*

II. Or it may have been invented and adopted as the medium of enunciating a particular thought, or of inculcating a certain doctrine, when it becomes a *philosophical legend.*

III. Or, lastly, the truthful elements of actual history may greatly predominate over the fictitious and invented materials of the myth; and the narrative may be, in the main, made up of facts, with a slight colouring of imagination, when it forms an *historical legend.*[3]

This classification is faulty, because under it a legend would become either *mythical* or *historical*, according to the fancies of individual inquirers; yet, as it may tend to explain another passage by the same author, wherein a problem hitherto insoluble is represented as being no longer so, I give it a place. Of the "Legend of the Craft," or, in other words, the history of Masonry contained in the "Old Charges" or "Constitutions,"[4] Mackey says: "In dissecting it with critical hands, we shall be enabled to dissever its historical from its mythical portions, and assign to it its true value as an exponent of the masonic sentiment of the Middle Ages."[5]

At what time the oral traditions of the Freemasons began to be reduced into writing, it is impossible to even approximately determine. The period, also, when they were moulded into a continuous narrative, such as we now find in the ordinary versions of the MS. Constitutions, is likewise withheld from our knowledge. This narrative may have been formed out of insulated traditions, originally independent and unconnected—a supposition rendered highly probable by the absurdities and anachronisms with which it abounds. The curiosity of the early Freemasons would naturally be excited about the origin of the Society. Explanatory

[1] Freemasons' Chronicle, April 29, 1883.

[2] Mackey, Encyclopædia of Freemasonry, p. 456.

[3] *Ante*, Chap. II., p. 100.

[4] See the "Buchanan MS.," No. 15, *ante*, Chap. II., p. 93.

[5] Encyclopædia of Freemasonry, p. 459.

legends would be forthcoming, and, in confounding, as they did, architecture, geometry, and Freemasonry, Dr Mackey considers that "the workmen of the Middle Ages were but obeying a natural instinct which leads every man to seek to elevate the character of his profession, and to give it an authentic claim to antiquity."[1]

That the utmost licence prevailed in the fabrication of these legends is apparent on the face of them. As the remote past was unrecorded and unremembered, the invention of the etiologist was fettered by no restrictions; he had the whole area of fiction open to him; and that he was not even bound by the laws of nature, witness the story of Naymus Grecus, whose eventful career, coeval with the building of King Solomon's Temple, ranged over some eighteen centuries, and was crowned by his teaching the science of masonry to Charles Martel!

Legend-making was also a favourite occupation in the old monasteries—the lives of the saints, put together possibly as ecclesiastical exercises, at the religious houses in the late Middle Ages, giving rise to the saying "that the title *legend* was bestowed on all fictions which made pretensions to truth."[2] The practice referred to is amusingly illustrated in the following anecdote:—Gilbert de Stone, a learned ecclesiastic, who flourished about the year 1380, was solicited by the monks of Holywell, in Flintshire, to write the life of their patron saint. Stone, applying to these monks for materials, was answered that they had none in their monastery; upon which he declared that he could execute the work just as easily without any materials at all, and that he would write them a most excellent legend, after the *manner* of the legend of Thomas à Becket. He has the character of an elegant Latin writer, and, according to Warton, "seems to have done the same piece of service, perhaps in the same way, to other religious houses!"[3]

Although nothing is more dangerous than to rationalise single elements of a legendary or mythical narrative,[4] the circumstance that an annual pledge day was celebrated at York in connection with the Minster operations, coupled with the ordinary guild usage of making one day of the year the "general" or "head" day of meeting,[5] raises a presumption that the "Annual Assemblies" mentioned in the "Old Charges" were really held.

It has been laid down, that a person who believes a story to have been constructed, centuries after the time of the alleged events, from legendary materials and oral relations, is not entitled to select certain points from the aggregate, upon mere grounds of apparent internal credibility, and to treat them as historical.[6] In such a case there is no criterion for distinguishing between the fabulous and the historical parts of the narrative, and it is impossible to devise a test whereby the fact can be separated from the fiction. Before the authenticity of any part of a legendary narrative can be admitted, some probable account must be forthcoming of the

[1] Mackey, Encyclopædia of Freemasonry, p. 459.

[2] *Cf. ibid.*, p. 456; and Lewis, An Inquiry into the Credibility of Early Roman History, vol. i., chap. xi., § 9.

[3] Warton, History of English Poetry, 1778, vol. ii., p. 190, citing MSS. James, xxxi., p. 6 (ad Iter Lancastr. num. 39, vol. 40), Bodleian Library.

[4] See A. Schwegler, Römische Geschichte, 1853-58, vol. i., p. 456.

[5] "The periodical recurrence of an anniversary, ∴ ∴ the permanence of some legal form or institution, may serve to stereotype an oral tradition. ∴ ∴ Commemorative festivals may serve as a nucleus, round which the scattered fragments of tradition are, for a time, collected and kept at rest" (Lewis, On the Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics, vol. i., p. 220). See Smith, English Gilds, Introduction, p. xxxiii.; and *ante*, Chap. VII., p. 374, *note* 1.

[6] Lewis, An Inquiry into the Credibility of Early Roman History, vol. i., p. 439.

means by which a fragment of tradition or of fact has been preserved, or the internal character and composition of the narrative must in some one or more of its details be borne out by external attestation.

Now, although the story of the Annual Assemblies is nearer the time of authentic masonic history than those of Nimrod, Euclid, Naymus Grecus, and Charles Martel, still the interval is so wide that oral tradition cannot be considered as a safe depository for its occurrences. This portion of the general narrative presents, however, as already indicated, some features with respect to its historical attestation, which places it on a different footing from the rest of the legend.

Conjectures which depart widely from traditional accounts are obviously not admissible; yet, if we refrain from arbitrary hypotheses, and strictly adhere to the history which we meet with in the "legend of the craft," it is impossible that a clear idea of the past of Freemasonry can be formed. Most of the events have a fabulous character, and there is no firm footing for the historical inquirer. Even masonic writers, who, as a rule, have a great deal of history which no one else knows, though they are often deplorably ignorant of that with which all other men are acquainted, do not venture on an *exposition*, but content themselves with furnishing a *description* of the traditionary belief for which the "Old Charges" are our authority.

It has been observed, that "to divest all tradition of authority would be depriving human life of a necessary instrument of knowledge and of practice." Without the aid of tradition—say the Rabbins—we should not have been able to have known which was the first month of the year, and which the seventh day of the week. A story is related of a Caraite who, rejecting traditions, tauntingly interrogated Hillel, the greatest of the Rabbins, on what evidence they rested. The sage, pausing for a moment, desired the sceptic would repeat the three first letters of the alphabet. This done, that advocate for traditions in his turn asked, "How do you know how to pronounce these letters in this way, and no other?" "I learnt them from my father," replied the Caraite. "And your son shall learn them from you," rejoined Hillel; "and this is tradition"!

In the words of a learned writer: "Tradition casts a light in the deep night of the world; but in remote ages, it is like the pale and uncertain moonlight, which may deceive us by flitting shadows, rather than indeed show the palpable forms of truth."[1]

[1] Isaac Disraeli, The Genius of Judaism, 1833, p. 107.

CHAPTER XIII.

EARLY BRITISH FREEMASONRY.

ENGLAND.—II.

THE CABBALA—MYSTICISM—THE ROSICRUCIANS—ELIAS ASHMOLE.

THE point we have now reached in the course of our researches, is at once the most interesting and the most difficult of solution, of all those problems with which the thorny path of true Masonic inquiry is everywhere beset. It is, I think, abundantly clear that the Masonic body had its first origin in the trades-unions of mediæval operatives. At the Reformation these unions, having lost their *raison d'être*, naturally dissolved, except some few scattered through the country, and these vegetated in obscurity for a period of close upon two centuries, until we find them reorganised and taking a new *point de départ* about the year 1717. But, by this time, the Masonic bodies appear under a new guise. While still retaining, as was natural, many forms, ceremonies, and words which they derived from their direct ancestors, the working masons, yet we find that operative masonry was, and probably long had been, in a state of decay, and a new form, that of speculative masonry, had been substituted in its place. During these two centuries of darkness we also have abundant proof that the world, or, at least, the world of Western Europe, the world which was agitated by the Reformation, was full of all kind of strange and distorted fancies, the work of disordered imagination, to an extent probably never known before, not even in the age which witnessed the vagaries of the Gnostics and the later Alexandrian school. These strange fancies, or at least some of them, had been floating about with more or less distinctness from the earliest period to which human records extend, and, as something analogous, if not akin, appears in speculative masonry, it has been supposed, either that there existed a union between the sects or societies who practised, often in secret, these tenets, and the decaying Masonic bodies; or that some men, being learned in astrology, alchemy, and Cabbalistic lore generally, were also Freemasons, and took advantage of this circumstance to indoctrinate their colleagues with their own fantastic belief, and so, under the cloak, and by means of the organisation of Freemasonry, to preserve tenets which might otherwise have fallen into complete oblivion. Especially has this been supposed to have been the case with the celebrated antiquary Elias Ashmole. Unfortunately, the materials at our disposal are almost *nil;* the

evidence, even as regards Ashmole, is of the slightest, and really amounts to nothing. Hence it is only possible to deal with these fanciful speculations in general terms, and to offer some remarks as to the origin of the forms and ceremonies, before alluded to, about which I may venture to say that much misplaced ingenuity has been expended, causing no small amount of unnecessary mystery. This has, in my opinion, arisen mainly from the erroneous mode in which the subject has hitherto been treated. For it must never be forgotten that in working out Masonic history we are in reality tracing a pedigree, and to attain success we must, therefore, adhere as strictly as possible to those principles by means of which pedigrees are authenticated. The safest way is to trace steadily backwards or upwards, discarding as we go on everything that does not rest on the clearest and strongest available evidence, and so forging step by step the links in the chain till the origin is lost in the mists of remote antiquity. But, if we proceed in the contrary direction, if we commence from the fountain head, and, coupling half-a-dozen families together, making use of similarity of names, connections with the same locality, and therefore possible intermarriages, family traditions, or rather suppositions, *et hoc genus omne*, we shall construct a genealogy, flattering indeed to the family vanity, and meant to be so, but which would vanish like a cobweb before the searching gaze of The College of Arms.[1]

With all deference, it would seem that the latter course has principally commended itself to the Historians of Masonry. Commencing from the very earliest times they have pressed every possible fact or tradition into their service, and, by the aid of numberless analogies and resemblances, some forced, some fortuitous, and others wholly fictitious, they have succeeded in building up a marvellous legend, which, while it may serve to minister to their own vanity, and astonish a few readers by the mystical marvels it unfolds, has only tended to excite the supercilious contempt of the great majority of mankind,—a contempt which is at once too intense and too disdainful, to condescend to examine the rational grounds for pride that all true masons may justly claim. As I have hinted above, the direct male line of Masonic descent is traceable to the lodges of operative masons who flourished towards the close of the mediæval period, and, whatever connection the Masonic lodges may have with the older and more mysterious fraternities and beliefs, can be compared only to a descent by marriage through the female line, if, indeed, they can claim as much. For the direct descent of one body of men who, though occasionally varying in aims and often in name, is still one society tracing direct from the founder, is a very different thing from a variety of societies with no particular connection the one with the other, but adopting, in many instances, similar or identical symbols, language, and ceremonies, and formed successively to promote certain aims, the tendency to which is inherent in the human race.[2]

[1] To give one example, no name of what may be termed the poetical class is perhaps more common than Geraldine. But it cannot, therefore, be inferred that all Geraldines are members of one mighty and wide reaching family, which would be a mythical and mystical *reductio ad absurdum*. The probability is that the fame of the "Fair Geraldine" has recommended the name to novel writers, and that through them the name, being of a somewhat beautiful and poetical nature, has recommended itself to fond mothers as a fitting appellation for their darlings. But the families in which the name is, so to speak, indigenous, exist at this day, and the connection of every one of them with the Eponymus of the race (the individual from whom the name originally came) can be traced step by step without a break. This is very different from mere vague conjecture.

[2] *E.g.* The Cocoa Tree is the original Tory Club and still exists. The October has long perished. Besides these, we have White's, whose political function has ceased, the Carlton, Conservative, Junior Carlton, St Stephen's, Beaconsfield,

Hence I shall not attempt to deny that many of the rites, symbols, and beliefs, prevalent among Masons may have been handed down from the earliest times; either they have been imitated the one from the other, being found useful, without any further connection; or they may have been the product of the human mind acting in a precisely similar manner under similar circumstances, in widely different periods and countries,[1] and without any possible suspicion of imitation or other more close connection. Any one who reflects on the wonderful vitality, even when transmitted to foreign countries, of superstitions, forms, ceremonies, and customs, and even of jokes, stories, and games, will be very slow to believe that the above imply any necessary lineal connection as indispensable to their continuance. They are handed down from one to the other in a manner which is as impossible to trace as it is certain in its existence. An observant friend informs me that he has seen a ragged child playing a purely Greek game in the churchyard of St Margaret's, Westminster, and also claims to have traced a particularly broad story told, after dinner, of an American, through a French epigram, to the Greek Anthology. The governmental Broad Arrow is believed, not without reason, to have had a cuneiform origin, having been the mark set by Phœnician traders upon Cornish tin, and, having been discovered on certain blocks of tin, was adopted by the Duchy of Cornwall, and was from thence pressed into the service of the Imperial government.[2] On the other hand, many things occur independently to people of a similar turn of mind when placed under similar circumstances, but without the slightest communication between each other. Le Verrier and Adams both discovered the existence of the planet Neptune at the same time by different methods, and wholly independent of each other. It is highly improbable that the inventor of steamboats, whoever he was—I believe it was really Watt, but it was certainly *not* Fulton—knew of the extremely rare tract in which Jonathan Hull foreshadowed the discovery in the year 1727, and who, by the way, was not the earliest. Did Watt or Hull know anything of Hero of Alexandria? It has been disputed whether Harvey or an earlier philosopher (Levasseur, *circa* 1540) was the actual discoverer of the circulation of the blood, though the balance is much in Harvey's favour;[3] but it is in the highest degree improbable that either knew of the work of Nemesius, a Christian philosopher of the fourth century, who wrote a treatise on "The Nature of Man," a work of unparallelled physical knowledge for those times, and in which he seems to have had some idea of the circulation of the

and now the Constitutional. These are all the outcome of Tory politics, but can scarcely be said to be the offspring the one of the other. The Carlton was certainly not the offspring of White's, and it is somewhat doubtful whether any of the latter five, save the Junior, are descendants of the Carlton. So with the Service Clubs, no one would say that they are the descendants of the "Senior," though they certainly spring from the wants felt by men in the two services. Alike as regards the Royal Geographical Society, which is the direct descendant of the Royal, and the latter the direct descendant of the Travellers, all three being founded with a view to promote geographical research, and each being started when its predecessor was found to fail.

[1] In Japan the Daimios' servants have their master's arms embroidered on their coats, which was a mediæval European fashion, but which could scarcely have been communicated to Japan. *Per contra*, European residents at Yokohama now adopt the Japanese mode.

[2] As this mark is placed on convict dresses, and as two of the great convict establishments are at Portland and Dartmoor, near the scene of Phœnician trading operations, an ingenious theory might, and probably some day will, be worked out to the effect that the Broad Arrow had its origin in the mark with which the Phœnicians branded their slaves, a mark which has come down in the same capacity to the present day!

[3] *Cf.* P. Flourens, Histoire de la découverte de la circulation du Sang, 1857.

blood.[1] In the same way the same disputes have agitated the philosophical and speculative world from the beginning of time, the same philosophical opinions have died out only to be repeated under the same or a slightly different form; and the "thinkers" of the present day might be startled, and perhaps humbled, if such a thing were possible—on finding that their much vaunted objections against the Scriptures have been advanced times without number by various heresiarchs of old—and refuted as often.

The object of the present chapter will therefore be, 1st, to present in as clear and succinct a manner as possible the origin, history, and development of mysticism or theosophism; 2nd, to endeavour to give some account of the mystical or theosophistical societies contemporary, and it may be connected, with the new development of Freemasonry; of the possibility, for we can say no more, of such having been the case; together with a short account of the shadowy and half-mythical Rosicrucians.

To commence, *ab initio*, Alexandria was an emporium, not only of merchandise, but of philosophy; and opinions as well as goods were bartered there to the grievous corruption of sound wisdom, from the attempt which was made by men of different sects and countries—Grecian, Egyptian, and Oriental—to frame from their different tenets one general system of opinions. The respect long paid to Grecian learning, and the honours which it now received from the hands of the Ptolemies, induced others, and even the Egyptian priests, to submit to this innovation. Hence arose a heterogeneous mass of opinions which, under the name of Eclectic Philosophy, caused endless confusion, error, and absurdity, not only in the Alexandrian school, but also among the Jews, who had settled there in very large numbers, and the Christians; producing among the former that spurious philosophy which they call the Cabbala,[2] and, among the latter a certain amount of corruption, for a time at least, in the Christian faith itself.

From this period there can be no doubt but that the Jewish doctrines were known to the Egyptians, and the Greek to the Jews. Hence Grecian wisdom being corrupted by admixture with Egyptian and Oriental philosophy assumed the form of Neo-Platonism, which, by professing a sublime doctrine, enticed men of different countries and religions, including the Jews, to study its mysteries and incorporate them with their own. The symbolical method of instruction which had been in use from the earliest times in Egypt was adopted by the Jews, who accordingly put an allegorical interpretation upon their sacred writings. Hence under the cloak of symbols, Pagan philosophy gradually crept into the Jewish schools, and the Platonic doctrines, mixed first with the Pythagorean, and afterwards with the Egyptian and Oriental, were blended with their ancient faith in their explanations of the law and the traditions. The society of the Therapeutæ was formed after the model of the Pythagorean system; Aristobulus, Philo, and others, studied the Grecian philosophy, and the Cabbalists formed their mystical system upon the foundation of the tenets taught in the Alexandrian schools. This Cabbala

[1] *Cf.* Friend's History of Physic; and J. A. Fabricius, Syll. Script. de Ver. Rel. Christ., c. 2, § 30.

[2] The observations on the various philosophical systems, which next follow, are mainly derived from Brucker's "Historia Critica Philosophiæ," 1767 (of which Enfield's "History of Philosophy" is an abridged translation). This work was the result of a course of investigation, in which the life of an industrious student was principally occupied for the long term of *fifty years* (Præf. ad., vol. vi.). See further Dr Ginsburg, The Kabbalah: Its doctrines, development, and literature, 1865; Gardner, Faiths of the World; and Fort, The Early History and Antiquities of Freemasonry, chap. xxxvi., and Appendix A.

RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD LEIGH.

PROVINCIAL GRAND MASTER OF WARWICKSHIRE.

Simeon ben Setach and others.[1] It is, to say the least of it, strange that it should have been perpetually lost and revealed until about the time when it was first forged.

It is tolerably clear that the abstruse and mysterious doctrines of the Cabbala could not have been developed from the simple principles of the Mosaic Law, and must have been derived from an admixture of Greek, Egyptian, and Oriental fancies. It is indeed true that many have imagined that in the Cabbala they have discerned a near resemblance to the doctrines of Christianity, and have therefore concluded that the fundamental principles of this mystical system were derived from Divine revelation. But this is traceable to a prejudice beginning with the Jews and continued by the Christian Fathers, that all Pagan wisdom had an Hebrew origin; a notion which probably took its rise in Egypt, where, as we have seen, Pagan tenets first crept in among the Jews. When they first embraced these tenets, neither national vanity nor their reverence for the law of Moses would permit their being under any obligation to the heathen, and they were therefore forced to derive them from a fictitious account of their own sacred writings, and supposed that from them all other nations had derived their learning. Philo, Josephus, and other learned Jews, to flatter their own and their nation's vanity, industriously propagated this opinion, and the more learned Christian Fathers adopted it without reflection, on the supposition that if they could trace back the most valuable doctrines of heathenism to a Jewish origin, they could not fail to recommend the Jewish and Christian religions to Gentile philosophers, and unfortunately many in modern times, on the strength of these authorities, have been inclined to give credence to the idle tale of the Divine origin of the Cabbala.

The real truth, as far as can be ascertained, is briefly as follows: The Jews, like other Oriental, and indeed many Western, nations, had from the most remote period their secret doctrines and mysteries. It was only Christianity which laid open the whole scheme of salvation to the meanest, and therein showed more conclusively than by any other possible proof its Divine origin. It had no strange mysteries that it feared to disclose to the eye of the world, and, secure in its immeasurable majesty, it could not be derogatory to stoop to the meanest of creation. When the sects of the Essenes and Therapeutæ were formed, foreign tenets and institutions were borrowed from the Egyptians and the Greeks, and, in the form of allegorical interpretations of the law, were admitted into the Jewish mysteries. These innovations were derived from the Alexandrian schools where the Platonic and Pythagorean doctrines had already been much altered from being mixed with Orientalism. The Jewish mysteries thus enlarged by the addition of heathen dogmas, were conveyed from Egypt to Palestine, when the Pharisees, who had been driven into Egypt under Hyrcanus, returned to their own country. From this time the Cabbalistic mysteries continued to be taught in the Jewish schools, till at length they were adulterated by Peripatetic doctrines and other tenets which sprang up in the Middle Ages, and were particularly corrupted by the prevalence of the Aristotelian philosophy.[2] The Cabbala itself may be divided into three portions, the Theoretical, which treats of the highest order of metaphysics, that relating to the Divinity and the relations of the Divinity to man; the Enigmatical, consisting of certain symbolical transpositions of the words or letters of the Scriptures, fit only for the amusement of children;

[1] Buxtorf, Bib. Rabb., p. 184; Reuchlin de Arte Cabb., l. i., p. 622; Wolf, Bib. Heb., pt. i., p. 112.

[2] Knorr, Cabb. Denud., t. ii., p. 389; Wachter, Elucid. Cabb., c. ii., p. 19.

and the Practical, which professed to teach the art of curing diseases and performing other wonders by means of certain arrangements of sacred letters and words.

Without wearying my readers with a long account of the Cabbalistic doctrines, which would be as useless and unintelligible to them as they probably were to the Jews themselves, I shall content myself with giving as brief a summary as is possible of the common tenets of the Oriental, Alexandrian, and Cabbalistic systems, first premising that the former is evidently the parent of the two latter. All things are derived by emanation from one principle. This principle is God. From Him a substantial power immediately proceeds, which is the image of God and the source of all subsequent emanations. This second principle sends forth, by the energy of emanation, other natures, which are more or less perfect, according to their different degrees of distance in the scale of emanation, from the first source of existence, and which constitute different worlds or orders of being, all united to the eternal power from which they proceed. Matter is nothing more than the most remote effect of the emanative energy of the Deity. The material world receives its form from the immediate agency of powers far beneath the first source of being. Evil is the necessary effect of the imperfection of matter. Human souls are distant emanations from the Deity; and, after they are liberated from their material vehicles, will return, through various stages of purification, to the fountain whence they first proceeded. Besides the Cabbala, properly so called, many fictitious writings were produced under the ægis of great names which tended greatly to the spread of this mystical philosophy, such as the Sepher Happeliah, "The Book of Wonders;" Sepher Hakkaneh, "The Book of the Pen;" and Sepher Habbahir, "The Book of Light." The first unfolds many doctrines said to have been delivered by Elias to the Rabbi Elkanah; the second contains mystical commentaries on the Divine commands; the third illustrates the more sublime mysteries. Two of the most eminent Rabbis who studied these things were Akibha and Simeon ben Jochai. The former, after the destruction of Jerusalem, opened a school at Lydda, where, according to Jewish accounts, he had 24,000 disciples; and afterwards, in an evil moment, joined the celebrated impostor Bar Cochbas, sometimes called Barochebas, in the reign of the Emperor Adrian. After sustaining a siege of three years and a half in the city of Bitterah, the pretended Messiah was taken and put to the sword with all his followers; Akibha and his son Pappus, who were taken with them, were flayed alive, being in all probability regarded with justice as the mainsprings of the insurrection. His principal work, the "Jezirah," was long regarded by the Jews, who asserted that he had received it from Abraham, as of almost Divine authority. He was succeeded by his disciple Simeon ben Jochai,[1] who was said to have received revelations faithfully committed to writing by his followers in the book "Sohar," which is a summary of the Cabbalistic doctrine expressed in obscure hieroglyphics and allegories.

From the third century to the tenth, from various causes but few traces of the Cabbalistic mysteries are to be met with in the writings of the Jews, but their peculiar learning began to revive when the Saracens became the patrons of philosophy, and their schools subsequently migrated to Spain, where they attained their highest distinction. By this time the attention paid both by Arabians and Christians to the writings of Aristotle excited the emulation of

[1] Called by the Jews, the prince of the Cabbalists. The Rabbi Saadias Gaon, *circa* 927 A.D., wrote a work entitled "The Philosopher's Stone," which is not, as might be expected, Alchemic, but Cabbalistic.

the Jews, who, notwithstanding the ancient curse pronounced on all Jews who should instruct their sons in the Grecian learning, a curse revived A.D. 1280 by Solomon Rashba, continued in their philosophical course, reading Aristotle in Hebrew translations made from the inaccurate Arabic (for Greek was at this period little understood) and became eminent for their knowledge of mathematics and physics. In order to avoid the imputation of receiving instruction from a pagan, they invented a tale of Aristotle having been a convert to Judaism, and that he learned the greater part of his philosophy from the books of Solomon.[1] The greatest of the mediæval Jewish philosophers were undoubtedly two Spaniards. Aben Esra, born at Toledo in the twelfth century, and Moses ben Maimon, better known as Maimonides, born at Cordova A.D. 1131, and who possessed the rare accomplishment of being a good Greek scholar. The writings of these mediæval Jewish philosophers are very numerous, as may be seen by a glance at such works—among many—as Wolf's "Bibliotheca Hebræa," the earlier work of Bartolocci, "Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica," the later volumes of the "Histoire Littéraire de la France," etc. After having long been almost totally neglected, a vague and transient interest has of late been excited in this kind of learning, by a few articles which have appeared from time to time in various magazines and reviews, and are well suited to the modern appetite for acquiring a smattering of novel learning without trouble, but there can be but little doubt that the great mass consists of a farrago of useless and unintelligible conceits, which has deservedly sunk into oblivion, for though in all probability it possesses numerous grains of wheat, yet they are too much encumbered with chaff to render their laborious disinterment a matter of use or profit.

Of the Alexandrian Neo-Platonic, or as it may be and is sometimes called, the Eclectic school, not to mention Apollonius of Tyana, who had all the gifts of a first-class impostor, but who is rather to be numbered with those who attempted to revive the Pythagorean system, or Simon Magus, who was a charlatan fighting for his own hand; we have the famous school, founded originally by Plotinus,[2] and continued by Porphyry, who wrote his life; Amelius, another pupil, Iamblichus of Chalcis in Cœlo-Syria, Porphyry's immediate successor, under whose guidance the school spread far and wide throughout the empire, but was obliged to remain more or less secret under the Christian Emperors Constantine and Constantius.[3] Œdesius, the successor of Iamblichus; then Eunapius, the weak and credulous biographer of the sect; Plutarch, the son of Nestorius, *ob.* A.D. 434; Syrianus; Proclus, at once one of the most eminent, and, at the same time, most extravagant of the whole, *ob.* 485; Marinus; Isodorus of Gaza; and Damascius. These philosophers, who, though men of talent, were half dreamers, half charlatans, dissatisfied with the original Platonic doctrine, that the intuitive contemplation of the Supreme Deity was the summit of human felicity, aspired to a deification of the human mind. Hence they forsook the dualistic system of Plato for the Oriental one of emanation, which supposed an indefinite series of spiritual natures derived from the Supreme source; whence, considering the human mind as a link in this chain of intelligence, they conceived that by passing through various stages of purification, it might at length ascend

[1] Wolf, Bibl. Hebr., p. 383.

[2] Plotinus, the father of Neo-Platonism, was born at Lycopolis in Egypt about 203 A.D. He lectured at Rome for twenty-five years, and died at Putcoli in Campania about 270 A.D.

[3] Sozomen, Hist. Eccl., l. i., c. 5.

to the first fountain of intelligence, and enjoy a mysterious union with the Divine nature. They even imagined that the soul of man, properly prepared by previous discipline, might rise to a capacity of holding immediate intercourse with good demons, and even to enjoy in ecstasy an intuitive vision of God,—a point of perfection and felicity which many of their great men, such as Plotinus, Porphyry, Iamblichus, and Proclus, were supposed to have actually attained.

Another striking feature in this sect was their hatred and opposition to Christianity, which induced them to combine all important tenets, both theological and philosophical, Christian or Pagan, into one system, to conceal the absurdities of the old paganism by covering it with a veil of allegory, and by representing the heathen deities as so many emanations of the Supreme Deity, while in the hopes of counteracting the credit which Christianity derived from the exalted merit of its Founder, the purity of the lives of His followers, and the weight which must necessarily attach to authentic miracles, these philosophers affected, and probably felt, the utmost purity and even asceticism, and by studying and practising the magical or theurgic arts sought to raise themselves on a level with our Saviour Himself. Lastly, for the purpose of supporting the credit of Paganism against Christianity they palmed upon the world many spurious books under the names of Hermes, Orpheus, and other celebrated but shadowy personages.

On the whole, if we can conceive—which I admit to be difficult—our modern spiritualists to be possessed of real talent, and to be animated by real but mistaken enthusiasm, working together for a definite purpose, and with a decided objection to imposture, we shall be able to form a pretty fair notion of this famous sect. Neo-Platonism did not survive the reign of Justinian, and in fact received the *coup de grâce* at the hands of that emperor. In respect, indeed, of the action of Justinian in breaking up the academy at Athens, we can but echo the laudation bestowed on an earlier Roman—"That he caused the school of folly to be closed."[1] Some scattered and vague reminiscences may have come down indirectly through the philosophy of the Jews to the Middle Ages, but the direct influence must have been very slight, or more probably *nil*, as will be evident when we consider the almost total ignorance of Greek, in which language their works were written. At the revival of learning, however, they were eagerly caught up, especially the supposed works of Hermes Trismegistus.[2]

Another ill effect followed the establishment of this strange and dreamy philosophy. In its infancy not a few of the fathers were so far deluded by its pretensions that they imagined that a coalition might advantageously be formed between it and Christianity; and this the

[1] "Cludere ludum *insipientiæ* jussit."

[2] Hermes Trismegistus, or the "Thrice Great," was, if not an utterly mythical personage, some extremely early Egyptian philosopher, who, for his own ends, passed himself off as either a favoured pupil or incarnation of the Egyptian god Thoth, identical with the Phœnician Tsaut, and, or assumed to be (for the Greeks and Romans fitted all foreign gods to their own), the Greek Hermes and the Latin Mercury. Trismegistus is the reputed author of 20,000 volumes, hence there can be no wonder that when Mr Shandy extolled him as the greatest of every branch of science, "'and the greatest engineer,' said my Uncle Toby." The sacred books of the Egyptians were attributed to him, and were called the *Hermetic Books*. All secret knowledge was believed to be propagated by a series of wise men called the "Hermetic Chain." Hermes and his reputed writings were highly esteemed by all kinds of enthusiasts, who called themselves from him "Hermetici." The learned Woodford, whilst admitting "that a great deal of nonsense has been written about the Hermetic origin of Freemasonry," stoutly contends "that the connection, as between Freemasonry and Hermeticism, has yet to be explained" (Kenning's Cyclopædia, *s. v.* Hermes).

more so as several of the philosophers became converts to the faith, the consequence naturally being, that Pagan ideas and opinions became gradually intermingled with the pure and simple doctrines of the gospel, without the slightest advantage being gained to counterbalance so great an evil; nay, philosophy herself became a loser, for in attempting to combine into one system the leading tenets of each sect they were obliged, in many cases, to be understood in a sense different from that intended by the original authors. Moreover, finding it impracticable to produce an appearance of harmony among systems essentially different from each other without obscuring the whole, they exerted their utmost ingenuity in devising fanciful conceptions, subtle distinctions, and vague terms; combinations of which, infinitely diversified, they attempted only too successfully to impose upon the world as a system of real and sublime truths. Lost in subtleties, these pretenders to superior wisdom were perpetually endeavouring to explain by imaginary resemblances and arbitrary distinctions what they themselves probably never understood. Disdaining to submit to the guidance of reason and common sense, they gave up the reins to the imagination, and suffered themselves to be borne away through the boundless regions of metaphysics where the mental vision labours in vain to follow them, as may be seen by a very cursory examination of the writings of Plotinus and Proclus, not to mention others, on the Deity and the inferior divine natures, where, amidst the undoubted proofs of great talent, will be found innumerable examples of egregious trifling under the name of profound philosophy. But in justice to the Alexandrian Neo-Platonists, it should be allowed that they are by no means the only sinners in this respect. Even the greatest of the Fathers are full of the weakest reasonings, and the majority of our modern thinkers, much as we may vaunt them, differ only in being less acute and less learned.[1]

In spite of the popular notion, the Arabians themselves not only were barbarous in their origin, but never in the times of their most exalted civilisation made any great advances in science, their most eminent philosophers having sprung from conquered, though, perhaps, kindred races. But towards the end of the eighth century, the Caliphs, beginning with Al-Mansor, Al-Rashid, Al-Mamon, and others, having reached a height of luxury and magnificence perhaps never equalled either before or since, were not unnaturally desirous of adding to the lustre of their reigns by encouraging science and literature; and they accordingly invited learned Christians to their court. But by this time the Eclectic sect was nearly, if not quite, extinct, so that nearly the whole Christian world professed themselves followers of Aristotle, deriving their ideas of his philosophy, however, not from the fountain-head, but from the adulterated streams of commentators, who were deeply infected with the spirit of the Alexandrian schools; and hence arose confusion twice confounded, for the system of Aristotle was now added to those other systems which were already, we cannot say blended, but jumbled together. Add to this that the Arabians were obliged to have recourse to Arabic versions, and these not taken directly from the original Greek, but from Syriac translations, made by Greek Christians at a period when barbarism was overspreading the Greek world and philo-

[1] "The sect of the Rationalists," says the learned Rabbi Aben Tibbon, "is composed of certain philosophical sciolists, who judge of things, not according to truth and nature, but according to their own imaginations, and who confound men by a multiplicity of specious words without meaning; whence their science is called 'The Wisdom of Words'" (In Lib. Morch). Human folly is alike in all ages.

sophy was almost extinct. The first translators themselves were ill qualified to give a true representation of the Aristotelian philosophy, so obscurely delivered in the first instance by its author, and of which the text had been for many centuries corrupt beyond the ordinary degrees of corruption, which had been further obscured by hints of commentators, who, following with extreme vigour the usual pursuits of the tribe, had succeeded in making obscurity more obscure and in intercepting rays of light wherever practicable. What then could be hoped from the second class of translators who implicitly followed such blind guides? The truth is, that the Arabian translators and commentators executed their task neither judiciously nor faithfully; often mistaking, even when there was no excuse for it, the sense of their author, adding many things which were not in the original, and omitting many passages that they did not understand. These errors, greatly increased, were transferred into the subsequent Latin versions, and became the cause of innumerable misconceptions and absurdities in the Christian schools of the west; where the doctrines of Aristotle, after having passed through the hands of the Alexandrians and Saracens, and to a certain extent also of the Jews, produced that wonderful mass of subtleties and dialectic ingenuity — the Scholastic Philosophy.

Aristotle, or rather the half mythical Aristotle, which was all that these Saracens could obtain, was implicitly followed, as were some other Greek works in mathematics, medicine, and pure physics, which also they were obliged to view through the intermedium of imperfect translations. The mathematical sciences were cultivated with great industry by the Arabians, and in arithmetic, and especially in algebra, which derives its name from them, their inventions and improvements are valuable; but in geometry, instead of improving on, they rather deteriorated from the works of the Greeks. In medicine, to which they paid much attention, their chief guides were Hippocrates and Galen, but by attempting to reconcile their doctrine with that of Aristotle they naturally introduced into their medical system many inconsistent tenets and useless refinements.[1] So with botany, though they made choice of no unskilful guide, and spent much labour in interpreting him, yet they frequently mistook his meaning so egregiously, that in the Arabian translation a botanist would scarcely suppose himself to be reading Dioscorides, nor were they more successful in other branches of natural history. Their discoveries in chemistry, it is true, were not inconsiderable, but they were concealed under the occult mysteries of alchemy. Even in astronomy, where they obtained the highest reputation, they made but few improvements upon the Greeks, as appears from the Arabic version of Ptolemy's "Almagest" and from their account of the number of fixed stars.[2] In astrology, indeed, they attained pre-eminence, but this cannot be called a science, and owes its existence to ignorance, superstition, and imposture.

The Saracens wanted confidence in their own abilities, and they, therefore, chose to put themselves under the guidance of Aristotle or any other master rather than to speculate for themselves; and hence, with all their industry or ingenuity they contributed but little towards enlarging the field of human knowledge. Not that there were not great men among the Arabians, or that philosophy owed nothing to their exertions, but at the same time we must confess that the advances which the Saracens made in knowledge were inconsiderable; they certainly fell far short of the Greeks in general know-

[1] Friend, Hist. Med., pt. ii., pp. 12, 14.

[2] *Ibid.*, pt. ii., p. 11.

ledge or in philosophical acuteness, and that it is only in a very few particulars that they made any addition to the fund of general knowledge. *Per contra*, we must accuse them of materially adding to that development of mystery which formed so prominent a feature in the revived learning of the sixteenth century.

We have now explored, I admit, in a very imperfect manner, the sources from which the mystical learning of the Reformation period was derived, and shall be the better able to estimate the value of these dreamy tenets from which, by a kind of morganatic marriage, the learning and tradition of the Freemasons are supposed to have been derived. We see that all ancient learning, Oriental, Jewish, Pythagorean, Platonic, Aristotelian, combined with that of Egypt, was strangely compounded into one, which gave birth to the Cabbala and the Arabian philosophy. Neo-Platonism had perished, save in so far as its influence was indirectly exerted in the formation of the Arabian and the mediæval Jewish schools; and our task now will be to endeavour to ascertain how far this ancient learning, descending from one family to the other, influenced the Reformation mystical philosophers, and whether it had sufficient influence on certain classes in the Middle Ages, to form a body of men who could transmit whole and entire, the old world doctrines to a generation living in a totally altered state of society.

As before stated, the Alexandrian school perished, it may be said, with the edict of Justinian closing the schools of Athens towards the middle of the sixth century. The Saracenic began three, and the new Jewish five, centuries later, and there is little in the writings of Western Europe, to suppose that an uninterrupted sequence of Alexandrian doctrines existed during the interval. But both Jew and Saracen, apart from what they may have derived from earlier sources, had, doubtless, many strange fancies of their own, which, while influencing the future, may have been influenced by the remotest past. The intercourse between the East and the West was constant and complete. In the Anglo-Saxon times, to take but one example, pilgrimages to the Holy Land were customary,—witness the travels of Arculfus, Willibald, and Sæwulf. Indeed, one cause of the Crusades was the ill-treatment of pilgrims by the new dynasties which held sway in Palestine. The learning of both Jews and Saracens in Spain spread certainly throughout the south of France, and how much farther it is difficult, at this period, to ascertain. The universal diffusion of the Jews, and the influence of the Crusades themselves, doubtless assisted in this new development, and when the romantic ardour of the Cross—an ardour so perfectly consonant with the spirit of the times—had ceased, the mercantile enterprise of the Genoese and Venetians doubtless kept the flame alive. Hence we may easily conclude that the Jewish and Saracenic ideas to a certain extent penetrated the intellectual feeling of Western Europe; but we may well pause, before giving our consent to the notion, however popular, that one mysterious and deathless body of men, worked in silence and in darkness, for the transmission of ancient fancies to generations yet unborn. Mathematicians, astrologers, and alchemists, especially when we remember the peculiarly romantic tendency of the Middle Ages, doubtless existed here and there, and the *quasi* knowledge which they imperfectly learned from their Oriental teachers, may have been cultivated by some few votaries, but the metaphysical speculations, the philosophy of the Middle Ages was, save in its origin, essentially different, and depended more on Augustine than upon Aristotle. Metaphysics, *i.e.*, abstract speculations as to the soul and its relations to the Divinity, is one thing; Theurgy, a magic alchemy and astrology, the attempt to bring these theoretical speculations to some practical point, such as controlling

the secret powers of nature, is another—and we may as well attempt to connect the speculations of Reid or Sir William Hamilton, with the vagaries of Mesmer or Cagliostro.

Alchemists, astrologists, *et hoc genus omne*, doubtless existed in the Middle Ages, but not, I imagine, to any great extent. We must remember the power of the Church, the tremendous engine of confession, and the fact that in an age in which, though often unduly decried, physical learning and science, properly so called, was at a very low ebb. Gerbert,[1] Roger Bacon, and Sir Michael Scott were all accounted as wizards. No actual magical lore, save what might have existed among the most superstitious and ignorant of the commonalty, had a chance of raising its head without being at once detected. It is a *reductio ad absurdum* to suppose that the mediæval masons who were mere mechanics, and were perhaps more than any other class of operatives under the immediate eye of the Church, could have been chosen to transmit such secrets, or that they would have had a chance of doing so if they had been so chosen. But I shall doubtless be met with the argument that mystic signs, such as the Pentalpha, etc., have been repeatedly found among masonic marks on stones, to say nothing of rings and other similar trinkets. To this I reply, that it is a very common thing for men to copy one from the other without knowing the reason why, and that the greater part of these supposed mysterious emblems, were transmitted from one to the other without any higher reason than that they were common and handy, and had, so to speak, fashion on their side. What, for instance, could be more absurd than to suppose that poor and illiterate masons should copy the signs of magical lore on stones under the very eyes of their employers—the clergy,—even supposing they knew their value, to be then turned in and buried within massive walls, on the chance of their being discovered by some remote generation which would have lost all sense of their symbolism? As well suppose that a nun bricked up in a niche, if ever such there were, was placed there as a warning to remote posterity and not as a punishment for present sin.[2]

So matters stood at the era of the Reformation. This era, of which the Reformation was only a part, formed a prodigious leap in the human intellect, a leap for which preparations had long been made. The phase of thought, peculiar to the Middle Ages, had long been silently decaying before the fall or impending fall of Constantinople had driven the Greek learned to Italy, before the invention of printing had multiplied knowledge, and long before the Reformation itself had added the climax to the whole, for the Reformation was only the final outcome of the entire movement.

For good or for evil, the mind of man in Western Europe—for the revolution was limited in area, far more so than we are apt to think—was then set free, and, as few people are capable of reasoning correctly, the wildest vagaries ensued as a matter of course.

[1] Afterwards Sylvester II. He was the first French Pope.

[2] It has been already mentioned (*ante*, Chap. IX., p. 456, note 3) that at the present day, if a stonemason, on moving from his own neighbourhood, finds his mark employed by another workman, the etiquette or usage of the trade requires that the new comer shall distinguish his work by a symbol differing in some slight respect from that of the mason whose trade mark, so to speak, is identical with his own. The Cabbalistic signs, doubtless originating in the East, must have always been very convenient for this purpose. A friend informs me that some two years ago, when the south-western portion of the nave of Westminster Abbey was in process of restoration, he saw a stone in the cloisters which had been taken down, and which bore the name of the mason and the date in full (*circa* March 30, 1663), the whole being enclosed by a line or border. A mere diagram was infinitely simpler and easier to cut, especially for those who could neither read nor write.

It was not only in theology that a new starting point was acquired; science, politics, art, literature,—everything, in short, that is capable of being embraced by the mind of man, shared in the same movement, and, as a matter of course, no phase of human folly remained unrepresented. The mind of man thus set free was incessantly occupied in searching after the ways of progress, but mankind saw but through a glass darkly; they were ignorant of fundamental principles; they drew wild inferences and jumped at still wilder conclusions, while the imagination was seldom, if ever, under control, and they were in the dark as to the method of inductive science, *i.e.*, the patient forging of the links in the chain from particulars to generals. This, one of the most precious of earthly gifts yet vouchsafed to the human intellect, had escaped the Greek philosophers and the perhaps still subtler scholastic doctors, and awaited the era of the Columbus of modern science, Lord Bacon. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that everything of ancient lore, more especially when it possessed a spark of mystery, should have been eagerly examined, and that as the printing press and the revival of Greek learning aided their efforts, everything that could be rescued of the Neo-Alexandrian school, of the jargon of the Cabbalists, the alchemists, and the astrologers, should have been pressed into the service, and resulted in the formation, not exactly of a school, but of a particular phase of the human mind, which was, as I have before said, even more extraordinary than that of the visionaries of Alexandria. It was not confined to the philosophers strictly so-called, —there was no folly in religion, politics, or arts, which was not eagerly embraced during the same period, until finally the storm died away in a calm which was outwardly heralded by the peace of Westphalia, the termination of the Fronde, and the English Restoration.[1]

First in point of date—for we may pass over the isolated case of Raymond Lully, *ob.* 1315, now principally remembered as the inventor of a kind of Babbage's calculating machine applied to logic, but who was also a learned chemist and skilful dialectician—comes John Picus de Mirandola, born of a princely family, 1463. Before he was twenty-four years of age he had acquired so much knowledge that he went to Rome and proposed for disputation nine hundred questions in dialectics, mathematics, philosophy, and theology, which he also caused to be hung up in all the open schools in Europe, challenging their professors to public disputation, and offering "*en prince*" to defray the expenses of any one travelling to Rome for that purpose. Naturally, he merely excited envy and jealousy, and after a few years he gave himself up to solitude and devotion, and formed a resolution to distribute his property to the poor, and to travel barefooted throughout the world, in order to propagate the gospel. But death put an end to this extravagant project in the thirty-second year of his age.[2] Pro-

[1] The whole of this period, both in the matters which led up to it, and the phases through which it passed, have had almost their counterpart in the French Revolution and its causes, and the stormy and perplexed state which nations are now in and have during the century been passing through.

[2] The custom, of which the famous nine hundred questions afford a typical illustration, was a common enough form of literary distinction in those days, though this is probably the most celebrated instance. By far the greater part were from Aristotle or the Cabbala. The secret of the whole is simple enough. He, and others like him, studied certain authors, and then offered to be examined in them, themselves setting the examination papers. Any one would be glad to go into a civil service examination on these terms. But the subjects must have been uncommonly well "got up." Most people will remember the story of Sir T. More, who, when a young man, answered the pedant who at Brussels offered to dispute "*de omni scibili*" by the proposition "An averia capta in Withernamia sint irreplegibilia?" (whether cattle taken in Withernam be irrepleviable?). Only an English common lawyer could have answered it; but the barbarous Latin in which it was couched made it appear still more terrible.

bably the blade had worn out the scabbard. I do not pretend to any deep learning in the doctrines of this school, or rather of the various classes of enthusiasts who sprang up—we cannot exactly say flourished—during this period. It is tolerably clear that very few formed any connected school, but that each was eagerly searching after truth, or following will o' the wisps, as his own fancies prompted; and if several pursued the same mode of investigation it was more from chance than design. What store of metaphysics they had was most probably gathered from their predecessors,—their physics, that is the empirical arts which they professed, from themselves, based on what they could gather from the Cabbalists and Saracens. Hence it would seem that the mystical descent of the Freemasons must be derived, if it be so derived at all, from a bastard philosophy springing from a somewhat mixed and doubtful ancestry. Men's minds being thoroughly upset, any one of ill-regulated or ardent imagination naturally became excited, and launched out into every kind of absurdity. The superior and more educated classes believed in alchemy, magic, astronomy, and fortune telling of a superior order; the common people believed almost universally in witchcraft. For this witchcraft was not the effect of the "gross superstition of the dark ages" and of ignorance, as is generally assumed by the glib talkers and writers of the day, but was rather the effect of the "outburst of the human intellect" and "the shaking-off of the thraldom of ignorance." It is strange that it prevailed mainly, if not entirely, in those countries most shaken by the throes of the Reformation—England, Scotland, France, and Germany (there is little heard of it, I believe, in Ireland), and seems most likely to have been a kind of lasting epidemic of nervous hysteria.[1] Its existence was believed in by the ablest of our judges; it was the subject of a special treatise by His Most Gracious Majesty James I., who was by no means the fool it is the fashion to suppose him; and if his opinion be not deemed of much weight it was equally supported, and that at a comparatively late period by one of the acutest geniuses England has yet produced—Glanvill—in his "Sadducismus Triumphatus." Indeed, there was nothing very extraordinary in this universal belief, for earth and air were full of demons, and the black and other kindred arts objects of universal study. Not to mention Nostradamus, Wallenstein, who was probably mad, had his astrologer, and a century earlier, Catherine de Medicis, who was certainly not, had hers. Between the two flourished the famous Dr Dee and Sir Kenelm Digby,[2] whose natural eccentricity wanted no artificial stimulus, followed in the same path as did Dr Lamb, who was knocked on the head by the populace early in Charles the First's reign, from which arose the cant phrase, "Lamb him,"[3] *teste* Macaulay. Lilly, the astrologer, who seems to have been half enthusiast, half fool, and whole knave, gives in his

[1] The poor women accused of witchcraft constantly asserted the truth of their having dealings with the Evil One, although they well knew that the confession would subject them to a cruel death. They must, therefore, in some way have been deluded into the belief. Again, they constantly asserted that they bore marks on their persons made by the fiend, and on their being examined this was generally found to be the case. This is another proof of nervous hysteria.

[2] Sir K. Digby being in the East, and finding, or fancying that he found, his virtue in danger, preserved his fidelity to his wife, the beautiful Venetia Stanley, to whom he was passionately attached, by writing a panegyrical biography of her. As he does not appear, however, from the same narrative to have been over scrupulous of his wife's honour, the performance seems to have savoured slightly of supererogation.

[3] To "lamb into a fellow" is a very old school phrase. If this is derivable from the former, it is another illustration, and a curious one, of the way things are handed down without any visible connection. For even the proverbially omniscient schoolboy can scarcely be supposed to be well acquainted with, or much interested in, the details of the life and death of the ill-starred Dr Lamb.

autobiography several most curious accounts of the various astrologers of his contemporaries then flourishing in London, every one of whom would now, most certainly, and with great justice, be handed over to the police. He also mentions that he himself (he seems to have towered above his colleagues) was consulted as to some of the attempted escapes of Charles I., which, according to him, only failed owing to the king having wilfully neglected his advice, while, on the other hand, he was thanked at Windsor by some of the leading officers of the Republican army for the astrological predictions, with which he had occasionally revived their drooping hopes. Before perusing Lilly's autobiography,[1] I was of opinion that these pious sectaries always "wrestled with the Lord in prayer," or, at the worst, tried a "fall" in the Bible akin to the *Sortes Virgilianæ*, but it would seem that, as they deceived others, so they themselves should be deceived. Lilly's business was so extensive that he complains, towards the end of his work, that he had not proper time to devote to his prayers, and, accordingly, retired to Hersham, near Walton-on-Thames, a place he had long affected. Having, through the interest of his friend Ashmole (of whom hereafter), obtained the degree of M.D. from Sheldon, Archbishop of Canterbury, he practised physic with much success at Kingston-on-Thames, and, dying in 1681 (he was born in 1602), was buried in the chancel of Walton Church. Whatever his success, however, he did not take in everybody, for the honour of human nature, be it said, that Pepys records:—

"Oct. 24, 1660.—So to Mr Lilly's, with Mr Spong, where well received, there being a clubb to-night among his friends. Among the rest, Esquire Ashmole, who, I found, was a very ingenious gentleman. With him we two sang afterwards in Mr Lilly's study. That done we all parted: and I home by Coach taking Mr Rooker with me, who did tell me a great many fooleries which may be done by nativities, and blaming Mr Lilly for writing to please his friends and to keep in with the times (as he did formerly to his own dishonour) and not according to the rules of art, by which he could not well erre as he had done."[2] And again:—

"June 14, 1667.—We read and laughed at Lilly's prophecies this month in his Almanack for this year."[3]

Among the numerous philosophers, all of them more or less eminent, and many endowed with really powerful genius who were led astray by these fancies, may be mentioned Johann Reuchlin,[4] born at Pforzheim in Suabia A.D. 1455, who professed and taught a mystical system compounded of the Platonic, Pythagorean, and Cabbalistic doctrines principally set forth in his works.[5] Henry Cornelius Agrippa, born near Cologne in 1486, a man of powerful genius and vast erudition, but of an eccentric and restless spirit, and who finally closed a roving and chequered existence at Grenoble in 1535.[6] His occult philosophy is rather a sketch of the Alexandrian mixed with the Cabbalistic theology than a treatise on

[1] Life of William Lilly, with Notes by Mr Ashmole. Ed. 1774.

[2] Samuel Pepys, Diary and Correspondence. [3] *Ibid.*

[4] Reuchlin's zeal for the Hebrew learning once nearly got him into great trouble. One Pfefferkorn, a converted Jew, of Cologne, with the not always disinterested zeal of converts, succeeded in obtaining an order from the Emperor that all Jewish books should be collected at Frankfort and burnt. The Jews, however, succeeded in inducing the Emperor to allow them first to be examined, and Reuchlin was appointed for that purpose, and his recommendation that all should be spared save those written against the Faith was carried out; by which means he incurred the intense hatred of the more bigoted churchmen. *Ob.* 1522.

[5] "De Verbo Mirifico" (1494), and "De Arte Cabbalistica" (1516).

See H. Morley, Life of Cornelius Agrippa von Mettesheim, Doctor and Knight, commonly known as a Magician, 1856.

magic, and explains the harmony of nature and the connection of the elementary, celestial, and intellectual worlds on the principles of the emanative system. Two things may be especially noted of him. He started in life as a physician with the wild project of recommending himself to the great by pretending to a knowledge of the secrets of nature, and especially of the art of producing gold. The other, that in the course of his wanderings he came for a short time to England, where he is said to have founded an hermetic society.[1] Jerome Cardan, an Italian physician, born at Pavia in 1501, and who died about 1576, was a wonderful compound of wisdom and folly. An astrologer all his life, his numerous predictions, and the cures which he undertook to perform by secret charms, or by the assistance of invisible spirits, made him pass for a magician, while they were in reality only proofs of a mind infatuated by superstition. His numerous works, collected and published by Spon, in 10 vols. (fol., Lugd., 1663), show him to have been a man of great erudition, fertile invention, and capable of many new and singular discoveries both in philosophy and medicine. Innumerable singularities, both physical and metaphysical, are found in his works, accompanied by many experiments and observations on natural phenomena, but the whole is thrown together in such a confused mass as to show clearly that, though he had no lack of ideas, he was incapable of arranging them, an incapacity which will render nugatory the most ingenious and original conceptions. His works [2] exemplify this combined strength and weakness, for if he could only have preserved a clear head and cool judgment, he would doubtless have contributed largely to the progress of true science. Thomas Campanella, a Dominican, born in Calabria in 1568, was also undoubtedly a man of genius, and it must be equally without doubt, that his imagination greatly predominated over his judgment, when we find that he not only gave credit to the art of astrology, but believed that he was cured of a disease by the words and prayers of an old woman; that demons appeared to him, and that he persuaded himself that when any danger threatened him, he was, between sleeping and waking, warned by a voice which called him by name. Still, in spite of his childish credulity and eccentricity, Campanella could reason soberly, and is especially worthy of praise, for the freedom with which he exposed the futility of the Aristotelian philosophy, and for the pains which he took to deduce natural science from observation and experience. He died in a Dominican monastery at Paris, A.D. 1639, in the seventy-first year of his age. Numerous other philosophers who have attained the highest eminence were, at least occasionally, not exempt from a belief in these follies, and that in comparatively modern times. Henry More, the famous Platonist, one of the most brilliant of the *alumni* of Cambridge, the friend and colleague of Cudworth, 1614-1687, shows in his works a deep tincture of mysticism, a belief in the Cabbala, and the transmission of the Hebrew doctrines through Pythagoras to Plato. Locke, 1632-1704, the father of modern thought and philosophy, was, early in life, for a time seduced by the fascinations of these mysteries; and the eminent Descartes, 1596-1650, in his long search after truth—which he did not ultimately succeed in finding—for a time admitted the same weakness.

[1] "In the year 1510 Henry Cornelius Agrippa came to London, and, as appears by his correspondence (*Opuscula*, t. ii., p. 1073), he founded a secret society for alchemical purposes similar to one which he had previously instituted at Paris, in concert with Landolfo, Brixianus, Xanthus, and other students at that university. The members of these societies did agree on *private signs of recognition*; and they founded, in various parts of Europe, corresponding associations for the prosecution of the occult sciences" (Monthly Review, second series, 1798, vol. xxv., p. 304).

[2] "De Rerum Subtilitate," and "De Rerum Varietate" afford a conspicuous illustration.

So far I have treated of philosophers who yielded principally to the weaknesses of astrology, magic, and a belief in demons; we now come to those who, also, in their new born ardour for the pursuit of material science, explored, or rather attempted to explore, the realms of chemistry, and to the vague generalities with which men commencing a study, and groping therefore in the dark, feeling their way gradually with many errors, added the mystical views of their contemporaries. The idea of demons, which is probably at the root of all magic, inasmuch as it supposes an inferior kind of guardians of the treasures of the earth, air, and planets, who can be communicated with by mortals, and, human vanity will add, controlled by them, is in all probability derived from the Cabbalists, whose doctrine of emanation was peculiarly suited to it, and from the Saracens (the two streams having united as already shown) who had plenty of jins and demons of their own, as may be gathered from the "Arabian Nights." To this possibly the old Teutonic, Celtic, and Scandinavian legends may have been superadded, so that the whole formed a machinery to which the earlier chemists, confused in their knowledge, and hampered with the superstitions of their times, attributed the control of the various forces of nature,—a system, of which a French caricature is given, by the author of the memoirs of the Count de Gabalis, of whom more anon.

The first, and perhaps the greatest, certainly the most celebrated of these, was Philippus Aureolus Theophrastus Paracelsus, a man of strange and paradoxical genius, born at Einsidlen, near Zurich, in 1493. His real name[1] is said to have been Bombastus, which, in accordance with the pedantry of the times, he changed to Paracelsus, which expresses the same thing in somewhat more learned language. Brought up by his father, who was also a physician, his ardour for learning was so great that he travelled over the greater part of Europe, and possibly even portions of Asia and Africa, in search of knowledge, visiting, not only the learned men, but the workshops of mechanics, and not only the universities, but the mines, and esteeming no person too mean nor any place too dangerous, provided only that he could obtain knowledge. It may easily be believed that such a man would despise book learning, and, in fact, he boasted that his library would not amount to six folio volumes. It may also be imagined that such a man would strike out bold and hazardous paths, often depending more on mere conjecture or fancy than on close reasoning founded on experiment, and also that such treatment might occasionally meet with striking success. So great, in fact, was his fame, a fame founded on undoubted successes, that it was not long before he rose to the summit of popular fame, and obtained the chair of medicine in the college of Bâsle. Among other nostrums he administered a medicine which he called Azoth, and which he boasted was the philosopher's stone given through the Divine favour to man in these last days. Naturally his irregular practices, and still more, no doubt, his irregular successes, stirred up all the fury of the regular practitioners—than whom no body of men, not even excluding the English Bar, have ever maintained a stricter system of trades' unionism—a fury which the virulence with which he censured the ignorance and indolence of the ordinary physicians by no means tended to allay. After a while he was driven from Bâsle and settled in Alsace, where, after two years, he returned in 1530 to Switzerland, where he does not appear to have stayed long, and, after wandering for many years through Germany and Bohemia, finished his life in the hospital of St Sebastian at Salzburg A.D. 1541.

[1] I doubt Bombastus being the real name. It was probably the Latinised term of an honest Swiss patronymic which, having been once *Latinised*, could take no great harm by being further *Grecised*.

The true character of Paracelsus has been the subject of great disputes. His admirers and followers have celebrated him as a perfect master of all philosophical and medical mysteries, and have gone so far, in some cases, as to assert that he was possessed of the grand secret of transmuting the inferior metals into gold. But, in this case, why did he die in a public hospital, therein following the example of most gold finders? Others, on the contrary, have charged his whole medical practice with ignorance, imposture, and impudence. J. Crato, in an epistle to Zwinger, declares that in Bohemia his medicines, even when apparently successful, left his patients in such a state that they soon after died of palsy or epilepsy, which is quite credible seeing that he was in all probability a bold and reckless innovator whose maxim was the vulgarism "kill or cure." The hostility of the regular practitioners is easily understood, and as easily pardoned. Erastus, who was one of his pupils for two years, wrote a work detecting his impostures. He is said to have been ignorant of Greek, and to have had so little knowledge of Latin that he dared not speak it before the learned—as, however, he despised the learning of Galen and Hippocrates, this may not have been altogether to his hindrance—and even his native tongue was so little at command, that he was obliged to have his German writings corrected by another hand. He has also been charged—but this will carry no real weight—with the most contemptible ignorance, the most vulgar scurrility, the grossest intemperance, and the most detestable impiety. The truth seems to be, that he was a rough and original genius who struck out a path for himself, but who, in so doing, neglected too much the accumulated wisdom of antiquity, wherein he erred in an opposite direction to the generality of the profession at that period, and neglected still more the common decencies and civilities of life. His chief merit, and that was a great one, consisted in improving the art of chemistry, and in inventing or bringing to light several medicines which still hold their place in the "Pharmacopœia." He wrote or dictated many works so entirely devoid of elegance, and, at the same time, so unmethodical and obscure, that one is almost tempted to credit the statement of his assistant Oponinus, who said that he was usually drunk when he dictated. They treat of an immense variety of subjects—medical, magical, and philosophical. His "Philosophia Sagax" is a most obscure and confused treatise on astrology, necromancy, chiromancy, physiognomy (herein anticipating Lavater), and other divining arts; and, though several of his works treat of philosophical subjects, yet they are so involved as to render it an almost impossible task, to reduce them to anything like philosophical consistency. He did, however, found a school which produced many eminent men, some of whom took great pains to digest the incoherent dogmas of their master into something like a methodical system. A summary of his doctrine may be seen in the preface to the "Basilica Chymica" of Crollius, but it is little better than a mere jargon of words.

A greater visionary, without, moreover, any scientific qualities to counterbalance his craziness, was Jacob Boehmen, a shoemaker of Gorlitz in Upper Silesia, born in 1575, and of whom it may safely be said, that no one ever offered a more striking example of the adage *ne sutor ultra crepidam*. It has sometimes been said that he was a disciple of Fludd, but beyond a probable acquaintance with the writings of Paracelsus, whose terms he frequently uses, he seems to have followed no other guides than his own eccentric genius and enthusiastic imagination. His conceptions, in themselves sufficiently obscure, are often rendered still more so, by being clothed in allegorical symbols, derived from the chemical art, and every attempt

which has been made to explain and illustrate his system has only raised a fresh *ignis fatuus* to lead the student still further astray. Indeed, it is impossible to explain that which possesses no system or design, and which contains simply the crazy outpourings of an ignorant fanatic who represented a mediæval Joanna Southcote, with German mysticism superadded. A more scientific theosophist was John Baptista van Helmont, born at Brussels 1577, who became lecturer on surgery in the academy of Louvain at the age of seventeen. Dissatisfied with what he had learned, he studied with indefatigable industry mathematics, geometry, logic, algebra, and astronomy; but, still remaining unsatisfied, he had recourse to the writings of Thomas à Kempis, and was induced by their perusal to pray to the Almighty to give him grace to love and pursue truth, on which he was instructed by a dream to renounce all heathen philosophy, and particularly stoicism, to which he had been inclined, and to wait for Divine illumination. Being dissatisfied with the medical writings of the ancients, he again had recourse to prayer, and was again admonished in a dream to give himself up to the pursuit of Divine wisdom. About this time he learned from a chemist the practical operations of the art, and devoted himself to the pursuit with great zeal and perseverance, hoping by this means to acquire the knowledge which he had in vain sought from books. The medical skill thus acquired he employed entirely in the service of the poor, whom he attended *gratis*, and obtained a high reputation for humanity and medical skill. His life ultimately fell a sacrifice to his zeal for science and philanthropy, for he caught cold attending a poor patient at night, which terminated his existence in the sixty-seventh year of his age. Van Helmont improved both the chemical and the medical art, but his vanity led him into empirical pretensions. He boasted that he was possessed of a fluid which he called *Alcahest* or pure salt (to be again referred to), which was the first material principle in nature, and was capable of penetrating into bodies and producing an entire separation and transmutation of their component parts. But this wonderful fluid was never shown even to his son, who also practised chemistry, and was rather more crazy than his father, inasmuch as to his progenitor's fancies he added the dreams of the Cabbala. His "Paradoxical Dissertations" are a mass of philosophical, medical, and theological paradoxes, scarcely to be parallelled in the history of letters.

The last of these writers, which I shall have occasion to mention, and that more particularly, is Robert Fludd, or De Fluctibus, born in 1574 at Milgate in Kent, and who became a student at Oxford in 1591. Having finished his studies he travelled for six years in France, Spain, Italy, and Germany; and on his return was admitted a physician, and obtained great admiration, not only for the depth of his chemical, philosophical, and theological knowledge, but for his singular piety.

So peculiar was his turn of mind, that there was nothing ancient or modern, under the guise of occult wisdom, which he did not eagerly gather into his magazine of science. All the mysterious and incomprehensible dreams of the Cabbalists and Paracelsians were compounded by him into a new mass of absurdity. In hopes of improving the medical and chemical arts he devised a new system of physics, loaded with wonderful hypotheses and mystical fictions. He supposed two universal principles—the northern or condensing, and the southern or rarefying, power.[1] Over these he placed innumerable intelligences and geniuses,

[1] This was in a vague idea true, putting north and south for heat and cold, which is physically and geographically absurd.

SIR WATKIN WILLIAMS-WYNN, BARONET

PROVINCIAL GRAND MASTER OF NORTH WALES AND SHROPSHIRE

wrote a reply which is supposed to have had the effect of crushing, not only Fludd, but also the whole body of Rosicrucians, whose great supporter he was.

Soane, indeed, in his "New Curiosities of Literature,"[1] asserts that they were forced to shelter themselves under the cloak of Freemasonry, a view which was first broached in Germany,[2] and with slight variation has been adopted by many English writers, notably by Mr King, who finds "the commencement of the real existence of Freemasonry" in "the adaptation to a special purpose of another society, then in its fullest bloom,—the Rosicrucians."[3] Gassendi's strictures on Fludd's philosophy I have not seen, but their purport is sufficiently disclosed in the "Athenæ Oxonienses."[4] According to the Oxford antiquary,—"Gassendus, upon Marsennus his desiring him to give his judgment of Fludd's two books wrote against him, drew up an answer divided into three parts. The first of which sifts the principles of the whole system of his whimsical philosophy, as they lie scattered throughout his works. The second is against 'Sophiæ cum Moriâ Certamen,' and the third answers the 'Summum Bonum' as his."[5]

Although the silence of Bayle, of Chauffepié, of Prosper Marchand, of Niceron, and of other literary historians, with regard to Fludd, is not a little remarkable, it is none the less certain that his writings were extensively read throughout Europe, where at that time they were infinitely more inquisitive in their occult speculations than we in England. Passing, however, for the present from any further consideration of the philosophy of this remarkable Englishman—who died in 1637[6]—I may yet briefly state, that one of our profoundest scholars, the illustrious Selden, highly appreciated the volumes and their author.[7]

It has been before observed that the earth and air were at this time supposed to be full of demons, and that this was probably owing to the Cabbalistic and Saracenic doctrines of countless angels and spirits, the whole springing ultimately from the Oriental doctrine of emanation. Much curious information on this subject, and which will serve to show to what lengths the belief was carried, may be found in the works below noted.[8] Some of the older authors wrote regular natural histories of demons, something after the manner of Buffon or Cuvier. There is one very curious form of exorcism which is given as having actually occurred. The exorcist,

[1] Vol. ii., 1848, p. 63.

[2] *Cf.* J. G. Buhle, Ueber den Ursprung und die Vornehmsten Schicksale des Ordens der Rosenkreuzer und Freimaurer, 1804.

[3] The Gnostics and their Remains, 1865, p. 177.

[4] Vol. ii., col. 621.

[5] Of the "Summum Bonum," Wood says, "Although this piece goes under another name (Joachim Frizium), yet not only Gassendus gives many reasons to show it to be of our author's composition (Fludd), but also Franc. Lanovius shows others to the same purpose; and Marsennus himself, against whom it was directed, was of the like opinion" (*Ibid.*, col. 620).

[6] The periods during which the various philosophers flourished, who are said to have been addicted to Rosicrucian studies, become very material. *E.g.*, Ashmole, whose Hermetic learning has been ascribed, in part, to the personal instruction he received from Michael Maier and Robert Fludd, was only three years old at the death of the former (1620), and had not quite attained legal age when the grave closed over the latter (1637).

[7] *Cf.* J. Fuller, Worthies of England, ed. 1811 (J. Nichols), vol. ii., p. 503; Athenæ Oxonienses (Bliss), vol. ii., col. 618; Biographie Universelle, Paris, Tome xvi., 1816, p. 109; and Disraeli, Amenities of Literature, vol. iii., p. 237.

[8] Martin Delrio, Disquisitionum Magicarum; Wiertz de Dæm. Præst.; Reginal Scot, The Discoverie of Witchcraft, 1584 (the 2d ed., 1634, has a "Discourse of the Nature and Substance of Devils and Spirits"); Rev. J. Glanvill, Saducismus Triumphatus, or, Full and Plain Evidence concerning Witches and Apparitions, 1667, etc. Amongst the more modern compilations which deal with the subject may be named Sir Walter Scott's Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft, 1831; and the Dictionnaire Infernale of Collin de Plancy, 3me edit. 1844.

on arriving at night in the room which the ghost affected, proceeded to form a charmed circle. This done, and the ghost appearing, he proceeded to subject him to control by means of his incantations, after which the following dialogue ensued:—

Exorcist. Thou shalt lie in the Red Sea.
Ghost. Nay, that cannot be.
Exorcist. How so?
Ghost. The Spaniard will take me as I go.
(There being war with Spain at this time.)
Exorcist. Thou shalt have a convoy.
Ghost. Then I will depart, boy.
Exorcist. And there shalt thou stay
For ever and a day.

The ghost was to repeat this after him, but not being anxious for penal servitude for life, whatever a ghost's life may be, tried to get off by saying—

And there will I stay
For never any day,

and immediately flew up the chimney. If the ears of the exorcist could be deceived, the whole proceedings would have been rendered invalid; but the latter was far too much on the alert to be thus caught, and sprinkled some dew, which he had brought in order to be prepared against such eventualities, on his "skirts," just as they were disappearing up the chimney. This brought the ghost down, and he ramped and raved, threatened and stormed, in a frantic manner, "but I nothing heeded his braggarding [the ghost-layer is made to say], knowing well that he could not come within the charmed circle." The ghost, having spent the greater part of the night in this unprofitable exhibition of temper, at length began to see signs of dawn, after which he dared not stay, while he could not leave without permission of the exorcist, because of the dew on his skirts. He was therefore obliged to surrender at discretion, repeat the words like a good boy, or ghost, and depart to his watery limbo. What would have happened to him if the exorcist had not let him go, and he had been caught either by the dawn or cock-crowing, is not stated, but it must have been something terrible, though nameless. It is difficult to imagine such a tale being meant seriously to be believed. Yet not many years ago a gentleman in North Devon having a haunted farm which he was unable on that account to let, had recourse to the ingenious expedient of calling in a number of clergymen, who exorcised the ghost, and having driven it down to the seashore, allotted the usual task of tying up a sheaf of sand with a sand rope, and carrying it to the top of a cliff which overhung the shore to the height of 600 feet. A cave happened opportunely to be at the foot of the cliff, which was probably the reason why that particular locality was chosen, and when the wind and tide were high, the noise made by the breakers dashing through the cavern was fully believed by the natives to be the moaning of the ghost over his impossible task. Somehow or another, either the knot of exorcism was not tied quite fast enough, or the ghost was a kind of spiritual Davenport or Maskelyne, but he was supposed to have got free from his task and to be rapidly moving up hill to his old quarters, and an apprehension prevailed that it might become necessary to go through the ceremony of exorcism a second time! Whether this troublesome ghost was again

laid, and if so, with what result, I have not heard. Similarly in another locality, not far from the above,[1] there dwelt an old labourer and his wife in a cottage near a pool, which was supposed to be haunted, though nobody even in that district ever pretended to have seen anything, but this legend, coupled with the fact that the poor old man was in the habit of comforting himself with singing Wesley's hymns when he could not sleep through rheumatism, caused himself and wife to be set down as wizard and witch respectively, and to such an extent did this belief go, that there is not a doubt but that some villager or other would have shot the harmless old couple, only to do this a silver bullet was absolutely necessary, and as in the days I am speaking of the Agricultural Labourers' Union did not exist, the disposable funds were luckily not equal to so large an expenditure of capital for any purpose however laudable.

We are apt to laugh at the superstition of former times, but I do not know that we have so much to boast of ourselves. Paracelsus, Cardan, and other visionary philosophers, though incapable of reasoning correctly, or of restraining the flights of their imagination, were men of talent—not to say genius—and learning, which is certainly more than can be said of Cagliostro, and even possibly of Mesmer. Astrological almanacs *à la* Lilly still find abundant sale; if Catherine de Medicis and Wallenstein had their astrologers, Napoleon had Mdlle. Le Normand, and Alexander I. a mystical lady, whose name I forget, and who persuaded him to found the Holy Alliance—which really was in its inception an alliance against the atheistical and blasphemous doctrines of the Revolution—if the sixteenth century believed in Nostradamus, a good many towards the end of the nineteenth believe in Mother Shipton. Delrio and Wiertz are fairly matched by Mrs Crowe,[2] while mesmerism, spiritualism, animal magnetism, table turning, and the latest development, thought-reading, to say nothing of the fact that there are very few people who have not their pet ghosts when once you succeed in "drawing them out," do not constitute a very high claim for immunity from superstition; moreover, I do not believe that any of the charlatans of the period of which I have been treating, ever hit on a more absurd mode of divining the future than by making use of a small piece of slit wood with two wheels at one end and the stump of a pencil at the other [Planchette].

Reverting to Robert Fludd, or "De Fluctibus," the mention of this celebrated man brings me not unnaturally to the Rosicrucians or Brothers of the Rosy Cross, an impalpable fraternity of which he is known to have been a follower and defender, and by some has been supposed to have been the second, if not the actual founder. The celebrity of, and the mystery attached to this sect, together with the circumstances of its having by some been especially connected with Freemasonry, will, I trust, warrant my entering with some degree of minutiæ into the subject.

The fullest account we have, although we may differ from its conclusions, is contained in the essay of Professor J. G. Buhle, of which a German version appeared in 1804,[3] being an enlargement of a dissertation originally composed in Latin, and read by him before the

[1] The remark of a learned writer, that the further *West* he proceeded, the more convinced he was that the wise men came from the *East*, will here occur to the judicious reader.

[2] The Night Side of Nature, 1848.

[3] Ueber den Ursprung und die Vornehmsten Schicksale des Ordens der Rosenkreuzer und Friemaurer, *i.e.*, On the Origin and the Principal Events of the Orders of Rosicrucians and Freemasons.

Philosophical Society of Göttingen A.D. 1803. This work was attacked by Nicolai in 1806, and in 1824 De Quincey published an abridgment of it in the "London Magazine,"[1] under the title of "Historico-critical Inquiry into the Origin of the Rosicrucians and the Freemasons."

Professor Buhle's work, which extended over more than 400 pages, has been cut down by De Quincey to about 90, but in such a manner as to render it often very difficult to detect what is due to Buhle and what to De Quincey,[2] and it is to this abridgment that I shall have recourse mainly for the following sketch of the rise and progress of Rosicrucianism. I must first, however, state the main argument. Denying the derivation of the order from the Egyptian, Greek, Persian, or Chaldean mysteries, or even from the Jews and Arabs, the writer asserts (and herein both Buhle and De Quincey are certainly in agreement) that though individual Cabbalists, Alchemists, etc., doubtless existed long previously, yet that no organised body made its appearance before the rise of the Rosicrucian sect, strictly so called, towards the beginning of the sixteenth century, when it was founded really accidentally by Andreä; that Fludd, becoming enamoured of its doctrines, took it up in earnest, and that hence the sect, which never assumed any definite form abroad, became organised in England under the new name of Freemasonry; he then goes on to show the points of resemblance between the two,[3] which in his idea proves relationship. The essay concludes with a long dissertation disproving the assertion of Nicolai, that Masonry was established to promote the Restoration of Charles II., and another theory sometimes advanced, which derives its origin from the Templars, neither of which requires serious, if any, refutation.

His conclusions are—

1. The original Freemasons were a society that arose out of the Rosicrucian mania between 1633 and 1646, their object being magic in the Cabbalistic sense, *i.e.*, the occult wisdom transmitted from the beginning of the world and matured by Christ [when it could no longer be occult, but this by the way], to communicate this when they had it, and to search for it when they had it not, and both under an oath of secresy.

2. This object of Freemasonry was represented under the form of Solomon's Temple, as a type of the true Church, whose corner-stone is Christ. The Temple is to be built of men, or living stones; and it is for magic to teach the true method of this kind of building. Hence all Masonic symbols either refer to Solomon's Temple or are figurative modes of expressing magic in the Rosicrucian sense.

3. The Freemasons having once adopted symbols, etc., from the art of Masonry, to which they were led by the language of Scripture, went on to connect themselves in a certain degree with the order itself of handicraft masons, and adopted their distribution of members into apprentices, journeymen, and masters. — Christ is the Grand Master, and was put to death whilst laying the foundation of the Temple of human nature.

[1] Vol. ix. Reprinted in his collected works, 1863-71; vol. xvi. (Suspiria de Profundis).

[2] De Quincey's vanity and conceit are most amusing, surpassing even the wide latitude usually allowed to a literary man. *E.g.*, "I have done what I could to remedy these infirmities of the book; and, upon the whole, it is a good deal less paralytic than it was"—again, "I have so whitewashed the Professor, that nothing but a life of gratitude on his part, and free admission to his logic lectures for ever, can possibly repay me for my services" (Preface).

[3] According to the Professor, "it was a distinguishing feature of the Rosicrucians and Freemasons that *they* first conceived the idea of a Society which should act on the principle of religious toleration."

This is the theory of Buhle and De Quincey, which is plausible but untenable, especially when confronted with the stern logic of facts, as I shall hereafter have occasion to show. But to return to the history, such as it is, of the Rosicrucians.[1]

Towards the close of the sixteenth century, Cabbalism, Theosophy, and Alchemy had overspread the whole of Western Europe, and more especially, as might have been expected, Germany. No writer had contributed more to this mania than Paracelsus, and amongst other things which excited deep interest, was a prophecy of his to the effect, that soon after the death of the Emperor Rudolph II.—who was himself deeply infected—there would be found three treasures that had never been revealed before that time. Accordingly, shortly after his death, in or about 1610, occasion was taken to publish three books. The first was the "Universal Reformation of the whole wide World,"[2] a tale not altogether devoid of humour. The seven wise men of Greece, together with M. Cato, Seneca, and a secretary, Mazzonius, are summoned to Delphi by Apollo, at the desire of Justinian, to deliberate on the best mode of redressing human misery. Thales advises to cut a hole in every man's breast; Solon suggests communism; Chilo (being a Spartan) the abolition of gold and silver; Cleobulus, on the contrary, that of iron; Pittacus insists on more rigorous laws; but Periander replies that there never had been any scarcity of these, but much want of men to obey them. Bias would have all bridges broken down, mountains made insurmountable, and navigation totally forbidden, so that all intercourse between the nations of the earth should cease. Cato, who probably preferred drinking,

"Narratur et prisci Catonis
Sæpe virtus caluisse mero."[3]

wished to pray for a new deluge, which should sweep away all the women, and at the same time introduce some new arrangement by means of which the species should be continued without their aid.[4] This exasperates the entire assembly, and they proceed to fall on their

[1] Besides the Spanish Illuminati of the sixteenth century, who seemed to have derived their ideas from the works of Lully, which never had much influence out of Spain, and which sect, having been suppressed by the Inquisition, reappeared not long after at Seville, when, being about contemporary, they were confounded with the Rosicrucians. There was a somewhat similar sect, at an earlier date (1525), in the Low Countries and Picardy, headed by two artisans, named Quentin and Cossin. There arose also A.D. 1586, a Militia crucifera evangelica, who assembled first at Luneburg, and are sometimes confounded with the Rosicrucians. They were, however, nothing more than a party of extreme Protestants, whose brains became overheated with apocalyptic visions, and whose object was exclusively connected with religion. Our chief knowledge of them is derived from one Simon Studion, a mystic and theosophist who got himself into some trouble with alchemy, and more with heresy. He was born at Urach in Wurtemberg 1565, and, having graduated at Tübingen, settled as a teacher at Marbach. His work, "Naometria," which contains the information above mentioned, appears to be a farrago of the ordinary class, and has apparently never been printed.

[2] This, the first of the three, was borrowed, if not translated verbatim, from the "Generale Riforma dell'Universo dai sette Savii della Grecia e da altri Letterati, publicato di ordine di Apollo" ("The General Reform of the Universe by the Seven Sages of Greece and other Literati, published by the orders of Apollo"), which occurs in the "Ragualio di Parnasso" of Boccalini, who was cudgelled to death in 1613 (Mazzuchelli, Scrittori d'Italia, vol. ii., pt. iii., p. 1378). So far Buhle, who says that there was an edition of the first "Centuria" in 1612. But as even the "Fama" is generally supposed to have an earlier date, for the actual time of its appearance is uncertain, it is possible that the Italian work was derived from the German. I shall not venture an opinion, nor is the subject of any vital importance.

[3] "And the virtue of the ancient Cato is said to have been often preserved by old wine" (Horace).

[4] See Milton's Paradise Lost, Book X.

knees and pray that "the lovely race of woman might be preserved, and the world saved from a second deluge." Which seems to have been about the only sensible thing they did. Finally, the advice of Seneca prevailed, namely, to form a new society out of all ranks, having for its object the general welfare of mankind, which was to be pursued in secret.[1] This was not carried without great debate and many doubts as to its success, but the matter was at length decided by the appearance of "the Age," who appeared before them in person, and described the wretched state of his health, and his generally desperate condition. Whatever success this *jeu d'esprit* may have had in its day, it has long been forgotten, and is now interesting only as having been a kind of precursor of the far more celebrated "Fama."

John Valentine Andreä, a celebrated theologian of Wurtemberg, and known also as a satirist and poet, is generally supposed to have been its author, although Burk has excluded it from the catalogue of his works. He was born 1586 at Herrenberg, and his zeal and talents enabled him early to accumulate an extraordinary amount of learning. Very early, also, in life he seems to have conceived a deep sense of the evils and abuses of the times, not so much in politics as in philosophy, morals, and religion, which he sought to redress by means of secret societies. As early as his sixteenth year he wrote his "Chemical Nuptials of Christian Rosy Cross," his "Julius, sive de Politia," his "Condemnation of Astrology," together with several other works of similar tendency. Between 1607-1612 he travelled extensively through Germany, France, Italy, and Switzerland, a practice he long continued, and even during the horrors of the Thirty Years' war exerted himself in founding schools and churches throughout Bohemia, Corinthia, and Moravia.[2] He died in 1654. "From a close review of his life and opinions," says Professor Buhle—and in his account of Andreä we may, I think, follow him with confidence—"I am not only satisfied that he wrote the three works (including the 'Confession,' which is a supplement to the 'Fama'), but I see why he wrote them." The evils of Germany were enormous, and to a young man such as Andreä was, when he commenced what we must admit to be his Quixotic enterprise, their cure might seem easy, especially with the example of Luther before him, and it was with this idea that he endeavoured to organise the Rosicrucian societies, to which, in an age of Theosophy, Cabbalism, and Alchemy, he added what he knew would prove a bait. "Many would seek to connect themselves with this society for aims which were indeed illusions, and from these he might gradually select the more promising as members of the real society. On this view of Andreä's real intentions

[1] It would have been more consonant with the character of this glib philosopher, who made nearly two millions and a half sterling by his profession of court philosopher, and who was a kind of philosophic Square on a gigantic scale, if he had proposed an universal loan society. The sudden recall of his loan of £400,000 was one of the main causes of the revolt of the unhappy Boadicea.

[2] Andreä was a very copious writer. The titles of his works amount to nearly 100. In many of these he strongly advocates the necessity of forming a society solely devoted to the regeneration of knowledge and manners, and in his "Menippus," 1617, he points out the numerous defects which in his own time prevented religion and literature from being as useful as they might be rendered under a better organisation. Of Robert Fludd, who was, notwithstanding all his extravagances, a very learned, able, and ingenious man, we have yet no sufficient biography. There is a short sketch of his life in the "Athenæ Oxonienses;" and Isaac Disraeli has agreeably skimmed the subject in his "Amenities of Literature," but that is all. [Abridged from a note in the "Diary" of Dr Worthington, published 1847 by the Chetham Society, a work useful only for two things—first, as showing the utterly trivial nature of the majority of the publications of book societies; secondly, as forming a vehicle for the valuable occasional notes of a very learned editor, the late James Crossley.]

we understand at once the ground of the contradictory language which he held about astrology and the transmutation of metals; his satirical works show that he looked through the follies of his age with a penetrating eye."[1] Buhle goes on to say, why did he not at once avow his books, and answers that to have done so at once would have defeated his scheme, and that afterwards he found it prudent to remain in obscurity. I do not myself see how an anonymous publication at first would have helped him, but if he were merely throwing up a straw he was right to conceal his name, and the storm of obliquy, excitement, hostility, and suspicion which followed shortly after, showed the wisdom and prudence of such a course. More than this, as a suspected person he even joined in public the party of those who ridiculed the whole as a chimera. But we nowhere find in his posthumous memoirs that he disavows the works;[2] and indeed the fact of his being the avowed author of the "Chemical Nuptials of Christian Rosy-Cross," a worthy never before heard of, ought of itself to be sufficient. Some, indeed, have denied his claim; for instance, Heidegger, who, in his "Historia Vitæ J. L. Fabricii," gives the work to Jung, a mathematician of Hamburg, on the authority of Albert Fabricius, who reported the story casually as derived from a secretary of the Court of Heidelberg. Others have claimed it for Giles Gutmann, for no other reason than that he was a celebrated mystic. Morhof has a remark, which, if true, might leave indeed Andreä in possession of the authorship without ascribing to him any influence in the formation of the order. "Not only," he says, "were there similar colleges of occult wisdom in former times, but in the[3] last, *i.e.*, the sixteenth century, the fame of the Rosicrucian fraternity became celebrated." But this is, at least, as far as I know, no sort of proof of this assertion, and the concurrent testimony of all who have written on the subject certainly is that the fraternity of Rosicrucians, if it ever existed at all, is never mentioned before the publication of the "Fama," in spite of isolated societies, such as that of Cornelius Agrippa in England, or of individual enthusiasts who pursued their dreams perhaps with more or less communication with one another. Moreover, the armorial bearings of Andreä's family were a St Andrew's Cross and four roses. By the order of the Rosy Cross he therefore means an order founded by himself—Christianus Rosæ Crucis, the Christian, which he certainly was, of the Rosy Cross.[4]

But so simple an explanation will not suit a numerous class of writers, for the love of mystery being implanted in human nature never wholly dies out, though it often changes its *venue*, and some, such as Nicolai, have considered the rose as the emblem of secrecy (hence under the rose, *sub rosa*), and the cross to signify the solemnity of the oath by which the vow of secrecy was ratified, hence we should have the fraternity of, or

[1] So far Buhle, but Andreä never seems to have made any effort to carry out the deep—not to say far-fetched—design here imputed to him. Many have thought the "Fama" a mere satire, to those who read it carefully it will appear a straw thrown up to ascertain which way the wind was blowing.

[2] Sir Philip Francis, in his later days, was most anxious to be thought the author of "Junius," going so far as to present his second wife, the great-aunt of my informant, with no other bridal gift—much, probably, to that lady's annoyance—than a copy of "Junius," magnificently bound in gilt vellum; to my mind, a tolerably conclusive proof against him. We do not hear of Colonel Barrè or Lord Grenville, both of whom are much more likely candidates for the somewhat doubtful honour, stooping to such tricks. Pitt, who was the soul of veracity, and who, by his mother's side, was a Grenville, said: "I *know* who the author of 'Junius' was, and he was *not* Francis."

[3] Fuere non priscis tantum seculis collegia talia occulta, sed et superiori seculo, *i.e.*, sexto decimo, de Fraternitate Rosæ Crucis fama percrebuit (Polyhist I., p. 131, ed. Lubecæ 1732).

[4] Like the Knight of the Fetterlock.

bound by the oath of silence, which is reasonable and grammatical if it were only true. But Mosheim[1] says that "the title of Rosy Cross was given to chymists who united the study of religion and chymistry, and that the term is alchemical, being not *rosa*, a rose, but *ros*,[2] dew. Of all natural bodies, *dew* is the most powerful dissolvent of gold, and a *cross* in the language of the fire philosophers, is the same as *lux*, light, because the figure of the cross X exhibits all the three letters of the word *lux* at one view. They called *lux* the *seed* or *menstruum* of the *Red Dragon*," or that gross and corporeal light, which, being properly digested and modified, produces gold. A *Rosicrucian* philosopher, therefore, is one who, by means of *dew*, seeks for light, *i.e.*, for the *Philosopher's Stone*—which, by the way, the Rosicrucians always denied to be their great aim, in fact, although they boasted of many secrets, they always maintained that this was the least. The other versions are false and deceptive, having been given by chemists who were fond of concealment. The true import of the title was perceived (or imagined to be so) by Gassendi in his "Examen Philosophiæ Fluddianæ," and better still, by the celebrated French physician Rènaudot in his "Conférences Publiques," iv. 87.

Many of these derivations are plausible enough, but unfortunately the genitive of *ros*, dew, is *roris*, so that the fraternity would in this case have been *roric*rucians.[3]

Soane, while admitting the family arms of Andreä, says, "The rose was, however, an ancient religious symbol, and was carried by the Pope in his hand when walking in procession on Mid Lent Sunday, and was worn at one time by the English clergy in their button holes."[4] Fuller, in his "Pisgah sight of Palestine," calls Christ "that prime rose and lily." "Est rosa flos Veneris" (the rose is the flower of Venus), because it represents the generative power "typified by Venus"—though how or why, except because exercised *sub rosa*, it is hard to conjecture? Ysnextie, the Holy Virgin of the Mexicans, is said to have sinned by eating roses, which roses are elsewhere termed *fructo del arbol*. Vallancey, in his "Collectanea de Rebus Hibernicis," giving the proper names of men derived from trees, states: "Susan lilium vel rosa uxor Joacim;" and after relating what Mosheim had said as above, he goes on to say that Theodoretus, Bishop of Cyrus in Syria, asserts that Ros was by the Gnostics deemed

[1] Ecclesiastical History, vol. iii., pp. 216, 217.

[2] Why not "*rhos*," in Welsh "a marsh," which, to a certain extent, is the same thing, both having to do with dampness and moisture. It is a pity that so promising an opportunity for bringing in the Druids has hitherto been neglected; but I do not despair yet of seeing it utilised. Perhaps some may take the hint.

[3] Vaughan says: "The derivation of the name Rosicrucian from *ros* and *crux*, rather than *rosa* and *crux*, is untenable. By rights, the word, if from *rosa*, should no doubt be Rosacrucian; but such a malformation, by no means uncommon, cannot outweigh the reasons adduced on behalf of the generally-received etymology" (Hours with the Mystics, 1856, vol. ii., p. 350). The elder Disraeli observes: "Mosheim is positive in the accuracy of his information. I would not answer for my own, though somewhat more reasonable; it is indeed difficult to ascertain the origin of the name of a society which probably never had an existence" (Amenities of Literature, 1841, vol. iii., p. 230). Fuller's amusing explanation of the term "Rosa-Crusian" was written without any knowledge of the supposititious founder. He says: "Sure I am that a Rose is the sweetest of Flowers, and a Cross accounted the sacredest of forms and figures, so that much of eminency must be imported in their composition" (Worthies of England, 1662). According to Godfrey Higgins, "Nazareth, the town of Nazir, or Ναζωραιος, 'the flower,' was situated in Carmel, the vineyard or garden of God. Jesus was a flower; whence came the adoration, by the Rossicrucians, of the Rose and Cross, which Rose was *Ras*, and this *Ras*, or knowledge, or wisdom, was stolen from the garden, which was also crucified, as he literally is, on the red cornelian, the emblem of the Rossicrucians—a Rose on a Cross" (Anacalypsis, vol. ii., p. 240). See further, Brucker, *op. cit.*, vol. iv., p. 735; and Arnold, Kirchen und Ketzen Historie, pt. ii., p. 1114.

[4] New Curiosities of Literature, 1848, vol. ii., p. 37.

symbolical of Christ. "By dew is confessed the Godhead of the Lord Jesus."[1] The Sethites and the Ophites, as the emblematical serpent worshippers were called, held that the dew which fell from the excess of light was *wisdom*, the hermaphrodite deity.

I quote the two above passages at length, as melancholy instances of learning, talent, and ingenuity run mad, and to show to what extent a vivid imagination, a want of sound judgment, and cool, clear, common sense, coupled with the vanity of displaying learning generally irrelevant, and often unreal, and ingenuity as perverted as it is misplaced, will lead men of the greatest talents and even genius. The more one reads, the more one will be apt to parody, with De Quincey, the famous words of Oxenstiern, and say, "Go forth and learn with what disregard of logic most books are written." The faults and foibles I have above enumerated have, I really believe, done more harm to the cause of true learning than all other causes and hindrances put together.

Maier, an upholder of the fraternity, in his "Themis Aureâ,"[2] denies that R. C. meant either ros, rosa, or crux, and contends that they were merely chosen as a mark of distinction, *i.e.*, arbitrarily. But a man must have *some reason*, however slight, for choosing anything, and the fact of the rose and cross forming his family arms must surely have been enough for Andreä. Arnold also[3] says that in the posthumous writings of M. C. Hirshen, pastor at Eisleben, it has been found that John Arne informed him in confidence, as a near friend and former colleague, how he had been told by John Valentine Andreä, also in confidence, that he, namely Andreä, with thirty others in Wurtemberg, had first set forth the "Fama," in order that under this screen they might learn the judgment of Europe thereon, as also what lovers of true wisdom lay concealed here and there who might then come forward.[4] There is a further circumstance connected with the "Fama," which, though it certainly does not prove it to have been a fiction of Andreä's, establishes with tolerable clearness that it was a fiction of some one's, and that is, that in the contemporary life of the famous Dominican John Tauler,[5] who flourished in the fourteenth century, mention is made of one Master Nicolas, or rather one supposed to be Master Nicolas, for he is always referred to as the "Master," who instructed Tauler in mystic religion—meaning thereby not mysticism in the ordinary sense, but the giving one's self up to "being wrapped up in," and endeavouring to be absorbed in, God. This mysterious individual, who is supposed to have been a merchant at Bâsle, really existed, and he did actually found a small fraternity, the members of which travelled from country to country, observing, nevertheless, the greatest secrecy, even to concealing from each other their place of sepulture, but who had also a common house where the master dwelt towards the end of his life, and who subsisted in the same silence, paucity of numbers, and secrecy, long after his death, protesting, as he did, against the errors and abuses

[1] Theod. Quæst. in Genes., cap. XXVII., Interrog. 82, p. 91, Tom. i. Halæ 1772.

[2] Themis Aurea, Hoc est de legibus fraternitatis Rosæ Crucis, Francfort, 1618. Translated into English, and published with a dedication to Elias Ashmole, in 1656. Of the author's connection with the Rosicrucians, it has been observed: "Maier fut certainement un des initiés ou plutôt des dupes, puisqu'il a eu la bonhomie de rédiger leurs lois, leurs coutumes, et qu'il a pris leur défense dans un de ses ouvrages" (Biographie Universelle, Paris, 1820, t. 26, p. 282).

[3] Kirchen und Ketzer Historie, p. 899.

[4] As the result proved, they were wise to commence in secrecy, and equally wise to remain so.

[5] *Cf.* Life and Times of Tauler, translated by Susannah Winkworth, 1857; and K. Schmidt, Nikolaus von Basel, Bericht von der Bekehrung Taulers, Strasburg, 1875.

of Rome, until the remnant was finally swallowed up in the vortex of the Reformation. The date of the "Master" anticipates by not much more than half a century the birth of the supposed C. R., and the two stories altogether bear so many points of close resemblance, that we shall be, I think, quite justified in concluding, without for a moment tracing any real connection, which I am very far indeed from supposing to have ever existed, that Andreä, who was not only a man of very great learning, but a countryman also of the "Master" and his disciples, knew of and adapted the story for his "Fama," in the same way as he did that of Boccalini for his "Reformation." The name was suggested by his coat of arms, and it so happens that it forms a by no means uncommon German patronymic—Rosecranz, Rosencranz, Rosecreutz, which would of course be Latinised into Rosæ Crucis.[1] Assuming then, as I think may safely be done, that the "Fama" and "Confessio" at least, if not the "Reformatio" as well, were the works of Andreä, and leaving aside all speculations of their having had an earlier origin, and of the mystical nature of the name as being either the work of imagination run mad, or the vanity of learning and ingenuity exhibiting themselves for learning and ingenuity's sake, let us now follow the fortunes of the works, and the results which sprang from them.[2]

Though the precise date of its first appearance is not exactly known, yet it was certainly not later than 1610, and the repeated editions which appeared between 1614 and 1617, and still more the excitement that followed, show how powerful was the effect produced. "In the library at Göttingen there exists a body of letters addressed between these years to the imaginary order by persons offering themselves as members. As qualifications most assert their skill in alchemy and Cabbalism, and though some of the letters are signed with initials only, or with names evidently fictitious, yet real places of address are assigned"—the reason for their being at Göttingen is that, as many indeed assert, unable to direct their communications rightly, they had no choice but to address their letters to some public body "to be called for," as it were, and, having once come to the University, there they remained. Others threw out pamphlets containing their opinions of the order, and of its place of residence, which, as Vaughan says in his "Hours with the Mystics," was in reality under Dr Andreä's hat. "Each successive writer claimed to be better informed than his predecessors. Quarrels arose; partisans started up on all sides; the uproar and confusion became indescribable; cries of heresy and atheism resounded from every corner; some were for calling in the secular power; and the more coyly the invisible society retreated from the public advances, so much the more eager were its admirers, so much the more blood-thirsty its antagonists." Some, however, seem to have suspected the truth from the first, and hence a suspicion arose that some bad designs lurked under the seeming purpose, a suspicion which was not unnaturally

[1] This pedantic fashion of Latinising and Grecising names lasted for a century and a half. Reuchlin was induced by the entreaties of a friend, who was shocked at the barbarism of his German appellation, to turn it into Capnio. It should have been Καπνος, the Greek for smoke, but I suppose the fact of the friend's being an Italian will account for it. I am not sure that it was an improvement, but Melancthon (Μελανχθων or *Black earth*) certainly is an improvement on Schwarzerd. So Fludd calls himself De Fluctibus, which is wrong in sense and grammar. He was *Fluctus* or *Diluvium*, not *De Fluctibus*. His works certainly were drawn out of the flood, but he himself never emerged in the ark of common sense from the overwhelming waves of fancy and irrational speculation.

[2] It is contended by some fanciful commentators, that the words which stand at the end of the "Fama"—Sab Umbrâ Alarum tuarum Jehova—furnish the initial letters of Johannes Val. Andreæ Stipendiata Tubingensis!

strengthened, for many impostors, as might have been expected, gave themselves out as Rosicrucians, and cheated numbers out of their money by alchemy, and out of their health and money together by quack medicines. Three, in particular, made a great noise at Wetzlar, Nuremberg, and Augsburg, of whom one lost his ears in running the gauntlet, and another was hanged. At this crisis Andreas Libau or Libavius attacked the pretended fraternity with great power by two works in Latin and one in German, published in 1615 and the following year, at Frankfort and at Erfurt respectively, and these, together with others of a like tendency, might have stopped the mischief had it not been for two causes—first, the coming forward of the old Paracelsists, who avowed themselves to be the true Rosicrucians in numerous books and pamphlets which still further distracted the public mind; secondly, the conduct of Andreä himself and his friends, who kept up the delusion by means of two pamphlets—(1.) Epistola ad Reverendam Fraternitatem R. Crucis. Fran. 1613; (2.) Assertio Fraternitatis R. C. à quodam Fratern. ejus Socio carmine expressa—Defence of the R. C. brethren by a certain anonymous brother, written in the form of a poem. This last was translated into German in 1616, and again in 1618, under the title of "Ara Fœderis Therapici," or the Altar of the Healing Fraternity—the most general abstraction of the pretensions made for the Rosicrucians being that they healed both the body and the mind.[1]

The supposed Fraternity was, however, defended in Germany by some men not altogether devoid of talent, such as Julianus à Campis, Julius Sperber of Anhalt Dessau, whose "Echo" of the divinely illuminated order of the R. C., if it be indeed his, was printed in 1615, and again at Dantzig in 1616, and who asserted that as esoteric mysteries had been taught from the time of Adam down to Simeon, so Christ had established a new "college of magic," and that the greater mysteries were revealed to St John and St Paul. Radtich Brotoffer was not so much a Cabbalist as an Alchemist, and understood the three Rosicrucian books as being a description of the art of making gold and finding the philosopher's stone. He even published a receipt for the same, so that both "materia et præparatio lapidis aurei," the ingredients and the mode of mixing the golden stone, were laid bare to the profane. It might have been thought that so audacious a stroke would have been sufficient to have ruined him, but, as often happens, the very audacity of the attempt carried him through, for his works sold well and were several times reprinted.[2] A far more important person was Michael Maier, who had been in England, and was the friend of Fludd. He was born at Rendsberg in Holstein in 1568, and was

[1] Andreä probably refers to the enjoyment of the hoax he had so effectually carried out in the "Mythologia Christiana," published at Strasburg in 1619, speaking under the name of Truth (die Alethia)—"Planissime nihil cum hac fraternitate commune habeo. Nam cum, paullo ante lusum quendam ingeniosiorem personatus aliquis in literario pro vellet agere,—nihil mota sum libellis inter se conflictantibus; sed velut in scenâ prodeuntes histriones non sine voluptate spectavi." "It is very clear that I have nothing in common with this fraternity, for when, not long ago, a certain person wished to start a rather more ingenious farce than usual in the republic of letters, I held aloof from the battle of books, and, as if on a stage, watched the actors with delight." He was perfectly right, Truth had nothing to do with the Fraternity, the controversy, or the combatants.

[2] It is said of the famous Sir Thomas Browne that when dining one day with the Archbishop, I think he was Abbot at Lambeth, he met, amongst others, a gentleman who related that in Germany he had seen a man make gold, and that, unless he had actually seen it, he confessed that he should not have believed it, but that, nevertheless, so it was. Some one, half in joke, remarked that he wondered that he should venture to relate such things at his Grace's table (seeing that they savoured of magic), and before so learned a man as Sir T. Browne, asking, at the same time, the latter what he thought of it—"Why," said Sir Thomas, in his thick huddling manner, "I am of the same opinion as the gentleman, he says that he would not have believed it unless he had seen it, neither will I."

physician to the Emperor Rudolph II., who, as has before been observed, was possessed with the mystical mania. He died at Magdebourg in 1622. His first work on this subject is the "Jocus Severus," Franc. 1617, addressed "omnibus veræ chymiæ amantibus per Germaniam," and especially to those "illi ordini adhuc *delitescenti*, ut Famâ Fraternitatis et Confessione suâ admirandâ et probabili *manifestato*"—"To that sect, which is still secret, but which, nevertheless, is made known by the Famâ and its admirable and reasonable Confession." This work, it appears, was written in England, and the dedication composed on his journey from England to Bohemia. Returning, he endeavoured to belong to the sect, so firmly did he believe in it, but, finding this of course impossible, he endeavoured to found such an order by his own efforts, and in his subsequent writings spoke of it as already existing, going so far even as to publish its laws—which, indeed, had already been done by the author of the "Echo." From his principal work, the [1] "Silentium post Clamores," we may gather his view of Rosicrucianism —"Nature is yet but half unveiled. What we want is chiefly experiment and tentative inquiry. Great, therefore, are our obligations to the R. C. for labouring to supply this want. Their weightiest mystery is a Universal Medicine. Such a Catholicon lies hid in nature. It is, however, no simple, but a very compound, medicine. For, out of the meanest pebbles and weeds, medicine and *even gold* is to be extracted." Again—"He that doubts the existence of the R. C. should recollect that the Greeks, Egyptians, Arabians, etc., had such secret societies; where, then, is the absurdity in their existing at this day? Their maxims of self-discipline are these—To honour and fear God above all things; to do all the good in their power to their fellow-men, etc." "What is contained in the Fama and Confessio is true. It is a very childish objection that the brotherhood have promised so much and performed so little. With them, as elsewhere, many are called, but few chosen. The masters of the order hold out the rose as a remote prize, but they impose the cross on those who are entering." "Like the Pythagoreans and Egyptians, the Rosicrucians exact vows of silence and secrecy. Ignorant men have treated the whole as a fiction; but this has arisen from the five years' probation to which they subject even well qualified novices before they are admitted to the higher mysteries; within this period they are to learn how to govern their tongues." Theophilus Schweighart of Constance, Josephus Stellatus, and Giles Gutmann were Will o' the Wisps of an inferior order, and deserve no further mention.

Andreä now began to think that the joke had been carried somewhat too far, or rather perhaps that the scheme which had thought to have started for the reformation of manners and philosophy had taken a very different turn from that which he had intended, and therefore, hoping to ridicule them, he published his "Chemical Nuptials of Christian Rosy Cross," which had hitherto remained in MS., though written as far back as 1602. This is a comic romance of extraordinary talent, designed as a satire on the whole tribe of Theosophists, Alchemists, Cabbalists, etc., with which at that time Germany swarmed. Unfortunately the

[1] "Silentium post Clamores, hoc est Tractatus Apologeticus, quo causæ non solum Clamorum (seu revelationum) Fraternitatis Germanicæ de R. C. sed et Silentii (seu non redditæ, ad singulorum vota responsionis) traduntur et demonstrantur. Autore Michaële Maiero Imp. Consist. Comite et Med. Doct., Francof, 1617." "Silence after sound, that is an apology, in which are given and proved the reason not only for the sounds (clamours), i.e., revelations of the German fraternity of the R. C., but also of their silence, i.e., of their not having replied to the wishes of individuals. By Michael Maier (or, as it is sometimes written, Mayer), Count of the Imperial Consistory, and Doctor of Medicine, Frankfort, 1617."

public took the whole "au grand sérieux." Upon this, in the following year, he published a collection of satirical dialogues under the title of "Menippus; sive dialogorum satyricorum centuria, inanitatum nostratium Speculum"—"A century of satyric dialogues designed as a mirror for our follies." In this he more openly reveals his true design—revolution of method in the arts and sciences, and a general religious reformation. He seems, in fact, to have been a dreamy and excessively inferior kind of German Bacon. His efforts were seconded by his friends, especially Irenæus Agnostus and Joh. Val. Alberti. Both wrote with great energy against the Rosicrucians, but the former, from having ironically styled himself an unworthy clerk of the Fraternity of the R. C., has been classed by some as a true Rosicrucian. But they were placed in a still more ludicrous light by the celebrated Campanella, who, though a mystic himself, found the Rosicrucian pretensions rather more than he could tolerate. In his work on the Spanish Monarchy, written whilst a prisoner at Naples, a copy of which, finding its way by some means into Germany, was there published and greatly read (1620), we find him thus expressing himself of the R. C.: "That the whole of Christendom teems with such heads" (Reformation jobbers)—a most excellent expression, but this by the way—"we have one proof more than was wanted in the Fraternity of the R. C. For, scarcely was that absurdity hatched, when—notwithstanding it was many times declared to be nothing more than a 'lusus ingenii nimium lascivientis,' a 'mere hoax of some man of wit troubled with a superfluity of youthful spirits;' yet because it dealt in reformations and pretences to mystical arts—straightway from every country in Christendom pious and learned men, passively surrendering themselves dupes to this delusion, made offers of their good wishes and services—some by name, others anonymously, but constantly maintaining that the brothers of the R. C. could easily discover their names by Solomon's Mirror or other Cabbalistic means. Nay, to such a pass of absurdity did they advance, that they represented the first of the three Rosicrucian books, the 'Universal Reformation,' as a high mystery; and expounded it in a chemical sense as if it had contained a cryptical account of the art of gold making, whereas it is nothing more than a literal translation, word for word, of the 'Parnasso' of Boccalini."

After a period of no very great duration, as it would appear, they began rapidly to sink, first into contempt and then into obscurity and oblivion, and finally died out, or all but did so, for, as Vaughan justly observes, "Mysticism has no genealogy. It is a state of thinking and feeling to which minds of a certain temperament are liable at any time and place, in occident and orient, whether Romanist or Protestant, Jew, Turk, or Infidel. The same round of notions, occurring to minds of similar make under similar circumstances, is common to mystics in ancient India and in modern Christendom,"[1] and it is quite possible that there may be Rosicrucians still, though they hide their faith like people do their belief in ghosts. Not only had science, learning, and right reason made more progress, but the last waves of the storm of the Reformation had died away and men's minds had sobered down in a great measure to practical realities. As usual, rogues and impostors took advantage of whatever credulity

[1] "Hours with the Mystics," 1856, vol. i., p. 60. The following, from the same work, is also worthy of note. At the revival "of letters spread over Europe, the taste for antiquity and natural science began to claim its share in the freedom won for theology; the pretensions of the Cabbala, of Hermes, of Neo-Platonist Theurgy became identified with the cause of progress" (vol. ii., p. 30). In short, men with excited imaginations were everywhere groping and struggling in the dark—*Quid plura?*

there was, and this hastened the decay of the sect, for though there was no actual society or organisation, yet the name of Rosicrucian became a generic term embracing every species of occult pretension, arcana, elixir, the philosopher's stone, theurgic ritual, symbols, initiations *et hoc genus omne.*[1] Some few, as I have remarked, doubtless lingered. Liebnitz was in early life actually connected with a *soi-disant* society of the R. C. at Nuremberg, but he became convinced that they were not connected with any real society of that name. "Il me paroit," he says, in a letter published by Feller in the "Otium Hannoveranum," p. 222, "que tout ce, que l'on a dit des Frères de la Croix de la Rose, est une pure invention de quelque personne ingénieuse." And again, so late as 1696, he says, elsewhere—"Fratres Roseæ Crucis fictitios esse suspicor; quod et Helmontius mihi confirmavit." One of the latest notices is to be found in Spence's "Anecdotes of Books and Men,"[2] where we have the Rev. J. Spence writing to his mother from Turin under date of August 25, 1740—"Of a sett of philosophers called adepts, of whom there are never more than twelve in the whole world at one time. ∴ ∴ Free from poverty, distempers, and death"—it was unkind and selfish in the last degree to conceal such benefits from mankind at large!—"There was one of them living at Turin, a Frenchman, Audrey by name, not quite 200 years old"—who must in this case have been past 70 when he joined the original fraternity? In the same work[3] it is also stated that a story of Gustavus Adolphus having been provided with gold by one of the same class, was related by Maréchal Rhebenden to the English minister at Turin, who told it to Spence. A similar anecdote is related by John Evelyn, who, whilst at Paris in 1652, was told by "one Mark Antonio of a Genoese Jeweller who had the greate *Arcanum*, and had made projection before him severall times."[4] But the great majority were doubtless mere knaves, and whole clubs even of swindlers existed calling themselves Rosicrucians. Thus Lud. Conr. Orvius, in his "Occulta Philosophia, sive cœlum Sapientum et Vexatio Stultorum," tells us of such a society, pretending to trace from Father Rosycross, who were settled at the Hague in 1622, and who, after swindling him out of his own and his wife's fortune, amounting to about eleven thousand dollars, expelled him from the order with the assurance that they would murder him if he revealed their secrets, "which secrets," says he, "I have faithfully kept, and for the same reason that women keep secrets, viz., because I have none to

[1] See Athenæ Oxonienses, *passim*. Butler writes—

"A deep occult philosopher,
As learn'd as the wild Irish are,
He Anthroposophus, and Floud,
And Jacob Behmen, understood:
In Rosicrucian lore as learned,
As he that *Verè Adeptus* earned."

—*Hudibras*, pt. I., canto I.

[2] Ed. 1820, p. 403.

[3] P. 405. The extravagancies of earlier Rosicrucians, or of persons claiming to be such, are thus alluded to by Disraeli—"In November 1626 a rumour spread that the King was to be visited by an ambassador from the President of the Society of the Rosycross. He was, indeed, a heteroclite ambassador, for he is described—'as a youth with never a hair upon his face.' He was to proffer to His Majesty, provided the King accepted his advice, three millions to put into his coffers; and by his secret councils he was to unfold matters of moment and secresy" (Curiosities of Literature, 1849, vol. iii., p. 512).

[4] Memoirs of John Evelyn, ed. 1870, p. 217. See the life of Arthur Dee, son of the famous John Dee, of whom Wood says—"While a little boy, 'twas usual with him to play at quaits with the slates of gold made by projection, in the garret of his father's lodgings" (Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. iii., col. 285).

reveal; for their knavery is no secret."[1] After all it is not to be wondered at, for the *auri sacra* (or *vesana*) *fames* does but change its form—not its substance; and those who, not long ago, bought shares in Mr Rubery's Californian anthill, made up of rubies, emeralds, and diamonds, would doubtless have fallen an easy prey to the first Rosicrucian alchemist, and really with more excuse. Considering that there never was any real body of Rosicrucians properly so called, there could not well be any fixed principles of belief, *e.g.*, especial creed as it were; still, as the number of those who, for one reason or another, chose to call themselves Rosicrucians was doubtless very great, it may readily be imagined that certain principles may be gathered as being common to all or, at least, most of all who might happen to be of that way of thinking. Accordingly we find that Mosheim says—"It is remarkable, that among the more eminent writers of this sect, there are scarcely any two who adopt the same tenets and sentiments. There are, nevertheless, some common principles that are generally embraced, and that serve as a centre of union to the society. They all maintain that the dissolution of bodies by the power of fire is the only way through which men can arrive at true wisdom, and come to discern the first principles of things. They all acknowledge a certain analogy and harmony between the powers of nature and the doctrines of religion, and believe that the Deity governs the kingdom of grace by the same laws by which He governs the kingdom of nature; and hence it is that they employ chemical denominations to express the truths of religion. They all hold that there is a kind of divine energy, or soul, diffused through the frame of the universe, which some call *Archæus*, others the *universal spirit*, and which others mention under different appellations. They all talk in the most obscure and superstitious manner of what they call the 'signatures of things,' of the power of the stars over all corporeal beings, and their particular influence upon the human race"—here the influence of astrology peeps out—"of the efficacy of magic, and the various ranks and orders of demons."[2]

Besides the above works, we have the attack on the sect by Gabriel Naudè, who gives the Rosicrucian tenets, or what he supposes were such—but this is perhaps hardly reliable—entitled "Instruction à la France, sur la vérité de l'histoire des Frères de la Rose-Croix, Paris, 1623," and the "Conférences Publiques" of the celebrated French physician Rénaudot, tom. iv., which destroyed whatever slight chance of acceptance the Rosicrucian doctrines had in that country. Morhof, however, in his "Polyhistor," lib. i., c. 13, speaks of a diminutive society or offshoot of the parent folly, founded, or attempted to be founded, in Dauphiné by a visionary named Rosay, and hence called the Collegium Rosianum, A.D. 1630. It consisted of three persons only. A certain Mornius gave himself a great deal of trouble to be the fourth, but was rejected. All that he could obtain was to be a serving brother. The chief secrets were perpetual motion, the art of changing metals, and the universal medicine.[3]

[1] See also the story in Voltaire's "Diction. Philosph. *s.v.* Alchemiste," of a rogue who cheated the Duke de Bouillon out of 40,000 dollars by pretended Rosicrucianism, which, however, he would doubtless have lost elsewhere.

[2] Mosheim, Ecclesiastical History, edit. 1823, vol. ii., p. 164, note.

[3] I may mention also the essays of C. F. Nicolai, at whose fanciful theory I have already glanced (*ante*, Chap. I., p. 9); of C. G. Von Murr (1803), who assigns to the Freemasons and the Rosicrucians a common origin, and only fixes the date of their separation into distinct sects at the year 1633; and Solomon Semler's "Impartial Collections for the History of the Rosy Cross," Leipzig, 1786-88, which gives them a very remote antiquity; also a curious little tract entitled "Hermetischer Rosenkreutz," Frankfurt, 1747, but apparently a reprint of a much earlier work. I may here state that several Rosicrucian writings, some translated from the Latin and others not, are to be found in the Harleian MSS. (6181-86), Brit. Mus. Library.

Lastly we have the famous *jeu d'esprit* entitled "The Count de Gabalis," being a diverting history of the Rosicrucian doctrine of spirits, viz., Sylphs, Salamanders, Gnomes, and Demons, translated from the Paris edition, and printed for B. Lintott and E. Curll, in 1714. It is subjoined to Pope's "Rape of the Lock," which gave rise to a demand for this translation. The piece is said to have been written by the French Abbé de Villars, in ridicule of the German Hermetic associations, 1670, and Bayle's account of them is prefixed to the translation. I should scarcely call it a parody or a piece written in ridicule, inasmuch as the doctrines, as far as I know of them in the original Hermetic, Cabbalistic, or Rosicrucian books, are utterly incapable of being parodied in any similar way, although certainly the doctrines may have been much altered and disfigured since the commencement. The work, which is very short, is simply that of a witty and licentious French Abbé, for the diversion of the courtiers of the Grand Monarque, and the literary world by which they were surrrounded. Some say that it was founded on two Italian chemical letters written by Borri; others affirm that Borri[1] took the chief parts of the letters from it, but after discussing it, Bayle, as usual, leaves the case undecided. Gabalis is supposed to have been a German nobleman, with estates bordering on Poland, who made the acquaintance of the writer, and so far honoured him with his confidence as to explain the most occult mysteries of his art. He informed him that the elements were full of ethereal, or rather semi-ethereal beings—Sylphs, Gnomes, and Salamanders, of exquisite beauty, but unendowed with souls, which they could only obtain by union with a human being;—that there were, therefore, great numbers of these beings who were also anxious to unite themselves with those of the opposite sex among us, and that therefore there was no trouble for the initiated to obtain a husband or wife, or indeed half-a-dozen of the most exquisite, and, what is better, of the most unfading beauty, but on one condition, that they must have no union with their fellow-creatures, which indeed they would be in no hurry to have, once they had seen the others. He added, however, that numbers of these sprites, seeing the trouble into which the possession of a soul had led so many mortals, had wisely concluded that it was better to remain without one. Still it was always the case that there were large numbers pining for what they had not. Hence we see that poor Dr Faustus was very much behind the age, and not really an adept at all, since he could easily have secured the affections of a bevy of infinitely more beautiful and unchanging Marguerites, and that without the aid of so very questionable and dangerous an old matchmaker as Mephistopheles. However, we ought not to be angry with a conceit which has given us, besides the "Rape of the Lock," "Ariel," and the "Masque of Comus"—"Undine," one of the loveliest of the creations of romance, and may have aided in inspiring Madame d'Aunay, the mother of the fairy tales of our youth.

Bayle's account in the preface ends as follows: "Afterwards, that Society, which in Reality, is but a Sect of Mountebanks, began to multiply, but durst not appear publickly, and for that Reason was sir-nam'd the *Invisible*. The *Inlightned*, or *Illuminati*, of Spain proceeded from them; both the one and the other have been condemn'd for Fanatics and Deceivers. We must add, that John Bringeret printed, in 1615, a Book in Germany, which comprehends two Treatises, Entituled the 'Manifesto [Fama] and Confession of Faith of the Fraternity of the Rosicrucians in Germany.' These persons boasted themselves to be the Library of Ptolemy Philadelphus, the Academy of Plato, the Lyceum, etc., and bragg'd of extraordinary Qualifications, whereof the least

[1] Joseph Francis Borri was a famous quack, chemist, and heretic. A Milanese by birth, he was imprisoned in the Castle of St Angelo, where he died 1695, in his seventy-ninth year.

SIR E. A. H. LECHMERE BART.

PROVINCIAL GRAND MASTER OF WORCESTERSHIRE.

was that they could speak all Languages; and after, in 1622, they gave this Advertisement to the Curious: 'We, deputed by our College, the Principal of the Brethren of the ROSICRUCIANS, to make our visible and invisible Abode in this City, thro' the grace of the Most High, towards whom are turned the Hearts of the just. We teach without Books or Notes, and speak the Language of the Countries wherever we are;[1] to draw Men, like ourselves, from the Error of Death.' This Bill [which was probably a mere hoax] was Matter of Merriment. In the meantime, the Rosicrucians have dissapear'd, tho' it be not the sentiment of that German chymist, the author of a book, 'De Volucri Arboreâ,' and of another, who hath composed a treatise stiled 'De Philosophiâ Purâ.'"

But nothing can give so clear an idea of what true Rosicrucianism really was, whether an account of a sect then actually existing, or the sketch of a sect which the projector hoped to form, or to which of the two categories it belongs, than of course the "Fama" itself, and as it is either—I am not now arguing on either side—the parent or the exponent of a very celebrated denomination, and one which, in some men's minds at least, has] had considerable influence on Freemasonry, I trust that I shall be pardoned if I present an abstract as copious as my space will allow, and as accurate as my abilities will enable me to perform. The translation which I have used is "printed by J. M. for Giles Calvert, *at the Black Spread Eagle at the west end of Paul's*, 1652," and is translated by Eugenius Philalethes, "with a preface annexed thereto, and a short Declaration of their (R. C.) Physicall work." This Eugenius Philalethes was one Thomas Vaughan, B.A. of Jesus College, Oxford, born in 1621, and of whom Wood says: "He was a great chymist, a noted son of the fire, an experimental philosopher, and a zealous brother of the Rosie-Crucian fraternity."[2] He pursued his chemical studies in the first instance at Oxford, and afterwards at London under the protection and patronage of Sir Robert Moray or Murray, Knight, Secretary of State for the Kingdom of Scotland. That this distinguished soldier and philosopher was received into Freemasonry at Newcastle in 1641, has been already shown;[3] and in the inquiry we are upon, the circumstance of his being in later years both a Freemason and a Rosicrucian, will at least merit our passing attention. Moray's initiation, which preceded by five years that of Elias Ashmole, *was the first that occurred on English soil* of which any record has descended to us. In this connection, it is not a little remarkable, that whereas it has been the fashion to carry back the pedigree of speculative masonry in England, to the admission of Elias Ashmole, the Rosicrucian philosopher, the association of ideas to which this formulation of belief has given rise, will sustain no shock, but rather the reverse, by the priority of Moray's initiation. Sir Robert Moray, a founder and the first president of the Royal Society, "was universally beloved and esteemed by men of all sides and sorts;"[4] but as it is with his character as a lover of the occult sciences we are chiefly concerned, I pass over the encomiums of his friends, John Evelyn[5] and Samuel Pepys,[6]

[1] We ought not to forget that at the present day we have Irvingites in our midst who still "speak with tongues."

[2] Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. iii., col. 719.

[3] *Ante*, Chap. VIII., p. 409. For further details, see Lyon, History of the Lodge of Edinburgh, p. 96; and Lawrie, History of Freemasonry, 1804, p. 102.

[4] Burnet, vol. i., p. 90.

[5] "July 6, 1673.—This evening I went to the funerall of my deare and excellent friend, that good man and accomplish'd gentleman, Sir Robert Murray, Secretary of Scotland. He was buried by order of His Majesty in Westminster Abbey" (Evelyn's Diary). See, however, Lyon, *op. cit.*, p. 99, who names the Canongate Churchyard as the place of interment!

[6] "Feb. 16, 1667.—To my Lord Broucker; and there was Sir Robert Murrey, a most excellent man of reason and learning. Here came Mr Hooke, Sir George Ent, *Dr Wren*, and many others" (Diary of Samuel Pepys).

and shall merely adduce in this place the short description given of him by Anthony à Wood, who says, "He was a single man, an abhorrer of women, a most renowned chymist, a great patron of the Rosie-Crucians, and an excellent mathematician."[1] Whether Ashmole and Moray, who must constantly have been brought together at meetings of the Royal Society, ever conversed about the other *Society* of which they were both members, cannot of course be determined. It is not likely, however, that they did. The elder of the two "brothers" or "fellows" died in 1673, nine years before the celebrated meeting at Mason's Hall, London, which I shall more closely consider in connection with Ashmole. Had this assembly of London masons taken place many years before it did, the presence or the absence of Sir Robert Moray from such a gathering of the fraternity, might be alike suggestive of some curious speculation. In my opinion, however, Masonry in its general and widest sense—herein comprising everything partaking of an operative as well as of a speculative character—must have been at a very low ebb about the period of Moray's death, and for some few years afterwards.

It is highly improbable, that lodges were held in the metropolis with any frequency, until the process of rebuilding the capital began, after the great fire. Sir Christopher Wren, indeed, went so far as to declare, in 1716, in the presence of Hearne, that "*there were no masons in London when he was a young man.*"[2] From this it may be plausibly contended that, *if* our British Freemasonry received any tinge or colouring at the hands of Steinmetzen, Compagnons, or Rosicrucians, the last quarter of the seventeenth century is the most likely (or at least the earliest) period in which we can suppose it to have taken place. Against it, however, there is the silence of all contemporary writers, excepting Plot and Aubrey, and notably of Evelyn and Pepys, with regard to the existence of lodges, or even of Freemasonry itself. Both these latter worthies were prominent members of the Royal Society, Pepys being president in 1684, a distinction, it may be said, declined times without number by Evelyn. Wren, Locke, Ashmole, Boyle,[3] Moray, and others, who were more or less addicted to Rosicrucian studies, enjoyed the distinction of F.R.S. Two of the personages named we know to have been Freemasons, and for Wren and Locke the title has also been claimed, though, as I have endeavoured to show, without any foundation whatever in fact. Pepys, and to a greater extent Evelyn,[4] were on intimate terms with all these men. Indeed, the latter, in a letter to the Lord Chancellor, dated March 18, 1667, evinces his admiration of the fraternity of the Rosie Cross, by including the names of William Lilly, William Oughtred, and George Ripley, in his list of learned Englishmen, with whose portraits he wished Lord Cornbury to adorn his palace. On the whole, perhaps, we shall be safe in assuming, either that the persons addicted to chemical or astrological studies, whom in the seventeenth century it was the

[1] Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. iii., col. 726.

[2] Philip Bliss, Reliquiæ Hearnianiæ, vol. i., p. 336.

[3] Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. i. (Life of Anthony à Wood, p. lii.). The Oxford Antiquary himself went through "a course of chimistry under the noted chimist and Rosicrucian, Peter Sthael of Strasburgh" (*Ibid.*).

[4] John Evelyn of Sayes Court, in Kent, lived in the busy and important times of King Charles I., Oliver Cromwell, King Charles II., King James II., and King William, and he early accustomed himself to note such things as occurred which he thought worthy of remembrance. Peter the Great—to whom he lent Sayes Court,—when that prince was studying naval architecture in 1698—having no taste for horticulture,—used to amuse himself by being wheeled through his landlord's ornamental hedges, and over his borders in a wheel-barrow. *Cf.* Diary, Jan. 30, 1798; Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. iv., col. 467; and D. Lysons, Environs of London, 1792-1811, vol. iv., p. 363.

fashion to style Rosicrucians, kept aloof from the Freemasons altogether, or if the sects in any way commingled, their proceedings were wrought under an impenetrable veil of secrecy, against which even the light of modern research is vainly directed. These points may be usefully borne in mind during the progress of our inquiry, which I now resume.

Sir Robert Moray was accompanied to Oxford by Vaughan at the time of the great plague, and the latter, after taking up his quarters in the house of the rector of Albury, died there, "as it were, suddenly, when he was operating strong mercury, some of which, by chance getting up into his nose, killed him, on the 27th of February 1666."[1] He was buried in the same place, at the charge of his patron.

Vaughan was so great an admirer of Cornelius Agrippa that—to use the words of honest Anthony à Wood—"nothing could relish with him but his works, especially his '*Occult Philosophy*,' which he would defend in all discourse and writing." The publication of the "Fama" in an English form is thus mentioned by the same authority in his life of Vaughan —"*Large Preface, with a short declaration of the physical work of the fraternity of the R. C., commonly of the Rosie Cross.* Lond. 1652. Oct. Which *Fame and Confession* was translated into English by another hand;" but whether by this is meant that Vaughan made one translation and somebody else another, or that Vaughan's share in the work was restricted to the preface, Wood does not explain. He goes on to say, however,—"I have seen another book entit. *Themis Aurea. The Laws of the Fraternity of the Rosie Cross.* Lond. 1656. Oct. Written in Lat. by Count Michael Maier, and put into English for the information of those who seek after the knowledge of that honourable and mysterious society of wise and renowned philosophers. This English translation is dedicated to Elias Ashmole, Esq., by an Epistle subscribed by $\left.\begin{matrix}\text{N. L.}\\ \text{T. S.}\end{matrix}\right\}$ H. S., but who he or they are, he, the said El. Ashmole, hath utterly forgotten."[2]

Eugenius Philalethes,[3] whoever he was, commences with two epistles to the reader, which, with a preface, or rather introduction, of inordinate length for the size of the book, a small 18mo of 120 pages in all, occupies rather more space than the "Fama" and "Confession" together (61 pages as against 56), and the whole concludes with an "advertisement to the reader," of five pages more. This introduction is principally occupied by an account of the visit of Apollonius of Tyana to the Brachmans[4] [Brâhmens], and his discourse with Jarchas, their chief.

THE "FAMA."

The world will not be pleased to hear it, but will rather scoff, yet it is a fact that the pride of the learned is so great that it will not allow them to work together, which, if they

[1] Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. iii., col. 723.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. iii., col. 724.

[3] Although rather a favourite pseudonym, there can hardly be a doubt as to Vaughan having written under it in the case before us.

[4] The "Brachmans" were to the people of Western Europe of the seventeenth century, what the Chinese with their Mandarins and Bonzes were to Montesquieu and the men of the eighteenth, but when distance no longer lent enchantment to the view, the pretty stories to which they gave rise have not been exactly corroborated by East Indian officials or Hong Kong and Shanghai merchants. Nevertheless, there is actually, I believe, at the present moment somewhere in Bengal a Theosophic society for the restoration of true religion, founded on the Brahminical precepts. But I do not know the exact address, nor do I intend to inquire.

did, they might collect a *Librum Natura*, or perfect method of all arts. But they still keep on their old course with Porphyry, Aristotle, and Galen, who, if they were alive and had our advantages, would act very differently; and though in theology, physic, and mathematics, truth opposes itself to their proceedings as much as possible, yet the old enemy is still too much for it. For such general reformation, then, C. R., a German, and the founder of our fraternity, did set himself. Poor, but nobly born, he was placed in a cloister when five years old, and, in his growing years, accompanied a brother P. A. L. to the Holy Land. The latter dying at Cyprus, C. R. shipped to Damasco for Jerusalem, but was detained by illness at Damasco, where the Arabian wise men appeared as if they had been expecting him, and called him by name. He was now sixteen, and after remaining three years, went to Egypt, where he remained but a short time, and then went on to Fez, as the Arabians had directed him. Constant philosophic intercourse was carried on for mutual improvement between Arabia and Africa, so that there was no want of physicians, Cabbalists, magicians, and philosophers, though the magic and Cabbala at Fez were not altogether true.[1] Here he stayed two years, and then "sailed with many costly things into Spain, hoping well; he himself had so well and profitably spent his time in his travel that the learned in Europe would highly rejoice with him, and begin to rule and order all their studies, according to those sound and sure foundations." [C. R. was now twenty-one years of age.][2] He showed the Spanish learned "the errors of our arts, how they might be corrected, how they might gather the true *Indicia* of the times to come; he also showed them the faults of the Church and of the whole *Philosophia Moralis*, and how they were to be amended. He showed them new growths, new fruits, and new beasts, which did concord with old philosophy, and prescribed them new *Axiomata*, whereby all things might fully be restored," and was laughed at in Spain as elsewhere. He further promised that he would direct them to the "only true *centrum*, and that it should serve to the wise and learned as a Rule" [whatever this might be]; also that there might be a "Society in Europe which should have gold, silver, and precious stones enough for the necessary purposes of all kings," "so that they might be brought up to know all that God hath suffered man to know" [the connection is not quite clear]. But failing in all his endeavours, he returned to Germany, where he built himself a house, and remained five years, principally studying mathematics. After which there "came again into his mind the wished-for Reformation," so he sent for from his first cloister, to which he bare a great affection, Bro. G. V., Bro. J. A., Bro. J. O.—by which four was begun the fraternity of the *Rosie Cross*. They also made the "magical language and writing, with a large dictionary, 'which we yet daily use to God's praise and glory, and do find great wisdom therein;' they made also the first part of the book M., but in respect that that labour was too heavy, and the unspeakable concourse of the sick hindred them, and also whilst his new building called *Sancti Spiritus* was now finished," they added four more [all Germans but J. A.], making the total number eight, "all of vowed virginity; by them was collected a book or volumn of all that which man can desire, wish, or hope for."

Being now perfectly ready, they separated into foreign lands, "because that not only

[1] Fez was actually, or had been, the seat of a great Saracenic school, and, I believe, that philosophic interchanges of views were carried on between different parts of the Arabian Empire.

[2] Andreä was born in 1586, which + 21 = 1607. The "Fama" *is said* to have been published in 1609 or 1610, but the real date is uncertain. It was probably *written* before.

their *Axiomata* might, in secret, be more profoundly examined by the learned, but that they themselves, if in some country or other they observed anything, or perceived any error, they might inform one another of it."

But before starting they agreed on six rules—

1. To profess no other thing, than to cure the sick, "and that *gratis*."

2. To wear no distinctive dress, but the common one of the country where they might happen to be.

3. "That every year on the day C. they should meet at the house S. Spiritus," or write the reason of absence.

4. Every brother to look about for a worthy person, who after his death might succeed him.

5. "The word C. R. should be their Seal, Mark, and Character."

6. The fraternity should remain secret 100 years.

Only five went at once, two always staying with Father *Fra;* R. C., and these were relieved yearly.

The first who died was J. O., in England, after that he had cured a young earl of leprosy. "They determined to keep their burial places as secret as possible, so that 'at this day it is not known unto us what is become of some of them, but every one's place was supplied by a fit successor.' What secret, soever, we have learned out of the book M. (although before our eyes we behold the image and pattern of all the world), yet are there not shown our misfortunes nor the hour of death, but hereof more in our Confession, where we do set down 37 reasons wherefore we now do make known our Fraternity, and proffer such high mysteries freely, and without constraint and reward: also we do promise more gold than both the Indies bring to the King of Spain; for Europe is with child, and will bring forth a strong child who shall stand in need of a great godfather's gift."

Not long after this the founder is supposed to have died, and "we of the third row" or succession "knew nothing further than that which was extant of them (who went before) in our Philosophical *Bibliotheca*, amongst which our *Axiomata* was held for the chiefest, *Rota Mundi* for the most artificial, and *Protheus* the most profitable."

"Now, the true and fundamental relation of the finding out of the high illuminated man of God, *Fra;* C. R. C., is this." D., one of the first generation, was succeeded by A., who, dying in Dauphiny, was succeeded by N. N. A., previously to his death, "had comforted him in telling him that this Fraternity should ere long not remain so hidden, but should be to all the whole German nation helpful, needful, and commendable." . . . The year following after he (N. N.) had performed "his school, and was minded now to travel, being for that purpose sufficiently provided with Fortunatus' purse,"[1] but he determined first to improve his building. In so doing he found the memorial tablet of brass containing the names of all the brethren, together with some few things which he meant to transfer to some more fitting vault, "for where or when *Fra* R. C. died, or in what country he was buried, was by our predecessors concealed and unknown to us." In removing this plate he pulled away a large piece of plaster disclosing a door. The brotherhood then completely exposed the door, and found written on it in large letters "Post 120 annos Patebo" [I shall appear after 120 years]. "We let it rest that night, because, first, we would overlook our *Rotam;* but we refer ourselves again

[1] Andreä was a great traveller. His excursions began in 1607, when he was twenty-one years old.

to the Confession, for what we here publish is done for the help of those that are worthy, but to the unworthy (God willing) it will be small profit. For, like as our door was after so many years wonderfully discovered, so also then shall be opened a door to Europe (where the wall is removed which already doth begin to appear), and with great desire is expected of many."

"In the morning we opened the door, and there appeared a Vault of seven sides, every side 5 feet broad and 8 high. Although the sun never shined in this vault, nevertheless it was enlightened with another sun, which had learned this from the sun, and was situated in the centre of the ceiling. In the midst, instead of a tombstone, was a round altar covered with a plate of brass, and thereon this engraven—

"A. C., R. C. Hoc universi compendium unius mihi sepulchrum feci
[I have erected this tomb as an epitome of the one universe].

"Round about the first circle was—

"Jesus mihi omnia
[Jesus is all things to me].

"In the middle were four figures inclosed in circles, whose circumscription was—

"1. Nequaquam[1] vacuum [There is no vacuum]. 2. Legis jugum [The yoke of the law]. 3. Libertas Evangelii [The liberty of the Gospel]. 4. Dei gloria intacta [The immaculate glory of God].

"This is all clear and bright, as also the seventh side and the two heptagons, so we knelt down and gave thanks to the sole wise, sole mighty, and sole eternal God, who hath taught us more than all men's wit could have found out, praised be His holy name. This vault we parted in three parts—the upper or ceiling, the wall or side, the floor. The upper part was divided according to the seven sides; in the triangle, which was in the bright centre [here the narrator checks himself], but what therein is contained you shall, God willing, that are desirous of our society, behold with your own eyes. But every side or wall is parted into ten squares, every one with their several figures and sentences as they are truly shown here in our book [which they are not]. The bottom, again, is parted in the triangle, but because herein is described the power and rule of the inferior governors, we forbear to manifest the same, for fear of abuse by the evil and ungodly world. But those that are provided and stored with the heavenly antidote, they do without fear or hurt, tread on, and bruise the head of the old and evil serpent, which this our age is well fitted for. Every side had a door for a chest, wherein lay divers things, especially all our books, which otherwise we had, besides the *Vocabulary* of Theophrastus Paracelsus, and these which daily unfalsifieth we do participate. Herein also we found his '*Itinerarium*' and '*Vitam*,' whence this relation for the most part is taken. In another chest were looking glasses of divers virtues, as also in other places were little bells, burning lamps, and chiefly wonderful artificial Songs; generally all done to that end, that if it should happen after many hundred years, the Order or Fraternity should come to nothing, they might by this onely Vault be restored again."

[1] The primary meaning of *nequaquam* is, of course, "in vain." I have ventured on a free translation, as seeming to possess slightly more meaning.

They now removed the altar, found a plate of brass, which, on being lifted, they found "a fair and worthy body, whole and unconsumed, as the same is here lively counterfeited [was the original illustrated?] with all the Ornaments and Attires: in his hand he held a parchment book called I., the which next unto the Bible is our greatest treasure, which ought to be delivered to the world." At the end of the book was the eulogium of *Fra*, C. R. C., which, however, contains nothing remarkable, and underneath were the names, or rather initials, of the different brethren in order as they had subscribed themselves [like in a family Bible].[1]

The graves of the brethren, I. O. and D., were not found [it does not appear that some of the others were either], but it is to be hoped that they may be, especially since they were remarkably well skilled in physic, and so might be remembered by some very old folks.

"Concerning *Minutum Mundum*, we found it under another little altar, but we will leave him [query *it*?] undescribed, until we shall truly be *answered upon this our true hearted Fama.* [So they closed up the whole again, and sealed it], and 'departed the one from the other, and left the natural heirs in possession of our jewels. *And so we do expect the answer and judgment of the learned or unlearned.*'" [These passages seem to indicate the purpose of the book.]

"We know after a time that there will be a general reformation, both of divine and human things, according to our desire, and the expectation of others, for 'tis fitting that before the rising of the Sun there should appear an *Aurora*; so in the meantime some few, which shall give their names, may joyn together to increase the number and respect of our *Fraternity*, and make a happy and wished-for beginning of our *Philosophical Canons*, prescribed by our brother R. C., and be partaken of our treasures (which can never fail or be wasted), in all humility, and love to be eased of this world's labour, and not walk so blindly in the knowledge of the wonderful works of God."

Then follows their creed, which they declare to be that of the Lutheran Church, with two sacraments. In their polity they acknowledge the [Holy] Roman Empire for their Christian head. "Albeit, we know what alterations be at hand, and would fain impart the same with all our hearts to other godly learned men. Our *Philosophy* also is no new invention, but as Adam after 'his fall hath received it, and as Moses and Solomon used it: also she ought not much to be doubted of, or contradicted by other opinions; but seeing that truth is peaceable, brief, and always like herself in all things, and especially accorded by with Jesus *in omni parte*, and all members. And as he is the true image of the Father, so is she his Image. It shall not be said, this is true according to Philosophy, but true according to Theology. And wherein Plato, Aristotle, Pythagoras, and others did hit the mark, and wherein Enoch, Abraham, Moses, Solomon, did excel [here we have traces of the Cabbala], but especially wherewith that wonderful book the Bible agreeth. All that same concurreth together, and make a Sphere or Globe, whose total parts are equidistant from the Center, as hereof more at large and more plain shall be spoken of in Christianly Conference'" [Christian conversation].

[1] One cannot help being reminded of the old Monk and William of Deloraine uncovering the body of the wizard Michael Scott, which lay with the "mighty book" clasped in his arm. Scott there indulges in one of his not unusual anachronisms. Michael Scott is mentioned by Dante, hence the Monk, who had been his companion, must have been 200 years old on a moderate calculation. Similarly, Ulrica who in "Ivanhoe" lived *temp.* Rich. I., and "had also seen the Conquest, must have been 150."

Gold making is the cause of many cheats, and even "men of discretion do hold the transmutation of metals to be the highest point of philosophy;" but the "true philosophers are far of another minde, esteeming little the making of gold, which is but a *parergon;* for besides that, they have a thousand better things;" for "he [the true philosopher] is glad that he seeth the heavens open, and the angels of God ascending and descending, and his name written in the Book of Life." Also, under the name of chemistry, many books are sent forth to God's dishonour, "as we will name them in due season, and give the pure-hearted a catalogue of them; and we pray all learned men to take heed of that kind of books, for the enemy never resteth. . . . So, according to the will and meaning of Fra, C. R. C., we, his brethren, request again all the learned in Europe who shall read (sent forth in five languages) this our Fama and Confessio, that it would please them with good deliberation *to ponder this our offer*, and to examine most nearly and sharply their Arts, and behold the present time with all diligence, and to declare their minde, *either communicato concilio, or singulatim*, by print.

"And although at this time we make no mention either of our names or meetings, yet nevertheless every one's opinion shall assuredly come into our hands, in what language soever it be; nor shall any body fail, who so gives but his name, to speak with some of us, either by word of mouth or else by writing. Whosever shall earnestly, and from his heart, bear affection unto us, it shall be beneficial to him in goods, body, and soul; but he that is false-hearted, or only greedy of riches, the same shall not be able to hurt us, but bring himself to utter ruin and destruction. Also our building (although 100,000 people had very near seen and beheld the same) shall for ever remain untouched, undestroyed, and hidden to the wicked world, *sub umbra alarum tuarum Jehova.*"[1]

The "Confessio."

After a short exordium, there being a preface besides, it goes on to say that

They cannot be suspected of heresy, seeing that they condemn the east and the west—*i.e.*, the Pope and Mahomet—and offer to the head of the Romish Empire their prayers, secrets, and great treasures of gold. [Andreä and his colleagues had some method in their madness.]

Still they have thought good to add some explanations to the Fama, "hoping thereby that the learned will be more addicted to us."

"We have sufficiently shown that philosophy is weak and faulty," . . . "she fetches her last breath, and is departing."

But as when a new disease breaks out, so a remedy is generally discovered against the same; "so there doth appear for so manifold infirmities of philosophy," the right means of recovery, which is now offered to our country.

"No other philosophy, we have, than that which is the head and sum, the foundation and contents, of all faculties, sciences, and arts, the which containeth much of theology and medicine, but little of the wisdom of lawyers, and doth diligently search both heaven and earth, or, to speak briefly thereof, which doth manifest and declare sufficiently, Man; whereof, then, all Learned who will make themselves known unto us, and come into our brotherhood, shall attain more wonderful secrets than they did heretofore attain unto, or know, believe, or utter."

Wherefore we ought to show why such mysteries and secrets should yet be revealed unto

[1] This latter passage corroborates all the others italicised above, as to the intent and purpose of the book.

the many. It is because we hope that our offer will raise many thoughts in men who never yet knew the *Miranda sextæ ætatis* [the wonders of the sixth age], as well as in those who live for the present only.

"We hold that the meditations, knowledge, and inventions of our loving Christian father (of all that which, from the beginning of the world, *man's wisdom*, either through God's revelation, or through the service of angels and spirits, or through the sharpness and deepness of understanding, or through long observation, hath found out and till now hath been propagated), are so excellent, worthy, and great, that if all books should perish and all learning be lost, yet that posterity would be able from that alone to lay a new foundation, and bring truth to light again."

To whom would not this be acceptable? "Wherefore should we not with all our hearts rest and remain in the only truth, if it had only pleased God to lighten unto us the sixth *Candelabrum*? Were it not good that we needed not to care, not to fear hunger, poverty, sickness, and age?

"Were it not a precious thing, that you could always live so, as if you had lived from the beginning of the world, and as if you should still live to the end?" That you should dwell in one place, and neither the dwellers in India or Peru be able to keep anything from you?

"That you should so read in one onely book," and by so doing understand and remember all that is, has been, or will be written.

"How pleasant were it, that you could so sing, that instead of stony rocks [like Orpheus] you could draw pearls and precious stones; instead of wild beasts, spirits; and instead of hellish *Pluto*, move the mighty Princes of the world?"

God's counsel now is, to increase and enlarge the number of our *Fraternity*.

If it be objected that we have made our treasures too common, we answer that the grosser sort will not be able to receive them, and we shall judge of the worthiness of those who are to be received into our Fraternity, not by human intelligence, but by the *rule of our Revelation and Manifestation*.

A government shall be instituted in Europe, after the fashion of that of Damear [or Damcar] in Arabia, where only wise men govern, who "by the permission of the king make particular laws (whereof we have a description set down by our Christianly father), when first is done, and come to pass that which is to precede."

Then what is now shown, as it were "secretly and by pictures, as a thing to come, shall be free, and publicly proclaimed, and the whole world filled withal." As was done with the "Pope's tyranny, . . . whose final fall is delayed and kept for our times, when he also shall be scratched in pieces with nails, and an end be made of his ass's cry" [a favourite phrase of Luther].

Our Christian father was born 1378, and lived 106 years [his remains being to be concealed 120, brings us to 1604, when Andreä was 18].

It is enough for them who do not despise our Declaration to prepare the way for their acquaintance and friendship with us. "None need fear deceit, for we promise and openly say, that no man's uprightness and hopes shall deceive him, whosoever shall make himself known unto us under the Seal of Secrecy, and desire our Fraternity."

But we cannot make them known to hypocrites, for "they shall certainly be partakers of all the punishment spoken of in our *Fama* [utter destruction, *vide supra*], and our treasures shall

remain untouched and unstirred until the Lion doth come, who will ask them for his use, and employ them for the confirmation and establishment of his kingdom." God will most assuredly send unto the world before her end, which shall happen shortly afterwards, "such Truth, Light, Life, and Glory as Adam had;" and all "lies, servitude, falsehood, and darkness, which by little and little, with the great world's revolution, was crept into all arts, works, and governments of man, and have darkened the most part of them, shall cease. For from thence are proceeded an innumerable sort of all manner of false opinions and heresies; all the which, when it shall once be abolished, and instead thereof a right and true Rule instituted, then there will remain thanks unto them which have taken pains therein; but the work itself shall be attributed to the blessedness of our age."

As many great men will assist in this Reformation by their writings, "so we desire not to have this honour ascribed to us." . . . "The Lord God hath already sent before certain messengers, which should testify His Will, to wit, some new stars, which do appear in the firmament in Serpentarius and Cygnus, which signify to every one that they are powerful *Signacula* of great weighty matters."

Now remains a short time, when all has been seen and heard, when the earth will awake and proclaim it aloud.

"These Characters and Letters [he does not say what], as God hath here and there incorporated them in the Holy Scriptures, so hath he imprinted them most apparently in the wonderful creation of heaven and earth—yea, in all beasts." As astronomers can calculate eclipses, "so we foresee the darkness of obscurations of the Church, and how long they shall last."

"But we must also let you understand; that there are some *Eagles' Feathers* in our way, which hinder our purpose." Wherefore we admonish every one carefully to read the Bible, as being the best way to our Fraternity. "For as this is the whole sum and content of our Rule, that every Letter or Character which is in the world ought to be learned and regarded well; so those are like, and very near allyed unto us, who make the Bible a Rule of their life. Yea, let it be a compendium of the whole world, and not only to have it in the mouth, but to know how to direct the true understanding of it to all times and ages of the World."

[Diatribe against expounders and commentators, as compared with the praises of the Bible:] "But whatever hath been said in the Fama concerning the deceivers against the transmutation of metals, and the highest medicine in the world, the same is thus to be understood, that this so great a gift of God we do in no manner set at naught, or despise. But because she bringeth not with her always the knowledge of Nature, but this bringeth forth not only medicine, but also maketh manifest and open unto us innumerable *secrets* and *wonders;* therefore it is requisite, that we be earnest to attain to the understanding and knowledge of philosophy; and, moreover, excellent wits ought not to be drawn to the tincture of metals, before they be exercised well in the knowledge of Nature."

As God exalteth the lowly and pulleth down the proud, so He hath and will do the Romish Church.

Put away the works of all false alchemists, and turn to us, who are the true philosophers. We speak unto you in parables, but seek to bring you to the understanding of all secrets.

"We desire not to be received of you, but to invite you to our more than kingly houses, and that verily not by our own proper motion, but as forced unto it, by the instigation of the Spirit of God, by His Admonition, and by the occasion of this present time."

An exhortation to join the Fraternity, seeing that they profess Christ, condemn the Pope, addict themselves to the true philosophy, lead a Christian life, and daily exhort men to enter into the order. Then follows a renewed warning to those who do so for worldly motives, for though "there be a medicine which might fully cure all diseases, nevertheless those whom God hath destinated to plague with diseases, and to keep them under the rod of correction, shall never obtain any such medicine."

"Even in such manner, although we might enrich the whole World, and endue them with Learning, and might release it from Innumerable Miseries, yet shall we never be manifested and made known unto any man, without the especial pleasure of God; yea, it shall be so far from him whosoever thinks to get the benefit, and be Partaker of our Riches and Knowledg, without and against the Will of God, that he shall sooner lose his life in seeking and searching for us, then to find us, and attain to come to the wished Happiness of the *Fraternity* of the *Rosie Cross*."

I have given these abstracts at considerable length, in order to afford my readers a complete idea of the substance of the two publications. As will easily be seen, the "Confessio" professes to give an account of the doctrines of the society, the "Fama"—rather resembling a history—is totally unintelligible, in spite of the care which I have taken to give an accurate and copious abridgment. It is impossible to believe that Andreä, or whoever else may have been the writer, was describing a sect that actually existed, and difficult indeed to believe that he had any serious object. Indeed the "Confessio" sounds more like a nonsensical parody on the ordinary philosophical jargon of the day, and there are many passages in it as well as some in the "Fama," which will especially bear this interpretation, like the celebrated nautical description of a storm in Gulliver. I shall not, however, attempt to deny that Andreä was a man of talent, and one sincerely desirous of benefiting mankind, especially German-kind, but in the ardour of youth he must have been more tempted to satire than in his maturer years, and may have sought to clear the ground by crushing the existing false philosophers with ridicule, as Cervantes subsequently did the romancists. He may also, as Buhle says—and there are repeated traces of this in both works—have sought to draw out those who were sincerely desirous of effecting a real and lasting reformation. The answers doubtless came before him in some form or another through his friends and associates, of whom one account says that there were thirty, and the answers, if they were all like those preserved at Gottingen, which, in spite of the solemn warnings in both the "Fama" and "Confessio," chiefly related to gold finding, must have been sufficiently discouraging to induce him to relinquish, for the time at least, any such scheme as that which has been ascribed to him. His efforts, however, only ceased with his life,[1] though his plans, which at first embraced all science and morality, seem ultimately to have been reduced to the practical good of founding schools and churches. Was he after all a dreamy Teutonic and very inferior Lord Bacon?[2] As for the "Fama" itself, it seems to have

[1] It has been asserted that the dates given in connection with C. R. C. by some German writers are imaginary, but this is not so, since the precise date of his supposed birth is given in the "Confessio." It is not in the "Fama," and hence the mistake.

[2] Lord Bacon's political is lost in his scientific genius, nevertheless it was very great. So was also his legal capacity. There is a passage in his works wherein he laments the non-publication of his judgments, which he says would have shown him at least equal, if not superior, to his rival, Coke. I know of no greater loss.

been based on the "Master Nicholas" of John Tanler, with a little taken from the early life of Lully—not forgetting his own personal career—and coupled with certain ideas drawn from the Cabbala, the Alchemists, the seekers after Universal Medicine, and the Astrologers.

At the end of this edition comes a short advertisement, I imagine by Eugenius Philalethes himself to the reader, inviting him, says the writer, "not to my *Lodging*, for I would give thee no such *Directions*, my *Nature* being more *Melancholy* than *Sociable*. I would only tell thee how *Charitable* I am, for having purposely omitted some *Necessaries* in my former *Discourse*. I have upon *second Thoughts* resolved against that silence." After this he goes on to say that "*Philosophie* hath her *Confidents*, but in a *sense* different from the *Madams*," among whom it appears that he flatters himself to be one; and he is so much in her confidence that he even knows the right way of preparing the philosopher's salt, which would seem to be the long-sought-for universal medicine, a medicine the true mode of preparing which was known to few, if any, not even to Tubal Cain himself—though Eugenius must have been very much in the confidence of *Philosophie* to have known anything about the secret practices of the great antediluvian mechanic.[1]

This whole passage is so curious, and is so illustrative, in a small space, of the ideas and practices of these so-called philosophers, that I shall here introduce it, preserving, as far as possible, both the textual and typographical peculiarities of the original.

"The *Second Philosophicall work* is commonly called the *gross work*, but 'tis one of the greatest Subtilties in all the *Art*. *Cornelius Agrippa* knew the *first Præparation*, and hath clearly *discovered* it; but the *Difficulty* of the *second* made him almost an enemy to his own *Profession*. By the *second work*, I understand, not *Coagulation*, but the *Solution* of the *Philosophical Salt*, a *secret* which *Agrippa* did not *rightly* know, as it appears by his *practise* at *Malines;* nor would *Natalius* teach him, for all his *frequent* and *serious intreaties*. This was it, that made his *necessities* so *vigourous*, and his *purse* so *weak*, that I can seldome finde him in a *full fortune*. But in this, he is not alone: *Raymond Lully*, the best *Christian Artist* that ever was, received not this *Mysterie* from *Arnoldus*, for in his *first Practises* he followed the tedious *common process*, which after all is scarce *profitable*. Here he met with a *Drudgerie* almost *invincible*, and if we add the *Task* to the *Time*, it is enough to make a *Man old*. *Norton* was so strange an *Ignoramus* in this *Point*, that if the *Solution* and *Purgation* were performed in *three* years, he thought it a *happy work*. *George Ripley* labour'd for *new Inventions* to *putrifie* this *red salt*, which he enviously cals *his gold:* and his *knack* is, to expose it to *alternat fits* of *cold* and *heat*, but in this he is *singular*, and *Faber* is so wise he will not understand him. And now that I have mention'd *Faber*, I must needs say that *Tubal-Cain* himself is *short* of the *right Solution*, for the *Process* he *describes* hath not anything of *Nature* in it. Let us return

[1] After all we ought not to wonder at the facility with which dupes were then made. It is only a very few months ago, that an appeal was made in the newspapers for subscriptions to excavate the hill of Tara, near Dublin, in order to discover the Jewish Ark, alleged to have been carried by the prophet Jeremiah, on the conquest of Jerusalem by the Assyrians, first to Egypt and subsequently to Ireland, where it was lodged in the aforesaid hill of Tara. Now this hill was the latest site of the supposed royal Irish palace, and some human work such as a "rath" or camp, fortified by earthworks, and enclosing wattled huts after the manner of the New Zealanders, only on a larger scale, certainly existed there. But before Tara, which was of a comparatively late date, was Emania, and before Emania some other abiding place whose name I forget, and it must have been the first that was in existence (if ever) when Jeremiah may have landed in Ireland. The prophet showed his prophetic instinct in placing the ark in the last seat of Irish royalty. The subscription was actually begun, for there was, if I remember rightly, some dispute about it quite lately.

then to *Raymund Lullie*, for he was so great a *Master*, that he perform'd the *Solution*, *intra novem dies* [in nine days], and this *Secret* he had from *God himself*. .·. .·. .·. It seems, then, that the *greatest Difficulty* is not in the *Coagulation* or *production* of the *Philosophicall Salt*, but in the *Putrefaction* of it when it is *produced*. Indeed this agrees *best* with the *sence* of the *Philosophers*, for one of those *Præcisians* tels us: "*Qui scit SALEM*, [et] *ejus SOLUTIONEM, scit SECRETUM OCCULTUM antiquorum Philosophorum*" ["he who knows the salt, and its solution, knows the hidden secret of the ancient philosophers"]. Alas, then! what shall we do? Whence comes our next *Intelligence*? I am afraid here is a sad Truth for somebody. Shall we run now to *Lucas Rodargirus*, or have we any *dusty Manuscripts*, that can instruct us? Well, *Reader*, thou seest how *free* I am grown; and now I could discover something else, but here is enough at once. I could indeed tell thee of the *first* and *second sublimation*, of a *double* Nativity, *Visible* and *Invisible*, without which the *matter* is not *alterable*, as to our *purpose*. I could tell thee also of *Sulphurs simple*, and *compounded*, of *three Argents Vive*, and as *many Salts*; and all this would be *new news* (as the *Book-men* phrase it), even to the *best Learned* in *England*. But I have done, and I *hope* this *Discourse* hath not *demolished* any man's *Castles*, for why should they *despair*, when I *contribute* to their *Building*? I am a hearty *Dispensero*, and if they have got anything by me, much good may it do them. It is my onely *fear*, they will *mistake* when they *read*; for were I to *live long*, which I am confident I shall not [of what use, then, was the salt?], I would make no other *wish*, but that my *years* might be as many as their *Errors*. I speak not this out of any *contempt*, for I *undervalue* no *man*; it is my *Experience* in this kind of *learning*, which I ever made my *Business*, that gives me the *boldness* to suspect a *possibility* of the same *faylings* in *others*, which I have *found* in my *self*. To conclude, I would have *my Reader* know, that the Philosophers, *finding* this *life* subjected to *Necessitie*, and that *Necessity* was *inconsistant* with the *nature* of the *Soul*, they did therefore look upon *Man*, as a Creature *originally ordained* for some *better State* than the present, for *this* was not agreeable with his *spirit*. This *thought* made them seek the *Ground* of his *Creation*, that, if possible, they might take hold of *Libertie*, and transcend the *Dispensations* of that *Circle*, which they *Mysteriously* cal'd *Fate*. Now what this *really signifies* not *one* in *ten thousand* knows—and yet we are *all Philosophers*.

"But to come to my *purpose*, I say, the *true Philosophers* did find in every *Compound* a double Complexion, *Circumferential*, and *Central*. The *Circumferential* was *corrupt* in *all things*, but in *some things* altogether *venomous*. The *Central* not *so*, for in the *Center* of every *thing* there was a *perfect Unity*, a miraculous indissoluble *Concord* of *Fire* and *Water*. These *two Complexions* are the *Manifestum* and the *Occultum* of the *Arabians*, and they *resist* one another, for they are *Contraries*. In the *Center* itself they found no *Discords* at all, for the *Difference* of *Spirits* consisted, not in *Qualities*, but in *Degrees* of *Essence* and *Transcendency*. As for the *Water*, it was of *kin* with the *Fire*, for it was not *common* but *æthereal*. In all *Centers* this *Fire* was not the *same*, for in *some* it was only a *Solar Spirit*, and such a *Center* was called, *Aqua solis*, *Aqua Cœlestis*, *Aqua Auri*, *Aqua Argenti*: In *some* again the *Spirit* was *more* than *Solar*, for it was *super-Cœlestial* and *Metaphysical*: This *Spirit* purged the very *rational Soul*, and *awakened* her *Root* that was *asleep*, and therefore *such* a *Center* was called, *Aqua Igne tincta*, *Aqua Serenans*, *Candelas Accendens*, *et Domum illuminans*. Of both these *Waters* have I discoursed in these *small Tractates* I have published; and though I have had some *Dirt* cast at me for my *pains*, yet this is so *ordinary* I mind it *not*, for whiles we *live here* we *ride* in a

High-way. I cannot think him *wise* who resents his *Injuries*, for he sets a *rate* upon *things* that are *worthless*, and makes use of his *Spleen* where his *Scorn* becomes him. This is the *Entertainment* I provide for my *Adversaries*, and if they think it *too coarse*, let them *judg* where they *understand*, and they may *fare better*."

Andreä's labours with respect to the Rosicrucians are said to have been crowned by the foundation of a genuine society for the propagation of truth, named by him the "Christian Fraternity,"[1] into the history of which, however, I shall not proceed, as it would needlessly widen the scope of our present inquiry. Buhle's theory is—to rush at once *in medias res*—that Freemasonry is neither more nor less than Rosicrucianism as modified by those who translated it into England. Soane[2] goes a step further, and says that the Rosicrucians were so utterly crushed by Gassendi's reply to Fludd, not to mention the general ridicule of their pretensions, that they gladly shrouded themselves under the name of Freemasons; and both seem to agree that Freemasonry, at least in the modern acceptance of the term, did not exist before Fludd. I will pass over for the present the fact, that the works of Mersenne, Gassendi, Naudé, and others, were but little likely to have been read in England; and that no similar compositions were issued from the press in our own country, on the one hand; while, on the other, that the Masonic body, as at present existing, undoubtedly took its origin in Great Britain—so that the Rosicrucians concealed themselves where there was no need of concealment, and did not conceal themselves where there was—also that Masonry undoubtedly existed before the time of Fludd, and the Rosicrucians never had an organised existence. So that men pursuing somewhat similar paths without any real organisation, but linked together only by somewhat similar crazes, spontaneously assumed the character of a pre-existing organisation, which organisation they could only have invaded and made their own by the express or tacit permission of the invaded? I shall next show Buhle's theory somewhat at length, on which and its confutation to build my subsequent arguments.

To the objection that the hypothesis of the Gottingen professor is utterly untenable—I reply, and equally so are all the visionary speculations, however supported by the authority of great names, which in any form link the society of Freemasons with the impalpable fraternity of the Rosie Cross. Yet as a connection between the two bodies has been largely believed in by writers both within[3] and without[4] the pale of the craft, and in a certain sense —for Hermeticism and Rosicrucianism are convertible terms[5]—still remains an article of faith with two such learned Masons as Woodford and Albert Pike,[6] it is essential

[1] A list of the members composing this Christian Brotherhood, which continued to exist after Andreä's death, is still preserved, and the curious reader is referred for further particulars concerning it to a series of works cited by Professor Buhle, and reprinted by De Quincey in a note at the end of chapter iv. of his abridgment (De Quincey's Works, 1863-71, vol. xvi., p. 405).

[2] New Curiosities of Literature, *loc cit.*

[3] W. Sandys, A Short History of Freemasonry, 1829, p. 52. See also the article "Masonry, Free," by the same author, in the "Encyclopædia Metropolitana," vol. xxii., 1845; and the "Anacalypsis" of Godfrey Higgins.

[4] Buhle, De Quincey, Soane, King, etc.

[5] *I.e.*, *Hermeticism*—as a generic term—now represents what in the seventeenth century was styled *Rosicrucianism*. Writers of the two centuries preceding our own, constantly refer to the *Hermetick* learning, science, philosophy, or mysteries; but the word *Hermeticism*, which signifies the same thing, appears to be of recent coinage.

[6] In the opinion of Mr Pike, "Men who were adepts in the Hermetic philosophy, made the ceremonials of the blue [*i.e.*, craft] degrees." The expression "blue degrees" or "lodges"—in my opinion a most objectionable one—appears to have been coined early in the century by Dr Dalcho of Charleston, South Carolina.

to carefully examine a theory of Masonic origin or development, so influentially, albeit erroneously, supported. In order to do this properly, I shall put forward Professor Buhle as the general exponent of the views of what I venture to term the Rosicrucian (or Hermetic) school.[1] Mackey says: "Higgins, Sloane, Vaughan, and several other writers have asserted that Freemasonry sprang out of Rosicrucianism. But this is a great error. Between the two there is no similarity of origin, of design, or of organisation. The symbolism of Rosicrucianism is derived from an Hermetic philosophy: that of Freemasonry from an operative art." This writer, however, after the publication of his "Encyclopædia," veered round to an opposite conclusion, owing to the influence produced upon his mind by a book called "Long Livers," originally printed in 1722, the consideration of which we shall approach a little later. Before, however, parting with the general subject, I shall briefly touch upon all the points omitted by Professor Buhle, and urged by others of the "Rosicrucian school"—at least so far as I have met with any in the course of my reading, which, by the greatest latitude of construction, can be viewed as bearing ever so remotely upon the immediate subject of our inquiry.

"At the beginning of the seventeenth century," says the Professor, "many learned heads in England were occupied with Theosophy, Cabbalism, and Alchemy: among the proofs of this may be cited the works of John Pordage, of Norbert, of Thomas and Samuel Norton, but above all (in reference to our present inquiry) of Robert Fludd."[2]

The particular occasion of Fludd's first acquaintance with Rosicrucianism is not recorded; and whether he gained his knowledge directly from the three Rosicrucian books, or indirectly through his friend Maier, who was on intimate terms with Fludd during his stay in England, is immaterial. At any rate—and it should be remembered that it is the Professor who is arguing—he must have been initiated into Rosicrucianism at an early period, having published his "*Apology*" for it in the year 1617. Fludd did not begin to publish until 1616, but afterwards became a voluminous writer, being the author of about twenty works, mostly written in Latin, and as dark and mysterious in their language as their matter. Besides his own name, he wrote under the *pseudonyms* of Robertus de Fluctibus, Rudolphus Otreb, Alitophilus, and Joachim Frizius. His writings on the subject of Rosicrucianism are as follows:—I. "A Brief Apology cleansing and clearing the Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross from the stigma of infamy and suspicion;" II. "An Apologetic Tract defending the Honesty of the Society of the Rosy Cross from the attacks of Libavius and others;" III. "The Contest of Wisdom with Folly;" IV. The "Summum Bonum," an extravagant work, from which I shall give various extracts, written "in praise of Magic, the Cabbala, Alchemy, the Brethren

[1] Buhle's "Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin of the Rosicrucians and the Freemasons," though "confused in its arrangement," is certainly not "illogical in its arguments," as contended by Dr Mackey. Its weak point is the insufficiency of the Masonic *data* with which the Professor was provided. On the whole, however, although some inaccuracies appear with regard to Ashmole's initiation, and the period to which English Freemasonry can be carried back, the essay—merely regarded as a contribution to *Masonic* history—will contrast favourably with all speculations upon the origin of Freemasonry of earlier publication. Whether Buhle was a Freemason it is not easy to decide; but from the wording of his own (not De Quincey's) preface, I think he must have been.

[2] With the exception of "Norbert," whom I have failed to trace, all the writers named by Buhle are cited in the Athenæ Oxonienses. Soane says that the Masonic lodges "sprang out of Rosicrucianism and the yearly meeting of astrologers," the first known members of which [the lodges]—Fludd, Ashmole, Pordage, and others, who were Paracelsists—being "all ardent Rosicrucians in principle, though the name was no longer owned by them."

of the Rosy Cross; and for the disgrace of the notorious calumniator Fr. Marin. Mersenne;" and V. "The Key of Philosophy and Alchemy."[1]

Some little confusion has arisen, out of the habit of this author of veiling his identity by a constant change of *pseudonym*. But it may be fairly concluded that all the works below enumerated are from his pen, since the references from one to another are sufficiently plain and distinct to stamp them all as the coinage of a single brain.

Anthony à Wood omits the "Apology" (II.) from his list of Fludd's works; but though denied to be his, it bears his name in the title page, and was plainly written by the author of the "Summum Bonum" (IV.), being expressly claimed by him at p. 39 of that work. Now, the "Sophiæ cum Moriâ Certamen" (III.), and the "Summum Bonum" (IV.), two witty but coarse books, were certainly Fludd's, *i.e.*, if the opinions of his contemporaries carry any weight, and the summing up of the Oxford antiquary, on this disputed point, is generally regarded as conclusive.[2]

Our author, indeed, sullied these two treatises by mixing a good deal of ill language in them, but Gassendi freely admitted that Mersenne had given Fludd too broad an example of the kind, for some of the epithets which he thought fit to bestow on him were no better than "Caco-magus, Hæretico-magus, fætidæ et horridæ Magiæ, Doctor et Propagator." And among other exasperating expressions, he threatened him with no less than damnation itself, which would in a short time seize him.[3]

Herein Mersenne showed himself a worthy rival of Henry VIII. and Sir Thomas More in their attack on Luther, who was a great deal more than their match in vituperation, though scarcely their superior in theology. It is certainly true that, as Hallam says, the theology of the Great Reformer consists chiefly in "bellowing in bad Latin," but it was effective, for he not only convinced others, but also himself, or appeared to do so, that every opposite opinion in theological argument was right, eternal punishment being always denounced as the penalty of differing from the whim of the moment. Buhle's theory, as he goes on to expand it, is that Fludd, finding himself hard pressed by Gassendi to assign any local habitation or name to the *Rosicrucians*, evaded the question by, in his answer to Gassendi, 1633, formally withdrawing the name, for he now speaks of them as "Fratres R. C. *olim sic dicti*, quos nos hodie Sapientes, vel Sophos vocamus; *omisso ille nomine*, tanquam odioso miseris mortalibus velo ignorantia obductis, *et in oblivione hominum jam fere sepulto*."[4]

I may observe, in passing, that, though from one cause or another, the name of "Rosicrucians" may have fallen into disrepute, that there is no reason why they should have hidden themselves under the name of "Freemasons," first, because there was no distinct

[1] I. Apologia Compendaria, Fraternitatem de Roseâ Cruce Suspicionis et Infamiæ, Maculis aspersam, abluens et abstergens. Leydæ, 1616; II. Tractatus Apologeticus, integritatem Societatis de Roseâ Cruce defendens contra Libavium et alios. Lugduni Batavorum, 1617; III. Sophiæ cum Moriâ Certamen, etc. Franc., 1629; IV. Summum Bonum, quod est verum, Magiæ, Cabalæ, Alchymiæ, Fratrum Rosæ Crucis Verorum, Veræ Subjectum—In dictarum Scientarum Laudem, in insignis Calumniatoris Fr. Mar. Marsenni Dedecus publicatum, per Joachim Frizium. 1629; V. Clavis Philosophiæ et Alchymiæ. Franc., 1633. The MS. catalogue of the Brit. Mus. Library affords, so far as I am aware, the only complete list of Fludd's works.

[2] *Ante*, p. 81; Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. ii., col. 620.

[3] Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. ii., col. 621.

[4] "The brethren of the R. C. who were formerly, at least, called by this name, but whom we now term the wise; the former name being omitted and almost buried by mankind in oblivion, since unhappy mortals are covered by such a thick veil of ignorance."

organisation which could go over, as it were, in a body—for the Rosicrucians never formed a separate fraternity in England any more than elsewhere; and, secondly, because there is no evidence of the English Freemasons ever having been called "Sapientes" or Wise Men.

Buhle, however, goes on to say that the immediate name of "Masons" was derived from the legend, contained in the *Fama Fraternitatis*, or the "Home of the Holy Ghost." Some have been simple enough to understand by the above expression a literal house, and it was inquired after throughout the empire. But Andreä has rendered it impossible to understand it in any but an allegorical sense. Theophilus Schweighart spoke of it as "a building without doors or windows, a princely, nay, an imperial palace, everywhere visible, yet not seen by the eyes of man." This building, in fact, represented the purpose or object of the Rosicrucians. And what was that? It was the secret wisdom, or, in their words, *magic*—viz., (1) Philosophy of nature, or occult knowledge of the works of God; (2) Theology, or the occult knowledge of God Himself; (3) Religion, or God's occult intercourse with the spirit of man;—which they fancied was transmitted from Adam through the Cabbalists to themselves. But they distinguished between a carnal and a spiritual knowledge of this magic. The spiritual being Christianity, symbolised by Christ Himself as a rock, and as a building, of which He is the head and foundation. What rock, says Fludd, and what foundation? A spiritual rock and a building of human nature, in which men are the stones, and Christ the corner stone. But how shall stones move and arrange themselves into a building? Ye must be transformed, says Fludd, from dead into living stones of philosophy. But what is a living stone? A living stone is a *mason* who builds himself up into the wall as part of the temple of human nature. "The manner of this transformation is taught us by the Apostle, where he says, 'Let the same mind be in you which is in Jesus.' In these passages we see the rise of the allegoric name of masons," and the Professor goes on to explain his meaning by quotations from other passages, which, as he has not given them quite fully, and perhaps not quite fairly, I shall hereafter quote at length. He says that, in effect, Fludd teaches that the Apostle instructs us under the image of a husbandman or an architect, and that, had the former type been adopted, we should have had *Free-husbandmen* instead of *Free-masons*.[1] The society was, therefore, to be a *masonic* society, to represent typically that temple of the Holy Ghost which it was their business to erect in the heart of man. This temple was the abstract of the doctrine of Christ, who was the Grand Master; "hence the light from the East,[2] of which so much is said in Rosicrucian and Masonic books. St John was the beloved disciple of Christ, hence the solemn celebration of his festival." Having, moreover, once adopted the attributes of masonry as the figurative expression of their objects, they were led to attend more minutely to the legends and history of that art; and in these again they found an occult analogy with their own relations to Christian wisdom. The first great event in the art of masonry was the building of the Tower of Babel; this expressed

[1] He does not tell us why the prefix *free* should have been added in either case, nor did he probably know that as attached to masons it has several derivations all perfectly reasonable, though of course they cannot all be true, and all long anterior to the era of which he is speaking.

[2] According to Soane, both the Rosicrucians and the Freemasons "derived their wisdom from Adam, adopted the same myth of building, connected themselves in the same unintelligible way with Solomon's temple, affecting to be seeking *light from the East*,—in other words, the Cabbala,—and accepted the heathen Pythagoras amongst their adepts" (New Curiosities of Literature, vol. ii., p. 91).

figuratively the attempt of some unknown Mason to build up the Temple of the Holy Ghost in anticipation of Christianity, which attempt, however, had been confounded by the vanity of the builders.[1]

"The building of Solomon's Temple, the second great incident[2] in the art, had an obvious meaning as a prefiguration of Christianity. Hiram,[3] simply the architect of this temple to the real professors of the art of building, was to the English Rosicrucians a type of Christ; and the legend of Masons, which represented this Hiram as having been murdered by his fellow-workmen, made the type still more striking. The two pillars also, Jachin and Boaz,[4] strength and power, which are among the most memorable singularities in Solomon's Temple,[5] have an occult meaning to the Freemasons. This symbolic interest to the English Rosicrucians in the attributes, legends, and incidents of the art exercised by the literal masons of real life naturally brought the two orders into some connection with each other. They were thus enabled to realise to their eyes the symbols of their own allegories; and the same building which accommodated the guild of builders in their professional meetings, offered a desirable means of secret assemblies to the early Freemasons. An apparatus of implements and utensils, such as were presented in the fabulous sepulchre of Father Rosycross, was here actually brought together. And accordingly, it is upon record that the first formal and solemn lodge of Freemasons, on occasion of which the very name of Freemasons was first publicly made known, was held in Mason's Hall, Mason's Alley, Basinghall Street, London, in the year 1646. Into this lodge it was that Ashmole the antiquary was admitted. Private meetings there may doubtless have been before; and one at Warrington is mentioned in the Life of Ashmole [it will be observed that here Buhle and De Quincey become totally lost]; but the name of a Freemason's lodge with all the insignia, attributes, and circumstances of a lodge, first came forward in the page of history on the occasion that I have mentioned. It is perhaps in requital of the services at that time rendered in the loan of their hall, etc., that the guild of Masons, as a body, and where they are not individually objectionable, enjoy a precedency of all orders of men in the right of admission, and pay only half fees. Ashmole, who was one of the earliest Freemasons, appears from his writings to have been a zealous Rosicrucian."

The Professor here pauses to explain that "when Ashmole speaks of the antiquity of Freemasonry, he is to be understood either as confounding the order of the philosophic masons with that of the handicraft masons, or simply as speaking the language of the Rosicrucians, who carry up their traditional pretensions to Adam as the first professor of the

[1] If this were really the case, there must have been a very long succession of Babels, which would, in a double sense, mean confusion, from the original to our own day.

[2] It is unfortunate that the two first great incidents should relate the one to *brick-laying* and the other to *metal working*, for the Temple was nothing else but wood overlaid with gold plates, the platform, like that of Baalbec, was formed of huge stones dragged together by mere manual labour. Hiram, King of Tyre, was half tributary prince, half contractor, and doubtless managed to make the one fit in with the other. As for the other Hiram, he was clearly a metal founder.

[3] A footnote to the essay, explains that Hiram was understood by the older Freemasons as an anagram, H. I. R. A. M.—Homo Jesus Redemptor AnimarUM; others made it Homo Jesus Rex Altissimus Mundi; whilst a few, by way of simplifying matters, added a C to the Hiram, in order to make it CHristus Jesus, etc.

[4] See the account of these pillars in the first Book of Kings, vii. 14-22, where it is said—"And there stood upon the pillars, as it were, *Roses*." Compare 2d Book of Chron. iii. 17.

[5] The pillars were probably mere ornamental adjuncts to the façade like the Egyptian obelisks, the famous masts at Venice, and numerous other examples that might be cited, including the Eleanor Cross in the station yard at Charing Cross.

secret wisdom."[1] "Other members of the lodge were Thomas Wharton, a physician; George Wharton; Oughtred, the mathematician; Dr Hewitt; Dr Pearson, the divine; and William Lilly, the principal astrologer of the day. All the members, it must be observed, had annually assembled to hold a festival of astrologers *before* they were connected into a lodge bearing the title of Free-masons. This previous connection had no doubt paved the way for the latter."[2]

So far, Buhle, De Quincey, and also Soane. A very pretty and ingenious theory, but unfortunately not quite in harmony with the facts of history. The whole of the latter part of the story is, as will be plainly demonstrated, a pure and gratuitous fabrication. The initiation of Elias Ashmole is stated to have taken place at the Mason's Hall, London, in 1646, and "private meetings"—for example, one at Warrington—are mentioned as having been held at an even earlier date. The truth being, as the merest tyro among masonic students well knows, that it was at the Warrington meeting which took place in 1646, Ashmole was admitted. The lodge at the Mason's Hall not having been held until 1682, or thirty-five years later.

The details of Ashmole's initiation will be considered hereafter at some length; but, before proceeding with my examination of the passages in Fludd's writings, upon which so much has been based by his German commentator, I shall introduce some observations of a learned Masonic writer, which, though much quoted and relied upon by a large number of authorities, tend to prove that he had then (1845) advanced little beyond the theory of Professor Buhle (1804), and that he was unable to prop up that theory by any increase of facts. The following extracts are from the "Encyclopædia Metropolitana,"[3] the article of which they form a part, being, without doubt, the very best on the subject that has ever appeared in any publication of the kind.

"It appears that Speculative Masonry, to which alone the term 'Free-Masonry' is now applied, was scarcely known before the time of Sir Christopher Wren; that it was engrafted upon Operative Masonry, which at that time was frequently called Free-Masonry, adopting the signs and symbols of the operative Masons, together, probably, with some additional customs, taken partly from the Rosicrucians of the seventeenth century, and partly imitated from the early religious rites of the Pagans, with the nature of which Ashmole and his friends (some of the first framers of Speculative Masonry) were well acquainted.

"Elias Ashmole was made a Mason at Warrington in the year 1646. At the same time, a society of Rosicrucians had been formed in London, founded partly on the principles of those established in Germany about 1604, and partly perhaps on the plan of the Literary Society, allegorically described in Bacon's 'New Atlantis,' as the House of Solomon. Among other emblems, they made use of the sun, moon, compasses, square, triangle, etc. Ashmole and some of his literary friends belonged to this society, which met in the Mason's Hall, as well as to the Masons [company], and they revised and added to the peculiar emblems and ceremonies of the

[1] As Dr Armstrong has well observed:—"The Livys of the Masonic commonwealth are far from willing to let their Rome have either a mean or unknown beginning." According to Preston,—"from the commencement of the world, we may trace the foundation of Masonry;" "but," adds Dr Oliver, "ancient Masonic traditions say, *and I think justly*, that our science existed *before the creation of this globe*, and was diffused amidst the numerous systems with which the grand empyreum of universal space is furnished" ! ! (Illustrations of Masonry, 1792, p. 7; Antiquities of Freemasonry, 1823, p. 26).

[2] Professor Buhle then proceeds to sum up the results of his inquiry. These I have already given at p. 84, *q. v.*

[3] Vol. xxii., 1845, *s. v.* Masonry-Free, by William Sandys, F.A.S. and F.G.S., pp. 11-23. Mr Sandys, also the author of "A Short History of Freemasonry," 1829, was a P. M. of the Grand Master's Lodge, No. 1.

latter, which were simple, and had been handed down to them through many ages. They substituted a method of initiation, founded in part, on their knowledge of the Pagan rites, and connected partly with the system of the Rosicrucians, retaining, probably in a somewhat varied form, the whole or greater part of the old Masonic secrets; and hence arose the first Degree, or Apprentice of Free and Accepted or Speculative Masonry, which was, shortly after, followed by a new version of the Fellow Craft Degree."

"These innovations by Ashmole were not perhaps immediately adopted by the fraternity in general, but Speculative Masonry gradually increased and mingled with Operative Masonry, until the beginning of the eighteenth century, when it was agreed, in order to support the fraternity, which had been on the decline, that the privileges of Masonry should no longer be restricted to Operative Masons, but extended to men of various professions, provided they were regularly approved and initiated into the Order."[1]

From what has gone before, it will be very apparent that if Sandys can be taken as the exponent of views, at that time generally entertained by the Masonic fraternity, the hypothesis of the Gottingen Professor, or at least his *conclusions*,—for the two writers arrive at virtually the same goal, though by slightly different roads,—were in a fair way of becoming traditions of the Society.

This I mention because, for the purposes of this sketch, it becomes necessary to lay stress upon the prevalence of the belief, that in some shape or form, the Rosicrucians, including in this term the fraternity, or would-be fraternity, strictly so-called, together with all members of the Hermetic[2] brotherhood—have aided in the development of Freemasonry.

I do not wish to be understood, as confounding the devotees of the Hermetic philosophy with the brethren of the Rosy Cross, but the following passage from the life of Anthony à Wood will more clearly illustrate my meaning:—

1663. "Ap. 23. He began a Course of Chimistry under the noted Chimist and Rosicrucian, Peter Sthael of Strasburgh in Royal Prussia, and concluded in the latter end of May following. The club consisted of 10 at least, whereof Franc. Turner of New Coll. was one (since Bishop of Ely), Benjam. Woodroff of Ch. Ch. another (since Canon of Ch. Ch.), and Joh. Lock of the same house, afterwards a noted writer. This Jo. Lock was a man of a turbulent spirit, clamorous and never contented. The Club wrot and took notes from the mouth of their master, who sate at the upper end of a table, but the said J. Lock scorn'd to do it; so that while every man besides, of the Club, were writing, he would be prating and troblesome. This P. Sthael, who was a Lutheran and a great hater of women,[3] was a very useful man, had his lodging in

[1] The resolution here referred to, which rests on the authority of Preston, will be considered at a later stage.

[2] Amongst the works not previously cited which will repay perusal in connection with the subject before us, I take the opportunity of mentioning Figuier's L'Alchimie et les Achimistes, 1855; A Suggestive Inquiry into the Hermetic Mystery (anonymous), 1850; and the Histoire de la Philosophie Hermétique of Lenglet Du Fresnoy, 1742. The curious reader, if such there be, who desires still further enlightenment, will find it in "The Lives of the Alchemystical Philosophers," where at pp. 95-112 a list is given of *seven hundred and fifty-one* Alchemical Books; and in Walsh's Bibl. Theol. Select., 1757-65, vol. ii., p. 96 *et seq.*, which enumerates nearly a *hundred* more, more than half being devoted to the Rosicrucian controversy. Of course, but a small proportion of both these lists relates to English works, but the mere number will serve to show the extent of the mania.

[3] This seems to have been a characteristic of all the tribe, and the feeling was probably very heartily reciprocated by the fair sex. It will be recollected that the original followers of C. R. were "all of vowed virginity." "It was a long received opinion amongst the Schoolmen and doctors, that no good angel could appear in the shape of a woman, and that any apparition in the form of a female must be at once set down as an evil spirit" (James Crossley, editorial note, Chetham Soc. Pub., vol. xiii., p. 361).

University Coll. in a Chamber at the west end of the old chappel. He was brought to Oxon. by the honorable Mr. Rob. Boyle, *an.* 1659, and began to take to him scholars in the house of Joh. Cross next, on the W. side, to University Coll., where he began but with three scholars; of which number Joseph Williamson of Queen's Coll. was one, afterwards a Knight and one of the Secretaries of State under K. Ch. 2. After he had taken in another class of six there, he translated himself to the house of Arth. Tylliard an apothecary, the next dore to that of Joh. Cross saving one, which is a taverne: where he continued teaching till the latter end of 1662. The chiefest of his scholars there were Dr Joh. Wallis, Mr Christopher Wren, afterwards a Knight and an eminent Virtuoso, Mr Thom. Millington of Alls. Coll., afterwards an eminent Physitian and a Knight, Nath. Crew of Linc. Coll., afterwards Bishop of Durham, Tho. Branker of Exeter Coll., a noted mathematician, Dr Ralph Bathurst of Trin. Coll., a physitian, afterwards president of his college and deane of Wells, Dr Hen. Yerbury, and Dr Tho. Janes, both of Magd. Coll., Rich. Lower, a physitian, Ch. Ch., Rich. Griffith, M.A., fellow of University Coll., afterwards Dr of phys. and fellow of the Coll. of Physitians, and severall others."

"About the beginning of the yeare 1663 Mr Sthael removed his school or elaboratory to a draper's house, called Joh. Bowell, afterwards mayor of the citie of Oxon., situat and being in the parish of Allsaints, commonly called Allhallowes. He built his elaboratory in an old hall or refectory in the back-side (for the House itself had been an antient hostle), wherein A. W. [Anthony à Wood] and his fellowes were instructed. In the yeare following Mr Sthael was called away to London, and became operator to the Royal Society, and continuing there till 1670, he return'd to Oxon in Nov., and had several classes successively, but the names of them I know not; and afterwards going to London againe, died there about 1675, and was buried in the Church of S. Clement's Dane, within the libertie of Westminster, May 30. The Chimical Club concluded, and A. W. paid Mr Sthael 30 shill., having in the beginning of the class given 30 shillings beforehand. A. W. got some knowledge and experience, but his mind still hung after antiquities and musick."[1]

From the preceding extract, we learn that both John Locke, the distinguished philosopher, and Sir Christopher Wren, pursued a course of study under the guidance of a "noted Rosicrucian;" and by some this circumstance may seem to lend colour to the masonic theories which have been linked with their respective names. Passing on, however, I shall proceed with an examination of the passages in Fludd's writings, upon which Professor Buhle has so much relied. The following extracts are from the "Summum Bonum:"[2]

1. "Let us be changed," says Darnæus, "from dead blocks to living stones of philosophy; and the manner of this change is taught us by the Apostle when he says: 'Let the same mind be in you which is in Jesus,'" and this *mind* he proceeds to explain in the following words: "For when He was in the form of God, He thought it not robbery to be equal with God. But in order that we may be able to apply this to the Chymical degrees, it is necessary that we should open out a little more clearly the meaning of the Chymical philosophers, by which

[1] Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. i., p. lii.

[2] *Ante*, p. 112, note 1. The following is a translation of its description on the title-page:—

"The Supreme Good, which is the Truth, consists of Magic, the Cabbala, Alchymy, the Fraternity of the Rosy Cross, which are concerned with Truth.

"In praise of the above-named sciences, and for the disgrace of the notorious calumniator, Fra. Mar. Mersenne; 1629."

(Fludd's Works, collected edition, Brit. Mus. Lib., vol. iv., pp. 36, 39, 47, 49.)

means you will see that these philosophers wrote one thing and meant another" [the hidden or esoteric wisdom].[1]

2. "We must conclude, then, that Jesus is the corner-stone of the human temple, by whose exaltation alone this temple will be exalted; as in the time of Solomon, when his prayers were ended, it is said that he was filled with the glory of God; and so from the death of Capha or Aben, pious men became living stones, and that by a transmutation from the state of fallen Adam to the state of his pristine innocence and perfection,—that is, from the condition of vile and diseased [*lit.* leprous] lead to that of the finest gold, and that by the medium of this living gold, the mystic philosopher's stone [whatever Fludd may have dreamt, the generality took it in a much more practical sense], I mean wisdom, and by the divine emanation which is the gift of God and not otherwise."[2]

3. "But in order that we may treat this brotherhood in the same way as we have the three special columns of wisdom,—namely: Magic, the Cabbala, and Chymistry,—we may define the Rosicrucian fraternity as being either

True or essential, and which deals rightly with the truth, } *i.e.*, with { Magic or wisdom. / The Cabbala. / Chymistry.

Or—

Bastard and adulterine, by which others give a false explanation of this society, or else because they are led away by a spirit } of { Of want or avarice, by which the common people are deceived. / Of pride, so that they should appear to be what they are not. / Of malice, so that, by living a vicious life, they may give the worst possible character to the society."[3]

[1] "Transmutemini [ait Darnæus] de lapidibus mortuis in lapides vivos Philosophicos; viam hujusmodi transmutationis, nos docet Apostolus dum ait: Eadem mens sit in vobis, quæ est in Jesu, mentem autem explicat in sequentibus, nimirum cum in formâ Dei esset, non rapinam arbitratus est se æqualem esse Deo. Sed ut Chymicis gradibus hoc præstare possumus, necesse est, ut Sapientum Chymicorum sensum, paulo accuratiori intuitu aperiamus, quo videatis aliud scripsisse, aliud intellexisse Sapientes" (pp. 36, 37).

[2] "Concludimus, igitur quod Jesus sit templi humani lapis angularis, cujus exaltatione non aliter exaltabitur ejus templum, quam tempore Salomonis, finitis ejus precibus, gloriâ Domini, dictum est fuisse repletum, atque ita ex Cæpha seu Aben mortuis, lapides vivi facti sunt homines pii, idque transmutatione reali, ab Adami lapsi statu in statum suæ innocentiæ et perfectionis, hoc est à vili et leprosi plumbi conditione in auri purissimi perfectionem, idque mediante auro illo vivo, lapide Philosophorum mystico, Sapientiâ dico, et emanatione divinâ quæ est donum Dei et non aliter" (p. 37).

[3] "Sed ut rem pari methodo cum Fraternitate istâ ac cum præcedentibus tribus præcipuis Sapientia columnis videlicet, Magia Cabbala atque Chymia æquamus, dicimus quod

Fraternitas Rosæ Crucis sit aut
- *Vera et essentialis*, quæ recti versatur in verâ, } — { Magia seu Sapientia. / Cabala. / Alchymia.
- *Adulterina et nothua* atque hujus sectæ alii talem falso induunt denominationem, aut animâ ducti } — { Avara, seu indigonte, quo vulgus decipiant. / Superba, ut scilicet videantur tales quales revera non sunt. / Malitiosa, ut vitam vitiosam ducentes pessimam in veram Fraternitatis famam inducant" (p. 39).

4. "Finally, the sacred pages show us how we ought to work in investigating the [nature of] this incomparable gem, namely, by proceeding either by general or particular form [or 'method']. The Apostle teaches us the general, where he says, 'We beseech you, brethren, that ye take heed that ye be at peace and conduct your own business, labouring with your hands as we have taught you, so that you seek nothing of any one.' In his particular instruction he teaches you to attain to the mystical perfection, using the analogy of *either an husbandman or an architect.* Under the type of an husbandman, he speaks as follows:—'I have planted, Apollos watered, but the Lord will give the increase.' For we are the helpers of and fellow-workers with God, hence he says, 'Ye are God's husbandry'" [or 'tillage.'[1] See 1 Cor., ch. iii., v. 10].

5. "Finally, a brother labours to the perfecting of this task under the symbol of an *architect.* Hence the Apostle says in the text, 'As a wise architect have I laid the foundation according to the grace which God has given me, but another builds upon it, for none other can lay the foundation save that which is laid, who is Christ alone.' It is in reference to this architectural simile that St Paul says, 'We are the fellow-labourers with God, as a wise architect have I laid the foundation and another builds upon it;' and David also seems to agree with this when he says, 'Except the Lord build the house the workmen labour but in vain.' All of which is the same as what St Paul brings forward under the type of an husbandman, 'For neither is he that planteth anything nor he that watereth but God who gives the increase, for we are the fellow-labourers with God.' Thus, although the incorruptible Spirit of God be in a grain of wheat, nevertheless it can come to nothing without the labour and arrangements of the husbandman, whose duty it is to cultivate the earth, and to consign to it the seed that it may putrefy, otherwise it would do no good to that living grain that dwells in the midst [of the seed]. And in like manner, under the type of an architect, the prophet warns us, 'Let us go up into the mountain of reason and build there the temple of wisdom.'"[2]

I shall not attempt to discuss the vexed question, and one which, after all, is impossible of any clear solution, whether some of the ideas inculcated by Fludd, and adopted doubtless more or less in their entirety by numerous visionaries, may not have found their way, may not have percolated, as it were, into the Masonic ranks; but it is, I think, tolerably clear that

[1] 4. "Deniqne; qualiter debent operari ad gemmæ istiusmodi incomparabilis inquisitionem, nos docet pagina sancta, videlicet, vel generali formâ vel particulari. Generaliter nos instruit Apostolus sic: 'Rogamus vos fratres ut operam detis, ut quieti sitis, et ut vestrum negotium agatis, et operamini manibus vestris, sicut præcepimus vobis, ut nullius aliquid desideretis.' In particulari suâ instructione more analogico discurrens, nos docet ad mysterii perfectionem, *vel sub Agricolæ vel sub Architecti typo pertingere.* Sub Agricolæ, inquam, titulo. Unde sic loquitur 'Ego plantavi, Appollos rigavit, sed Deus incrementum dabit. Dei enim sumus adjutores et operatores: unde dixit Dei agricultura estis'" (p. 49).

[2] 5. "Denique; *sub architecti figurâ* operatur frater ad hujus operis perfectionem, unde Apostolus ait loco citato Secundum gratiam Dei quæ mihi data est, ut sapiens Architectus, fundamentum posui, alius antem superædificat, fundamentum enim nemo aliud potest ponere præter id quod positum est, quod est solus Christus. De hujusmodi Architecturâ intelligens Paulus, ait 'Dei sumus adjutores, ut sapiens architectus fundamentum posui; alius tamen superædificat, cui etiam David astipulari videtur dicens: Domum nisi ædificaverit Deus in vanum laboraverunt qui eam superædificaverunt. Quod est idem cum illo à Paulo sub typo Agricolæ prolato.' Neque qui plantat est aliquid, neque qui rigat, sed qui incrementum dat, Deus, Dei autem sumus adjutores. Sic etiam licet incorruptibilis Dei spiritus sit in grano tritici, nihil tamen præstare potest sine Agricolæ adaptatione et dispositione, cujus est terram cultivare, et semen in eâ ad putrefactionem disponere aut granum illud vivam in ejus centro habitans nihil operabitur. Atque sub istiusmodi Architecti typo nos monet Propheta, 'ut ascendamus montem rationabilem ut ædificemus domum sapientiæ'" (p. 49).

not only was there no deliberate adoption of the Rosicrucian, or rather Fluddian tenets by the Masons, and no taking of the old masonic name and organisation as a cloak for the new society, but no possibility of such a thing having occurred.

The expression "living stones"—upon which so much has been founded—or "living rock" (*vivam rupem*), occurs very frequently in the old chronicles.[1] The title "Magister de Lapidibus Vivis," according to Batissier,[2] was given in the Middle Ages to the chief or principal artist of a confraternity—"master of living stones," or "pierres vivantes." On the same authority we learn that the official just described was also termed "Magister Lapidum," and some statutes of a corporation of sculptors in the twelfth century, quoted by a certain "Father Della Valle," [3] are referred to on both these points.

It is tolerably clear that no Rosicrucian Society was ever formed on the Continent. In other words, whatever number there may have been of individual mystics calling themselves Rosicrucians, no collective body of Rosicrucians acting in conjunction was ever matured and actually established in either Germany or France.[4] Yet it is assumed, for the purposes of a preconceived argument, that such a society existed in England, although the position maintained is not only devoid of proof, but conflicts with a large body of indirect evidence, which leads irresistibly to an opposite conclusion.

The literature of the seventeenth century abounds with allusions to the vagaries of Alchymists and Astrologers. There was an Astrologers' feast, if indeed an Astrologers' College or Society was not a public and established institution, and sermons, even if not always preached, were at least written on their side.[5] A school certainly existed for a time at Oxford, as I have already shown, presided over by a noted Rosicrucian. In fact, there seems to have been no kind of concealment as regards the manner in which all descriptions of what may, without impropriety, be termed the "black art" were prosecuted. There is, however, no trace whatever of any Rosicrucian *Society*, and it is consonant to sound reason to suppose that nothing of the kind could either have been long established, or widely spread, without at least leaving behind some vestiges of its existence, in the writings of the period.

It is worthy of note, moreover, that perhaps the most ardent supporter of that visionary scheme, a Philosophical College, with which so many minds were imbued by Bacon's "New Atlantis"[6]—Samuel Hartlib[7]—of whom a full memoir is still a desideratum in English

[1] Church Historians of England, 1852-56, vol. i., pt. ii., p. 554; W. H. Rylands, The Legend of the Introduction of Masons into England, pt. iii. (Masonic Monthly, Nov. 1882).

[2] Elements d'Archæologie, 1843; Freemason, July 8, 1882, note 19.

[3] In the opinion of Woodford, he is the same person who wrote, in 1791, the "Storia del Duomo d'Orvieto," published at Rome (Freemason, *loc. cit.*).

[4] It is true that, according to the preface of the "Echo of the Society of the Rosy Cross," 1615, "meetings were held in 1597 to institute a Secret Society for the promotion of *Alchymy*." See *ante*, p. 87, note 3.

[5] Stella Nova, a new Starre, Preached before the learned Society of Astrologers, August 1649, by Robert Gell, D.D.; Astrology Proved Harmless, Useful, Pious, Being a Sermon written by Richard Carpenter, 1657. The latter, a discourse on Gen. i. 14, "And let them be for signs," was dedicated to Elias Ashmole. The author, according to Wood, "was esteemed a theological mountebank."

[6] The late Mr James Crosaley alludes to two continuations of that fine fragment, Bacon's "New Atlantis"—one by R. H., Esquire, printed in 1660; the other (in his own possession) written by the celebrated Joseph Glanvill, and still in MS. (Chetham Soc. Pub., vol. xiii., p. 214).

[7] A friend of Evelyn and Dr Worthington. Milton's "Tractate on Education" was addressed to him. According to Evelyn, he was a "Lithuanian" (Diary, Nov. 27, 1655); whilst Wood styles him "a presbyterian Dutchman, a witness against Laud" (Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. iii., col. 965).

MAJOR GEORGE S TUDOR

PROVINCIAL GRAND MASTER OF STAFFORDSHIRE

Thomas G. Jack, London & Edinburgh.

biography, speaks of the Rosicrucians[1] in such terms as to make it quite clear that, in the year 1660, they occupied a very low position in the estimation of the learned. In letters addressed by him to Dr Worthington, on June 4 and December 10 respectively, he thus expresses himself,—"I am most willing to serve him [Dr Henry More], by procuring if I can a transcript of a letter or two of the supposed Brothers Ros.[eæ] Crucis;" and writing under a later date, he says, "the cheats of the Fraternity of the Holy [Rosy] Cross (w^ch^ they call mysteries) have had infinite disguises and subterfuges."[2]

Macaria—from μακαρία, "happiness" or "bliss"—was the name of the Society, the establishment of which Hartlib appears to have been confidently expecting throughout a long series of years. It was to unite the great, the wealthy, the religious, and the philosophical, and to form a common centre for assisting and promoting all undertakings in the support of which mankind were interested. Somewhat similar schemes were propounded by John Evelyn and Abraham Cowley; whilst John Joachim Becher or Beccher, styled by Mr Crossley "the German Marquis of Worcester," in his treatise "De Psychosophia," put forward the idea of what he calls a Psychosophic College, for affording the means of a convenient and tranquil life, and which is much of the same description as those planned by Hartlib and the others.

A similar society seems also to have been projected by one Peter Cornelius of Zurichsea.[3]

It is not likely that the Freemasons had any higher opinion of the Rosicrucians—*i.e.*, the *fraternity*—than was expressed by Hartlib. Freemasons, and Freemasonry more or less speculative, existed certainly in Scotland, and inferentially in England, long before its supposed introduction by Fludd, as I shall presently show, and if we cannot distinctly trace back to a higher origin than the sixteenth century, it is only to be inferred that *proof* of a more remote antiquity may be yet forthcoming. "Old records" of the craft, as I have already had occasion to observe, are oftener quoted than produced; but a few are still extant, and from these few we learn, that Masonic Societies were in actual existence at the time of their being written (or copied), and were not merely *in embryo*.

It will not be difficult to carry back the history of the Freemasons beyond the point of contact with the Rosicrucians, which is the leading feature of Buhle's hypothesis. He says:—1. "I affirm as a fact established upon historical research that, before the beginning of the seventeenth century, *no traces are to be met with* of the Rosicrucian or Masonic orders;" and 2. "That Free-Masonry is neither more nor less than Rosicrucianism as modified by those who transplanted it into England."

As regards the first point, "traces of the Masonic order," as Buhle expresses it, are certainly "to be met with" before the period which he has arbitrarily assigned for its inception. It is abundantly clear that Speculative Masonry—meaning by this phrase the membership of lodges by non-operative or geomatic masons—existed in the *sixteenth* century.[4] The fate of the second proposition is involved in that of its predecessor. It is not, indeed, even as an hypothesis, endurable for an instant that Freemasonry made its first appearance in South Britain as a Rosicrucian (*i.e.*, German) transfusion, *circa* 1633-46—herein slightly

[1] Meaning, of course, the so-called *fraternity*.

[2] Diary and Correspondence of Dr Worthington, Chetham Soc. Pub., vol. xiii., pp. 197, 239.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 149, 163, 239, 284; Boyle's Works, 1744, vol. v., p. 347.

[4] *Vide* Chap. VIII., *ante*, *passim*.

anticipating the other but equally chimerical theory of a Teutonic derivation through the Steinmetzen—unless we adopt Horace's maxim—

"Mihi res, non me rebus subjungere conor,"

in a sense not uncommon in philosophy, and strive to make facts bend to theory, rather than theory to fact.

Hence, the dispassionate reader will hardly agree with Soane—whose faith in Buhle no doubt made it easier for him to suppose, that what was probable must have happened, than to show that what did happen was probable—"that Freemasonry sprang out of decayed Rosicrucianism just as the beetle is engendered from a muck heap"[1]—a phrase which, however lively and forcible, errs equally against truth and refinement.

Extending the field of our inquiry, there can be but little doubt that Hermeticism—and my reasons for employing this word will be presently stated—only influenced Freemasonry, if at all, in a very remote degree; for there does not seem even the same analogy—fanciful as it is—as can be traced between the tenets of Fludd and those espoused by the Freemasons. Here, however, I deprecate the hasty judgment of my friend, the Rev. A. F. A. Woodford, whose known erudition, and the indefatigable ardour with which he dives into the most obscure recesses of book learning, entitle his opinions to our utmost respect; inasmuch as any *present* opinion upon the subject under discussion, must necessarily rest on purely circumstancial evidence, and is liable, therefore, to be overthrown at any moment, by the production of documentary proof bearing in any other direction.

It has been laid down by the authority I have last named, that "the importance of Hermeticism in respect of a true History of Freemasonry is very great;" also the opinion is expressed, "that an Hermetic system or grade flourished synchronously with the revival of 1717," and "that Elias Ashmole may have kept up a Rose Croix Fraternity" is stated to be "within the bounds of possibility."[2]

Three points are here raised—1. What is Hermeticism? 2. Was Freemasonry influenced by Elias Ashmole? and 3. Upon what evidence rests the supposition that Hermetic grades and Masonic degrees existed side by side in 1717?

These points I shall now proceed to consider, though not exactly in the order in which they are here arranged. For convenience sake, and before summing up the final results of our inquiry, I shall cite some evidence, which has been much relied on, by Mackey, Pike, Woodford, and other well-known Masonic students, as proving the existence of Hermetic sodalities certainly in 1722, and inferentially before 1717. This occurs in the preface to a little work called "Long Livers," published in 1722, and my object in here introducing it, is to obviate the necessity of dealing with the general subject, as it were, piecemeal—*i.e.*, in fugitive passages, scattered throughout this history; it being in my judgment the sounder course to take a comprehensive glance at the entire question of Hermeticism or Rosicrucianism, within, however, the limit of a single chapter. The points, therefore, which await examination in my concluding remarks are as follows:—1. Hermeticism; 2. The evidence of "Long Livers;" and 3. Ashmole as an Hermetic Philosopher.

[1] New Curiosities of Literature, vol. ii., p. 35.

[2] Masonic Monthly (1882), vol. i., pp. 139, 292; and *Cf.* Kenning's Cyclopædia, pp. 302, 303.

I. I have already stated that what we now call the Hermetic art, learning, or philosophy, would in the seventeenth century have passed under the generic title of Rosicrucianism. Whether the converse of this proposition would quite hold good, I am not prepared to say—much might be urged both for and against it. However, I shall not strain the analogy, but will content myself with describing the Hermetic art, as embracing the sciences of Astrology and Alchymy. The Alchymists engaged in three pursuits—

I. The discovery of the Philosopher's Stone, by which all the inferior metals could be transmuted into gold.

II. The discovery of an *Alcahest*,[1] or universal solvent of all things.

III. The discovery of a panacea, or universal remedy, under the name of *elixir vitæ*, by which all diseases were to be cured and life indefinitely prolonged.

The theory of the small but, I believe, increasing school who believe in Hermeticism as a factor in the actual development of Freemasonry may be thus shortly stated—

1. That an Hermetic Society existed in the world, whose palpable manifestation was that of the Rosicrucian fraternity.
2. That mystic associations, of which noted writers like Cornelius Agrippa[2] formed part, are to be traced at the end of the fifteenth century, if not earlier, with their annual *assemblies*, their secrets and mysteries, their signs of recognition, and the like.
3. The forms of Hermeticism—of occult invocations—are also masonic, such as the sacred Delta, the Pentalpha, the Hexagram (Solomon's Seal), the point within a circle.
4. The so-called "magical alphabet," as may be seen in Barrett's "Magus," is identical with the square characters which have been used as masons' marks at certain epochs, and on part of so-called masonic cyphers.
5. [*General Conclusions.*]—Hermeticism is probably a channel in which the remains of Archaic mysteries and mystical knowledge lingered through the consecutive ages.

Freemasonry, in all probability, has received a portion of its newer symbolical formulæ and emblematical types from the societies of Hermeticism.

At various points of contact, Freemasonry and Hermeticism, and *vice versâ*, have aided, sheltered, protected each other; and that many of the more learned members of the monastic profession were also Hermetics, is a matter beyond doubt,—nay, of absolute authority.

If ever there was a connection between the building fraternities and the monasteries, this duplex channel of symbolism and mysticism would prevail; and it is not at all unlikely, as it is by no means unnatural in itself, that the true secret of the preservation of a system of masonic initiation and ceremonial and teaching and mysterious life through so many centuries, is to be attributed to this twofold influence of the legends of the ancient guilds, and the influence of a contemporary Hermeticism.

The above statement I have drawn up from some notes kindly furnished by the Rev. A.

[1] Although Brucker, *op. cit.*, awards the credit of having introduced this term to Van Helmont, it is assigned by Heckethorn to Paracelsus, and its meaning described as "probably a corruption of the German words '*all geist*,' 'all spirit'" (Secret Soc. of All Ages and Countries, 1875, vol. i., p. 220).

[2] See H. Morley, Life of Cornelius Agrippa Von Mettesheim, Doctor and Knight, commonly known as a Magician, 1856, *passim*; Monthly Review, second series, 1798, vol. xxv., p. 304; Mackey, Encyclopædia of Freemasonry, *s. v.* Agrippa; and *ante*, p. 76, note 1.

F. A. Woodford, and have merely to add, that the school of which he is the *Coryphæus*, disclaim the theory—as being self-destructive—of the origin of Freemasonry in an Hermetic school, which grouped itself around Elias Ashmole and his numerous band of adepts and astrologers, and of which germs may be found in the mystical works of Amos Comenius, and the "Nova Atlantis" of Bacon.[1]

II. "LONG LIVERS"[2] is "a curious history of such persons of both sexes who have liv'd several ages, and grown young again;" and professes to contain "the rare secret of Rejuvenescency." It is dedicated—and with this dedication or preface we are alone concerned—"to the Grand Master, Masters, Wardens, and Brethren of the Most Antient and Most Honourable Fraternity of the Freemasons of Great Britain and Ireland." The introductory portion then proceeds:[3]

"Men, Brethren,—

"I address myself to you after this Manner, because it is the true Language of the Brotherhood, and which the primitive Christian Brethren, as well as those who were from the Beginning, made use of, as we learn from the holy Scriptures, and an uninterrupted Tradition."

"I present you with the following Sheets, as belonging more properly to you than any [one] else. By what I here say, those of you *who are not far illuminated, who stand in the outward Place*, and are not worthy to look behind the Veil, may find no disagreeable or unprofitable Entertainment: and those who are so happy as to have *greater Light*, will discover under those Shadows somewhat truly great and noble, and worthy the serious Attention of a Genius the most elevated and sublime: *The Spiritual Celestial Cube*, the only true, solid and immoveable Basis and Foundation of all Knowledge, Peace, and Happiness." ∴ ∴ ∴

"Remember that you are the Salt of the Earth, the Light of the World, and the Fire of the Universe. *Ye are living Stones*, built up [in] a spiritual House, who believe and rely on the chief *Lapis Angularis*. ∴ You are called from Darkness to Light." ∴ ∴

[A considerable portion of the preface is here omitted. The writer moralises at very great length, and throughout several pages the only observation bearing, however remotely, upon the subject-matter of the current chapter, is his suggestion that legal pettifoggers, or "Vermin of the Law," should be "for ever excluded the Congregation of the Faithful," and "their names rased for ever *out of the Book M.*," from which—disregarding all speculation with reference to his hatred of the lawyers—some readers may infer that the idea of a *Book M.*[4] had been copied from the Fraternity of the Rosie Cross, by the society he was addressing.]

"And now, my Brethren, *you of the higher Class*, permit me a few Words, since you are but few; and these few Words I shall speak to you in Riddles, because to you it is given to know those Mysteries which are hidden from the Unworthy."

"Have you not seen then, my dearest Brethren, that stupendous Bath, filled with most limpid Water. ∴ ∴ Its Form is a Quadrate sublimely placed on six others, blazing all with celestial Jewels, each angularly supported with four Lions. Here repose our mighty King and Queen (I speak foolishly, I am not worthy to be of you), the King shining in his

[1] Although much abridged, the *ipsissima verba* of the Rev. A. F. A. Woodford are preserved throughout.

[2] "London: printed for J. Holland at the Bible and Ball, in St Paul's Churchyard, and L. Stokoe at Charing Cross, 1722."

[3] The passages italicised are those which have been most frequently quoted in support of the theory that our *present* system of Freemasonry was directly influenced by *earlier* Hermetic societies.

[4] *Ante*, p. 100.

glorious Apparel of transparent incorruptible Gold, beset with living Sapphires; he is fair and ruddy, and feeds amongst the Lillies; his Eyes two Carbuncles; .·. his large flowing Hair, blacker than the deepest Black; .·. .·. his Royal Consort, vested in Tissue of immortal Silver, watered with Emeralds, Pearl, and Coral. O mystical Union! O admirable Commerce!"

"Cast now your Eyes to the Basis of this celestial Structure, and you will discover just before it a large Bason of Porphyrian Marble, receiving from the Mouth of a large Lion's Head .·. .·. a greenish Fountain of liquid Jasper. Ponder this well, and consider. Haunt no more the Woods and Forests; (I speak as a Fool) hunt no more the fleet Hart; let the flying Eagle fly unobserved; busy yourselves no longer with the dancing Ideot, swollen Toads, and his own Tail-devouring Dragon; leave these as Elements to your *Tyrones*."

"The Object of your Wishes and Desires (some of you perhaps have obtained it, I speak as a Fool) is that admirable thing which hath a Substance neither too fiery, nor altogether earthy, nor simply watery. .·. .·. In short, that One only Thing besides which there is no other, the blessed and most sacred Subject of the Square of wise Men, that is——I had almost blabbed it out, and been sacrilegiously perjured. I shall therefore speak of it with a Circumlocution yet more dark and obscure, that none but the Sons of Science, and those who are *illuminated* with the *sublimest Mysteries* and *profoundest Secrets* of MASONRY may understand, ——It is then, what brings you, my dearest Brethren, to that pellucid, diaphanous Palace of the true disinterested Lovers of Wisdom, that transparent Pyramid of purple Salt, more sparkling and radiant than the finest Orient Ruby, in the centre of which reposes inaccessible Light epitomiz'd, that incorruptible celestial Fire, blazing like burning Crystal, and brighter than the Sun in his full Meridian Glories, which is that immortal, eternal, never-dying PYROPUS, the King of Gemms, whence proceeds everything that is great, and wise, and happy." .·. .·. .·.

"Many are called,
Few chosen." .·. .·. .·. Amen.

"EUGENIUS PHILALETHES, Jun., F.R.S.

"*March* 1*st*, 1721."

The author of "Long Livers" was Robert Samber, a prolific writer, but who seems to have made his greatest mark as a translator. Two of his translations—published in his own name—are dedicated to members of the Montague family, one to the Duke, the other to his daughter, Lady Mary.[1] The title of "Long Livers" states it to be by "Eugenius Philalethes, Jun.," author of a "Treatise of the Plague." The latter work, published in 1721, is also dedicated to the Duke of Montague, and the preface abounds with the same mystical and Hermetic jargon as that of which I have just given examples. A brief illustration of this will suffice.

"A true Believer will not reveal to anyone his Good Works, but to such only to whom it may belong. .·. .·. This elevates us to the highest Degrees of true Glory, and makes us

[1] Amongst his miscellaneous works may be named, "Roma Illustrata," 1722, and an "Essay in Verse to the Memory of E. Russell, late Earl of Oxford, 1731." He also *translated* "A Method of Studying Physic" (H. Boerhaave), 1719; "The Courtier" (Count B. Castiglione), 1729; "The Devout Christian's Hourly Companion" (H. Drexellius), 1716; "The Discreet Princess, or the Adventures of Finetta" (reprinted 1818); "One Hundred New Court Fables" (H. de la Motte), 1721; "Memoirs of the Dutch Trade in all the States of the World," 2d ed., 1719; and "Nicetas" (H. Drexellius), 1633. Some of the dates are not given, and the last apparently refers to the year of original publication.

equal with Kings. It is the most pretious and most valuable Jewel in the World: a Jewel of Great Price, redder and more sparkling than the finest Rubies, more transparent than the purest Chrystal of the Rock, brighter than the Sun, Shining in Darkness, and is the Light of the World, and the Salt and Fire of the Universe."

Eugenius Philalethes[1]—*i.e.*, Robert Samber—also exhorts his Grace "to do good to his *poor Brethren*." It is certain that Samber received many kindnesses at the hands of the Duke—indeed, this is placed beyond doubt by the expressions of gratitude which occur in the preface of one of his translations,[2] dedicated to the same patron. He says: "Divine Providence has given me this happy opportunity publickly to acknowledge the great obligations I lye under to your Grace, for these signal favours which you, my Lord, in that manner of conferring benefits so peculiar to yourself, so much resembling Heaven, and with such a liberal hand, without any pompous ostentation or sound of trumpet, had the goodness, in private, to bestow on me;" and concludes by styling the Duke "the best of Masters, the best of Friends, and the best of Benefactors." This preface, which is dated Jan. 1, 1723, and signed "Robert Samber," brings us back very nearly to the period when "Long Livers," or at least its dedication, was written, *viz.*, March 1, 1721—*i.e.*, 172½[3]—or, according to the New Style, 1722, in which year, it should be recollected, the Duke of Montague was at the head of the English Craft. Now, in my judgment, nothing seems more natural than that Samber—himself an earnest Freemason, as his exhortations to the Fraternity abundantly testify—should seize the opportunity of coupling his gratitude towards his patron, with his affection for the Society to which they commonly belonged, by a complimentary address to the "Grand Master and Brethren of the Most Honourable Fraternity of the Freemasons of Great Britain and Ireland."

In this connection, indeed, it must not be forgotten that the Duke was a most popular ruler.[4] From 1717 to 1721 the Freemasons were longing to have a "Noble Brother at their Head," until which period only did they, from the very first establishment of the Grand Lodge, contemplate choosing a Grand Master "*from among themselves*,"[5] as Anderson somewhat quaintly expresses it. "At the Grand Lodge held on Lady-day, 1721, Grand Master Payne proposed for his successor John, Duke of Montagu, *Master* of a Lodge:[6] who, being present, was forthwith saluted *Grand Master Elect*, and his Health drank in *due* Form; when they all express'd great Joy at the Happy prospect of being again patronized by *noble Grand Masters*, as in the prosperous times of *Free Masonry*."[7]

I have given these details at some length, because (as it seems to me) a good deal of misconception has arisen from the phraseology of Samber's dedication having been discussed

[1] The various books and pamphlets classified under the title of *Philalethes*, with varied prefixes, fill nearly an entire volume of the British Museum Catalogue. *Inter alia*, the following are given: *Philalethes* (Eugenius) *pseud.* [*i.e.*, Thomas Vaughan]; *Philalethes* (Eugenius, Jun.) *pseud.* [*i.e.*, Robert Samber]; *Philalethes* (Eireneus) *pseud.* [*i.e.*, George Starkey]; *Philalethes* (Irenæus) *pseud.* [*i.e.*, William Spang]. The last-cited *nom de plume* is also accorded to Thomas Vaughan, J. G. Burckhard, Louis Du Moulin, and Samuel Prypkowski.

[2] The Courtier, 1729; probably, from the date of the preface, a 2d edition.

[3] The Julian or Old Style, and the practice of commencing the legal year on the 25th of March, subsisted in England until 1752.

[4] "Grand Master Montagu's good Government inclin'd the better Sort to continue him in the Chair another year" (Constitutions, 1738, p. 114).

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 109.

[6] It is very probable that Samber was a member of this Lodge!

[7] Constitutions, 1738, p. 111.

by commentators, without any consideration whatever of the circumstances under which it was written. Indeed, a portion of the criticism that has been passed upon it, before I announced the real author's name in the *Freemason*,[1] rests entirely upon *suppositions*, more or less ingenious, which identify the writer with Rosicrucian or Hermetic celebrities.[2]

Although I am quite unable to discern anything in the language employed by Samber, which calls for critical remark in a history of Freemasonry; yet, as a different opinion is entertained by many other writers whose claim to the public confidence I readily admit, it has seemed better, on all grounds, to place the evidence, such as it is, fairly before my readers, in order that they may draw what conclusions they think fit.[3] With this view, I have presented above every passage which, to the extent of my knowledge, has served as the text of any Masonic sermoniser, although, as the commentaries upon this Hermetic work are scattered throughout the more ephemeral literature of the Craft, I cannot undertake to say that a more subtle exposition of Samber's strange phraseology than I have yet seen, does not lie hidden in the forgotten pages of some Masonic journal.

"Long Livers," or its author, is nowhere referred to in the early minutes of the Grand Lodge, or the newspaper references to Freemasonry of contemporaneous date, which were of frequent occurrence; and from this alone I should deduce an inference totally at variance with the belief that the work possessed any Masonic importance. The only reference to it I have met with in the course of my reading, before its disinterment from a long obscurity by the late Matthew Cooke, Dr Mackey, and others, occurs in a *brochure* of 1723, which an advertisement in the *Evening Post*, No. 2168, from Tuesday, June 18, to Thursday, June 28, of that year, thus recommends, curiously enough, to the notice of the Craft: "Just published, in a neat Pocket Volume (for the use of the Lodges of all Freemasons), 'Ebrietatis Encomium,' or 'The Praise of Drunkenness,' confirmed by the examples of [*inter alios*] Popes, Bishops, Philosophers, Free Masons, and other men of learning in all ages. Printed for E. Curll.[4] .·. Price 2s. 6d."

Chapter XV. is thus headed,—"Of Free Masons, and other learned men, that used to get drunk." It commences as follows:—"If what brother Eugenius Philalethes, author of 'Long Livers,' a book dedicated to the Free Masons, says in his Preface to that treatise, be true, those mystical gentlemen very well deserve a place amongst the learned.[5] But, without entering into their peculiar jargon, or whether a man can be sacrilegiously perjured for revealing secrets when he has none, I do assure my readers, they are very great friends to the vintners. An eye-witness of this was I myself, at their late general meeting at Stationers'

[1] June 4, 1881.

[2] As "Long Livers" is an extremely rare work, it may be useful to state that a reprint of the *preface* will be found in the *Masonic Magazine*, vol. iv., 1876-77, p. 161.

[3] I was deterred by the length of some of Eugenius Philalethes' exhortations, from quoting them *literatim*. It is, however, important to state, that, whilst eulogising Christianity, he directs the Masons "to avoid Politics and Religion" (Long Livers, preface, p. 16, l. 19).

[4] The following appears on the title-page: "Ebrietatis Encomium: or, the Praise of Drunkenness: Wherein is Authentically, and most evidently proved, The Necessity of Frequently Getting Drunk; and, That the Practice is Most Ancient, Primitive, and Catholic. By Boniface Oinophilus, De Monte Fiascone, A. B. C." According to the MS. Catalogue, Brit. Mus. Library, this work is a translation of "L'Éloge de L'Yvresse" of A. H. de Sallengrè.

[5] "Thus shall Princes love and cherish you, as their most faithful and obedient Children and Servants, and take delight to commune with you, inasmuch as amongst you are found Men excellent in all kinds of Sciences, and who thereby may make their Name, who love and cherish you, immortal" (Long Livers, preface, p. 17, l. 6).

Hall,[1] who having learned some of their catechism,[2] passed my examination, paid my five shillings, and took my place accordingly. We had a good dinner, and, to their eternal honour, the brotherhood laid about them very valiantly. But whether, after a very disedifying manner, their demolishing huge walls of venison pasty be building up a spiritual house, I leave to brother Eugenius Philalethes to determine. However, to do them justice, I must own, there was no mention made of politics or religion, so well do they seem to follow the advice of that author.[3] And when the music began to play, 'Let the king enjoy his own again,' they were immediately reprimanded by a person of great gravity and science."

I adduce the above, as the only contemporary criticism of the preface to "Long Livers" with which I am conversant, and have merely to add that the writer, in anticipation of the charge, "that he who wrote the 'Praise of Drunkenness,' must be a drunkard by profession," expresses "his content, that the world should believe him as much a drunkard as Erasmus, who wrote the 'Praise of Folly,' was a fool, and weigh him in the same balance." "The Praise of Drunkenness" is both a witty and a learned book, and Samber's apostrophe to the Freemasons is dissected far more minutely than I have shown above. The criticism, however, tends to prove, that none of the speculations now rife with regard to the mystical language in which Eugenius Philalethes is supposed to have veiled Masonic secrets—above the comprehension of the general body of the craft—occupied the minds of those by whom his *jeu d'esprit* was perused at the time of its appearance.

It has been said that after Paracelsus the Alchymists divided into two classes: one comprising those who pursued useful studies; the other, those that took up the visionary side of Alchymy, writing books of mystical trash, which they fathered on Hermes, Aristotle, Albertus Magnus, and others. Their language is now unintelligible. One brief specimen may suffice. The power of transmutation, called the Green Lion, was to be obtained in the following manner:—"In the Green Lion's bed the sun and moon are born, they are married and beget a King; the King feeds on the lion's blood, which is the King's father and mother, who are at the same time his brother and sister; I fear I betray the secret,[4] which I promised my master to conceal in dark speech from every one who does not know how to rule the philosopher's fire."[5] "Our ancestors," says Heckethorn, "must have had a great talent for finding out enigmas if they were able to elicit a meaning from these mysterious directions; still the language was understood by the adepts, and was only intended for them." To give one further example. When Hermes Trismegistus, in one of the treatises attributed to him, directs the adept to catch the flying bird and to drown it, so that it fly no more, the fixation of quicksilver by a combination with gold is meant. Many statements of mathematical

[1] This must either have been the meeting of June 21, 1721, when the Duke of Montague was invested as Grand Master, or that of June 24, 1722, when the Duke of Wharton was irregularly proclaimed; no other assembly having been held at Stationers' Hall, at which the author of the work quoted from (1723) could have been present. The allusion to the toast of the Pretender, coupled with the Duke of Wharton's known Jacobite proclivities, would favour the later date.

[2] This points to an earlier form of the Masonic Examination than has come down to us.

[3] Long Livers, preface, p. 16, l. 19.

[4] Compare with the passage (satirized by the author of the "Praise of Drunkenness") wherein Eugenius Philalethes expresses his horror of being "sacrilegiously perjured."

[5] Heckethorn, Secret Societies of All Ages and Countries, 1875, vol. i., p. 222, § 182.

formulæ must always appear pure gibberish[1] to the uninitiated into the higher science of numbers; still these statements enunciate truths well understood by the mathematician.[2]

In my judgment, Robert Samber is to be classed with these Alchymists, or people addicted to the use of alchymical language, "*who did not pursue useful studies;*" and there I should leave the matter, but some interpretations have been placed upon his words, of which, in candour, I am bound to give some specimens. "If," says Dr Mackey—and the reader should carefully bear in mind that this is the opinion of one of the most accurate and diligent of Masonic students—"as Eugenius Philalethes plainly indicates, there were, in 1721, higher Degrees, or at least a higher Degree in which knowledge of a *Masonic* character was hidden from a great body of the craft ∴ ∴ why is it that neither Anderson nor Desaguliers make any allusion to this higher and more illuminated system?" Mackey here relies on two passages which are italicised in my extract from Samber's preface—one, the allusion to those "who stand in the outward place," and "are not far illuminated;" the other, the exhortation to "Brethren of the higher class." The result of his inquiry being, "that this book of Philalethes introduces a new element in the historical problem of Masonry," in which opinion the Rev. A. F. A. Woodford evidently concurs.

Among the further commentaries upon the introduction to "Long Livers," I shall only briefly notice those of Mr T. B. Whytehead,[3] who alludes to the "Spiritual Celestial Cube," and infers from the language of the writer that he may have belonged to certain Christian degrees; and of Mr John Yarker, who finds in its phraseology a *résumé* of the symbolism and history given in the three Degrees of Templar, Templar Priest, and Royal Arch,[4] which Degrees he considers date from the year 1686, and observes (on the authority of Ashmole) that they synchronize with the revival of Freemasonry and Rosicrucianism in London.[5]

The remarks I have to offer on the subject of *degrees* will be given in a later chapter, and I shall next give a short sketch of Elias Ashmole, in his character of an Hermetic Philosopher.

III. Elias Ashmole, "the eminent philosopher, chemist, and antiquary"—as he is styled by his fullest biographer, Dr Campbell[6]—founder of the noble museum at Oxford, which still bears his name, was the only child of Simon Ashmole, of Lichfield, Saddler, in which city his birth occurred on May 23, 1617. The chief instrument of his future preferments, as he gratefully records in his diary, was his cousin Thomas, son of James Paget, Esq., some time Puisne Baron of the Exchequer, who had married for his second wife, Bridget, Ashmole's aunt by the mother's side. When he had attained the age of sixteen, he went to reside with Baron Paget, at his house in London, and continued for some years afterwards a dependent of that family.

[1] It is a singular fatality that Abu Musa Jafar al Sofi—better known as Geber—considered to be the father and founder of Chemistry, and also a famous astronomer, and who is said to have written 500 hermetic works, should have descended to our times as the founder of that jargon known by the name of gibberish!

[2] Heckethorn, *loc. cit.*

[3] Freemasons' Chronicle, May 14, 1881.

[4] Freemason, Jan. 1 and Jan. 29, 1881.

[5] He says, "I may point out that Ashmole makes the London revival of Freemasonry and the occult Rosicrucian system, with which he was connected, as both taking place in 1686" (Freemason, Jan. 29, 1881).

[6] Biographia Britannica, vol i., 1747, *s. v.* Ashmole. As the ensuing monograph of Ashmole is derived mainly from the memoirs of him in the work last cited; in Collier's "Historical Dictionary," 1707, Supplement, 2d Alphabet; Wood's "Athenæ Oxonienses," vol. iii., col. 354; and *Masonic Magazine*, December 1881 (W. H. Rylands, Freemasonry in the Seventeenth Century—Warrington, 1646); together with his own "Diary," published by Charles Burman in 1717; I shall only refer to these authorities in special instances.

In 1638 he settled himself in the world, and on March 27 of that year, married Eleanor, daughter of Mr Peter Mainwaring of Smallwood, in the county of Chester, and in Michaelmas term the same year became a Solicitor in Chancery. In 1641 he was sworn an Attorney in the Common Pleas, and in the same year lost his wife, who died suddenly. The following year—owing to the unsettled condition of affairs—he retired to Smallwood, where he prosecuted his studies, and in 1644 went to Oxford, and at Brazen-Nose College and the public library, "applied himself vigorously to the sciences, but more particularly to natural philosophy, mathematics, and astronomy, and his intimate acquaintance with Mr, afterwards Sir, George Wharton, gave him a turn to astrology, which was in those days in greater credit than now."[1] On March 12, 1646, at the recommendation of Sir John Heydon,[2] he was made a captain in Lord Ashley's regiment at Worcester, and on June 12, Comptroller of the Ordnance. After the surrender of the town of Worcester, Ashmole again withdrew to Cheshire, and on October 16 in the same year (1646) was made a Freemason at Warrington in Lancashire, respecting which occurrence, as it will form the subject of our inquiry, from a different point of view, in the next chapter, I shall merely pause to observe, that whilst he is stated to have regarded his admission as a great distinction, there is no direct proof that he was present at more than two Masonic meetings in his life.[3]

Ashmole left Cheshire at the end of October, and arriving in London, became intimate with Mr, afterwards Sir, Jonas Moore, Mr William Lilly, and Mr John Booker,[4] esteemed the greatest astrologers living, by whom he was "caressed, instructed, and received into their fraternity, which then made a very considerable figure, as appeared by the great resort of persons of distinction to their annual feast, of which he was afterwards elected steward."[5] On November 16, 1649, he became the fourth husband of Lady Mainwaring,[6] and shortly afterwards settled in London, when his house became a fashionable *rendezvous* for the most learned and ingenious persons of the time. In 1661 he was admitted a Fellow of the Royal Society. Twice he declined the office of Garter-King-at-Arms. His wife, Lady Mainwaring, died on April 1, 1668, and he was married to Elizabeth, the daughter of Sir William Dugdale, on November 3 in the same year. Ashmole died on May 18, 1692, in the seventy-sixth year of his age. Anthony à Wood, who seldom erred on the side of panegyric, says of him, "He was the greatest virtuoso and curioso that ever was known or read of in England before his time. *Uxor Solis* took up its habitation in his breast, and in his bosom the great God did abundantly store up the treasures of all sorts of wisdom and knowledge. Much of his time, when he was in the prime of his years, was spent in chymistry; in which faculty being accounted famous, did worthily receive the title of

[1] Biog. Brit., *loc. cit.* According to Ashmole's "Diary," he "first became acquainted with Captain Wharton, Ap. 17, 1645;" and their friendship, which had been discontinued many years, by reason of the latter's "unhandsome and unfriendly dealing, began to be renewed about the middle of December 1669." Wharton died Nov. 15, 1673.

[2] Lieutenant-General of the Ordnance, who died October 16, 1653, and is to be carefully distinguished from John Heydon (Eugenius Theodidactus) the astrologer, of whom anon.

[3] *E.g.* on October 16, 1646; and on March 11, 1682. See, however, *post*, p. 137.

[4] Booker died in 1667, and Lilly in 1681; gravestones were placed over them by Ashmole, who purchased both their libraries.

[5] Biog. Brit., *loc. cit.*

[6] Sole daughter of Sir William Forster of Aldermarston, Berks, first married to Sir Edward Strafford, next to Mr T. Hamlyn, Pursuivant of Arms, and then to Sir Thomas Mainwaring, Knt., one of the Masters in Chancery.

Mercuriophilus Anglicus."[1] This, Dr Campbell—who can himself see no defects in Ashmole's character—allows to be "an extraordinary commendation from so splenetic a writer,"[2] though, as we shall see, it was somewhat qualified, by the further remarks of the Oxford Antiquary. After mentioning the rarities, coins, medals, books, and manuscripts given by Elias Ashmole in his lifetime, and at his death, to the University of Oxford, he very abruptly goes on to say —"But the best *elixir* that he enjoyed, which was the foundation of his riches, wherewith he purchased books, rarities, and other things, were the lands and joyntures which he had by his second wife .·. .·. Mr Ashmole taking her to wife on the 16th of Nov. 1649, enjoyed her estate, tho' not her company for altogether, till the day of her death, which hapned on the first of Apr. 1668."

Ashmole's greatest undertaking was his history of the "Most Noble Order of the Garter," published in 1672, and of which it has been said, "if he had published nothing else, it ought to have preserved his memory for ever, since it is in its kind one of the most valuable books in our language."[3]

As it is, however, with his Hermetic works that we are alone concerned, I proceed with their enumeration; premising that he made his first appearance as an editor and translator before taking upon himself the character of an author.

1. "*Fasciculus Chymicus*:[4] or, Chymical Collections expressing the Ingress, Progress, and Egress of the Secret Hermetick Science. Whereunto is added the *Arcanum*,[5] or Grand Secret of Hermetick Philosophy. Both made English by James Hasolle, Esq.; *Qui est Mercuriophilus Anglicus*. London, 1650."

To these translations was prefixed a kind of hieroglyphical frontispiece in several compartments, of which a brief notice will suffice—"a scrowl from above, and a *mole* at the foot of an *ash*-tree, express the author's name, which is also anagramised in *James Hasolle, i.e., Elias Ashmole*. A column on the right hand refers to his proficiency in music, and to his being a Freemason,[6] as that on the left does to his military preferments. Ashmole's *prolegomena* alone runs to thirty-one pages. According to Wood, "farc'd with Rosycrucian language," and dedicated to "all the ingeniously elaborate students of Hermetick Learning."[7]

2. "Theatrum Chemicum Britannicum: or, Annotations on Several Poetical Pieces of our Famous English Philosophers who have written the Hermetique Mysteries in their own ancient language. London, 1652."

In this he designed a complete collection of the works of such English chymists as had till then remained in MS.; and finding that a competent knowledge of Hebrew, was absolutely

[1] Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. iii., col. 359. [2] Biog. Brit., *loc. cit.* [3] *Ibid.*

[4] Arthur Dee, Fasciculus Chymicus de Abstrusis Hermeticæ Scientæ, Ingressu, Progressu, etc., Par. 1631. Besides the libraries of Booker, Lilly, Milbourn, and Hawkins, Ashmole also bought that of Dr Dee.

[5] As to the authorship of this, see *post*, p. 133.

[6] Biog. Brit., *loc. cit.* "A pillar adorned with musical instruments, rules, compasses, and mathematical schemes" (*Ibid*). In Ben Jonson's comedy, "The Alchemist," 1610, Subtle says—

> "He shall have *a bel*, that's *Abel*:
> And by it standing one whose name is *Dee*,
> In a *rug* gown, there's D, and *Rug*, that's *drug*:
> And right anenst him a dog snarling *er*:
> There's *Drugger*, Abel Drugger. That's his sign.
> And here's now mystery and hieroglyphic."

[7] Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. iv., col. 361.

necessary, for understanding and explaining such authors as had written on the Hermetic science, he had recourse to Rabbi Solomon Frank, by whom he was taught the rudiments of the sacred tongue, which he found very useful to him in his studies. The work last described gained him a great reputation among the learned, especially in foreign countries.

3. "The Way to Bliss," in three books, made public by Elias Ashmole, 1658.

This was penned by an unknown author, who lived in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Ashmole received the copy from William Backhouse, and published it, because a pretended copy was in circulation, which it was designed "to pass for the child of one Eugenius Theodidactus, being—by re-baptisation—called 'The Wise-Man's Crown, or Rosie-crusian Physic.'"[1]

This Eugenius Theodidactus—*i.e.*, the taught of God—was one John Heydon, a great pretender to Rosicrucian knowledge, who married the widow of Nicholas Culpepper, the famous quack, and published many idle books, in one[2] or more of which he abused Ashmole on this subject. In his "Wiseman's Crown, or the Glory of the Rosy Cross," 1664, are the following curious passages:

"The Rosie Crucians, with a certain terible authority of religion, do exact an oath of silence from those they initiate to the arts of Astromancy, Geomancy, and Telesmaticall Images, &c."

"The late years of tirany admitted Stocking weavers, Shoemakers, Millers, *Masons*, Carpenters, Bricklaiers, Gunsmiths, Hatters, Butlers, &c., to write and teach astrology, &c."[3]

My readers can place what construction they please on the preceding quotations, but their value for any useful purpose is much lessened by the general character of the writer's productions. In one of these, indeed, he speaks of the Rosicrucians as "a divine fraternity that inhabite the subburbs of Heaven;" and in another place says, "I am no Rosicrucian."[4] His knowledge, therefore, of the fraternity must have been of the slightest. The passage relating to the masons appears to me to prove rather too much, though I insert it, in deference to the learning and research of the friend from whom I received it; for not masons only, but apparently all kinds of mechanics, were admitted into the ranks of the astrologers; indeed, this is placed beyond doubt by Lilly's description of his colleagues.[5]

"The Way to Bliss" was a treatise in prose on the Philosopher's Stone, to which he prefixed a preface, dated April 16, 1658. This address to the reader was a kind of farewell to Hermetic philosophy on the part of Ashmole. The treatise itself is pronounced by Dr Campbell "*to be the best and most sensible book in our language*"[6]—an expression of opinion which

[1] The Way to Bliss, Ashmole's preface.

[2] The Idea of the Law, 1660. Heydon, according to his own statement, was born in 1629. He has been confounded with Sir John Heydon, probably from the fact that the latter's father, Sir C. Heydon, wrote a "Defence of Judicial Astrology," 1603. Twenty years afterwards, Dr George Carleton, successively Bishop of Llandaff and Chichester, published "Astrologimania: or, the Madness of Astrologers," which was an answer to Sir C. Heydon's book (Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. i., col. 745; vol. ii., col. 422).

[3] For these extracts I am indebted to the Rev. A. F. A. Woodford. The work from which they are taken is not in the library of the British Museum.

[4] The Rosie Crucian Infallible Axiomata, or General Rules to Know All Things, Past, Present, and to Come. 1660. (Preface.) A complete list of Heydon's works is given in the "Athenæ Oxonienses," vol. iv., col. 362.

[5] Alexander Hart had been a soldier; William Poole, a gardener, plasterer, and bricklayer; Booker, a haberdasher's apprentice; and Lilly, a domestic servant (Life of Lilly, with notes by Elias Ashmole).

[6] Biog. Brit., *loc. cit.*

induced the late Mr Crossley [1] to remark, "I rather agree with Dr Dibdin,[2] who pronounced it 'a work invincibly dull,' and 'a farrago of sublime nonsense.' Probably neither of us have the true Hermetic vein, which only

"'Pauci quos æquus amavit
Jupiter'

are blessed with. Dr Campbell might be one of those more favoured readers of whom Ashmole speaks: 'It is a cause of much wonder where he that reads, though smatteringly acquainted with nature, should not meet with clear satisfaction; but here is the reason: *Many are called, but few are chosen.* 'Tis a haven towards which many skilful pilots have bent their course, yet few have reached it. For, as amongst the people of the Jews, there was but one who might enter into the Holy of Holies, (and that but once a year,) so there is seldom more in a nation whom God lets into this Sanctum Sanctorum of philosophy; yet some there are. But though the number of the elect are not many, and generally the fathom of most men's fancies that attempt the search of this most subtle mystery is too narrow to comprehend it, their strongest reason too weak to pierce the depth it lies obscured in, being indeed so unsearchable and ambiguous, it rather exacts the sacred and courteous illuminations of a cherub than the weak assistance of a pen to reveal it; yet let no man despair." [3]

After Ashmole once addicted himself to the study of antiquities and records, he never deserted it, or could be prevailed upon to resume his design of sending abroad the works of the other English *Adepti*, though he had made large collections towards it.

It has been suggested, that some of the abler alchemists showed him his mistakes, in what he had already published, particularly as to the *Arcanum* before mentioned, which he calls "the work of a concealed author," though in what seems to be the motto,—viz., the words *Penes nos unda Tagi*,—the very name of the author was expressed, viz., Jean Espagnet.[4] But this piece published by Ashmole, was only the second part of Espagnet's work, the first being published under the title of "Enchiridion Physicæ restitutæ cum Arcano Philosophiæ Hermeticæ." [5] Paris, 1623. In the title of this work, the author's name is concealed under another anagrammatical motto, viz., *Spes mea in agno est.* The second part was entitled, "Enchiridion Philosophiæ Hermeticæ," 1628. It was printed again in 1647, and a third time in 1650; and from this last volume Ashmole translated it. "The truth is," says Dr Campbell, "and the Abbé Fresnoy [6] has justly observed it, our author was never an Adept, and began to write when he was but a disciple. He grew afterwards more cautious, and though he never missed any opportunity of purchasing chymical MSS., yet he was cured of the itch of publishing them, and held it sufficient to deposit them in the Bodleian Library, for their greater security, and for the benefit of society." [7]

Ashmole's claim to the title, of which the Abbé Fresnoy would deprive him, rests in the

[1] Chetham Soc. Pub., vol. xiii., p. 157, note 1.

[2] Bibliomania, p. 387.

[3] Fasciculus Chymicus, 1650, *prolegomena.*

[4] "President of the Parliament of Bordeaux, and esteemed the ablest writer on this sort of learning whose works are extant" (Biog. Brit., *loc. cit.*).

[5] The Enchiridion of Revived Physic, with the Secret of the Hermetic Philosophy.

[6] Citing Histoire de la Philosophie Hermétique, tom. iii., p. 105.

[7] Biog. Brit., *loc. cit.*

main, upon certain entries in his diary which refer to Mr William Backhouse,[1] who himself was reputed an Adept, and, it is said, instilled into the mind of the younger inquirer his affection for chemistry. These are as follow:

"1651. April 3. *Post merid.* Mr William Backhouse of Swallowfield, in *com.* Berks, caused me to call him father thenceforward."

"June 10. Mr Backhouse told me I must now needs be his son, because he had communicated so many secrets to me."

"1652. March 10. This morning my father Backhouse opened himself very freely, touching the great secret."

"1652. May 13. My father Backhouse lying sick in Fleet Street, over against St Dunstan's Church; and not knowing whether he should live or die, about one of the clock, told me, in syllables, the true matter of the Philosopher's Stone, which he bequeathed to me as a legacy."[2]

The nature of this kind of philosophic adoption is very copiously explained by Ashmole himself, in his notes on Norton's "Ordinal,"[3] and perhaps the passage may not be disagreeable to the reader.[4]

"There has been a continued succession of Philosophers in all ages, altho' the heedless world hath seldom taken notice of them; for the antients usually (before they died) adopted one or other for their sons, whom they knew well fitted with such like qualities, as are set down in the letter that Norton's master wrote to him, when he sent to make him his heir unto this science, and otherwise than for pure virtue's sake, let no man expect to attain it, or, as in the case of Tonsile—

"'For almes I will make no store,
Plainly to disclose it, that was never done before.'[5]

"Rewards nor terrors (be they never so munificent or dreadful) can wrest this secret out of the bosom of a Philosopher, amongst others, witness Thomas Daulton.[6]

"Now under what ties and engagements, this secret is usually delivered (when bestowed by word of mouth), may appear in the weighty obligations of that oath, which Charnock took before he obtained it: For thus spake his master to him[7]—

[1] Born in 1593, "a most renown'd Chymist, Rosicrucian, and a great encourager of those that studied chymistry and astrology, especially Elias Ashmole, whom he adopted his son, and opened himself very freely to him the *secret*. He died on the 30th of May 1662, leaving behind him the character of a good man, and of one eminent in his profession" (Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. iii., col. 577).

[2] *Query:* Was this to follow the course of ordinary legacies, *i.e.*, not to fall in, until the *death* of the testator, which, as stated in the previous note, did not take place until 1662?

[3] Theatrum Chemicum Britannicum, p. 440.

[4] In Ben Jonson's comedy, Sir Epicure Mammon thus addresses Subtle the Alchemist, "Good morrow, *father;*" to which the latter replies, "Gentle *son*, good morrow." Also when the deacon Ananias, announcing himself as "a faithful *brother*"—as the Puritans styled themselves—Subtle affects to misunderstand the expression, and to take him for a believer in Alchemy. He says—"What's that?—a Lullianist?—a Ripley?—Filius Artis?" (The Alchemist, 1610, Act ii. Sc. i.; Jonson's Works, edit. 1816, vol. iv., pp. 59, 81).

[5] Norton's Ordinal, *apud* Theatrum Chemicum Britannicum, p. 41.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

[7] Breviary of Philosophy, chap. v. (Theat. Chem. Brit., p. 299).

"'Will you with me to-morrow be content,
Faithfully to receive the Blessed Sacrament,
Upon this Oath that I shall heere you give;
For ne Gold, ne Silver, as long as you live;
Neither for love you beare towards your Kinne,
Nor yet to no great Man, preferment to wynne,
That you disclose the seacret that I shall you teach
Neither by writing, nor by no swift speech;
But only to him which you be sure
Hath ever searched after the seacrets of Nature?
To him you may reveale the seacrets of this *art*,
Under the Covering of *Philosophie*, before this world yee depart.'

"And this oath he charged him to keep faithfully, and without violation, as he thought to be saved from the Pit of Hell.

"And if it so fell out, that they met not with any, whom they conceived in all respects worthy of their adoption,[1] they then resigned it into the hands of God, who best knew where to bestow it. However, they seldom left the world, before they left some written legacy behind them, which (being the issue of their brain) stood in room and place of children, and becomes to us both parent and schoolmaster, throughout which they were so universally kind, as to call all students by the dear and affectionate title of Sons[2] (Hermes, giving the first precedent), wishing all were such, that take the true pains to tread their fathers' steps, and industriously to follow the rules and dictates they made over to posterity, and wherein they faithfully discovered the whole mystery—

"'As lawfully as by their fealty thei may,
By lycence of the dreadful Judge at domesday.'[3]

"In these legitimate children, they lived longer than in their adopted sons; for though these certainly perished in an age, yet their writings (as if when they dyed, their souls had been transmigrated into them) seemed as immortal, enough at least to perpetuate their memories, till time should be no more. And to be the father of such sons, is (in my opinion) a most noble happinesse."

"Our author's Commentary making this point quite clear," says Dr Campbell, "there is no necessity of insisting farther upon it; only it may be proper to observe, that Mr Ashmole's father, Backhouse, did not die till May 30, 1662, as appears by our author's 'Diary.'[4] He was esteemed a very great Chemist, and admirably versed in what was styled the Rosicrucian learning, and he was so; but it appears plainly from Mr Ashmole's writings, that he understood his father, Backhouse, in too literal a sense, and did not discover the confusion occasioned by applying a method of removing all the imperfections of metals to physic, and thereby misleading people on that subject, by the promises of an universal medicine,[5] true

[1] Norton's Ordinal, chap. ii. in the story of Thomas Daulton, a famous Hermetic Philosopher, who flourished in the reign of Edward IV. (Theat. Chem. Brit., p. 37).

[2] Hermes in Pimandro. [3] Norton's Ordinal, in his Introduction. [4] P. 28.

[5] Biog. Brit., *loc. cit.* The Universal Medicine of the Rosicrucians shows that physical science had something to do with it. The mystical philosophy branches off into two—the one mental, the other physical—both equally absurd, though not without some grains of truth (for there generally are, even in the greatest absurdities), and both declined shortly after to give way beneath the general advance of human knowledge.

perhaps in the less obvious sense and false in the other, in which, however, it is generally taken."

In the opinion of the same authority, Ashmole, by saving so many of the best chemical writers from oblivion, has very worthily filled that post which he assigned himself, when declining the arduous labours which were necessary to the gaining his father Backhouse's legacy, and becoming an Adept; and that, in modestly and truly styling himself *Mercuriophilus Anglicus*, he selected a title so just, and so expressive of his real deserts, that one would have thought he had exerted his skill as a herald in devising it, if we had not known that chemistry was his first, and to his last continued his favourite, study.[1]

In next proceeding with an examination of the influence, real or supposed, of Ashmole upon our early Freemasonry, I shall ask my readers to cast a backward glance at the extracts already given from the "Encyclopædia Metropolitana."[2] This article, from the pen it should be recollected, of a learned Masonic writer, is decidedly plausible, and, what is of infinitely greater importance, it is also to a very considerable extent consonant with common sense. Nor shall I attempt to deny that in all probability some process of transformation such as is here indicated took place about this time; but I think Sandys falls into the error of asserting too much, and of going too minutely into detail. For without reckoning the facts that there never was a German Rosicrucian Society, and that the era of the mania is slightly antedated, we may well ask, was there ever a Rosicrucian Society established in London? If there was, did Ashmole belong to it? How do we know that the members made use of certain emblems? Did Ashmole and his friends[3] transfer the same, with sundry rites, ceremonies, and teachings to the Masonic body? Did the Society meet in the Mason's Hall?—together with other queries of a like nature.

The argument usually brought forward, on behalf of the Ashmolean theory, is an admirable specimen of the kind of reasoning too often employed on such matters. Certain observances and ideas which did not exist before are found, or are supposed to have been found, prevalent among Masons towards the commencement of the eighteenth century. Ashmole was known to have been a Mason, and to have been fond of wasting his time upon all sorts of queer, out of the way, and unprofitable pursuits—therefore these new conceits were taught by Ashmole to the Freemasons! But in the first place let us see, by his own showing, what manner of man Ashmole really was. A strange being, very learned,[4] very credulous, very litigious, and, to use a vulgarism, extremely cantankerous, perfectly capable of acquiring money and taking care of it when so acquired, capable also of writing one or two books of crabbed and ponderous learning, and capable of very little else. As a rule his "Diary" is trifling where it is not simply nauseous.[5] Pepys and Evelyn, judging from the tone of the allusions to Ashmole,

[1] Biog. Brit., *loc. cit.*

[2] *Ante*, p. 115.

[3] Who were they? Ashmole was intimate at various times with Wharton, Lilly, Moore, Booker, Vaughan, Backhouse, Oughtred, and other votaries of the Hermetic art; but the only *Freemason* among them, so far as any proof extends, was Sir Robert Moray.

[4] Evelyn, however, thus speaks of him:—"He has divers MSS., but most of them Astrological, to which study he is addicted, *though I believe not learned*, but very industrious, as his 'History of the Order of the Garter' proves" (Diary, July 23, 1678).

[5] "1657. October 8. The cause between me and my wife was heard, where Mr Serjeant Maynard observed to the

in their respective diaries, seem to have had no very exalted opinion of him. When the former says he found him "a very ingenious gentleman," it is damning with faint praise, in the same way as people call a person "good natured," when by no possibility can any other salient trait of goodness be ascribed to him.

This was not the kind of man to influence any considerable body or bodies of his fellow-men, either for good or for evil, to inoculate them with his own ideas, or to guide their steps into new fields of inquiry. Moreover, we do not actually know that he was a philosopher of the class supposed. An astrologer, or a believer at least in astrology, he certainly was, though it may be doubted whether any of the charlatans forming his *entourage* ever succeeded in getting money from him; but it is believed by competent authorities, as has been stated on a former page, that he was never an adept or professional at either this or any similar art. It is also denied that he was a Rosicrucian, although Wood asserts the contrary. By "Rosicrucian," we must, I imagine, in the former instance, understand a disciple of Fludd, of which I do not find any positive proof; whilst what Wood meant must clearly have been that he was addicted to pursuits which passed under that generic term. We have also to consider, that the taste for such trifles had considerably died out, in the last half of the seventeenth century, during the greater part of which period lay Ashmole's connection with the Freemasons.

Moreover, what were the circumstances attending his connection with the Masonic body? Only two allusions to the Freemasons occur under his own hand—one relating to his admission in 1646, the other to his attending a meeting at Mason's Hall in 1682, thirty-five years subsequently, and it has been inferred from his silence that these were the only two occasions on which he ever attended a lodge.[1] But not to mention that his diary obviously omits many things of infinitely greater interest than his colds, purges, or "the heavy form which fell and hurt his great toe,"[2] it is difficult to account for his being *summoned* to a Lodge at Mason's Hall, London, in 1682, thirty-five years after his initiation at far distant Warrington, if he held altogether aloof from Masonic meetings in the *interim*, or what is virtually the same thing, strictly concealed the fact of his being a member of the Fraternity. Is it likely, under either supposition, that the Masons of the metropolis—even had the fact of his initiation in any way leaked out—would have gone so far as to *summon* (not invite) their distinguished and "unattached" brother to take part in the proceedings of a society upon which he had long since virtually turned his back? It is probable, therefore, that he did in some way keep up his connection with the Freemasons, but that it was of such a slender character as not to merit any special mention. He might not, and probably would not, have entered into any detail—his diary

Court that there were 800 sheets of depositions on my wife's part, and not one word proved against me of using her ill, nor ever giving her a bad or provoking word.

"October 9. The Lords Commissioners having found no cause for allowing my wife alimony, did, *4 hor. post merid.*, deliver my wife to me; whereupon I carried her to Mr Lilly's, and there took lodgings for us both."

This summary mode of issuing a decree for the restitution of conjugal rights will astonish some readers. Poor Lady Mainwaring had, I doubt not, at least 800 good reasons for leaving such a man, who must certainly have been most "provoking." Still, as he was her fourth husband, she ought to have been pretty well used to the ways of the sex, and, at her time of life—she had a grown-up family when she made her fourth venture—had no one but herself to thank for her troubles, more especially as her acquaintance with Ashmole was not a sudden one.

[1] Findel, History of Freemasonry, p. 113.

[2] Of the trivial character of the entries, the following affords a good specimen:—"1681. April 11. I took early in the morning a good dose of Elixir, and hung three spiders about my neck, and they drove my ague away—*Deo gratias.*"

scarcely gives details on any point except his ailments and his law-suits—but he would probably have given at least notices of his having attended Lodges—had he done so with any frequency—as he does of having attended the Astrologers' feasts. Moreover, if Dr Knipe's account[1] of his collections relative to Freemasonry be correct, he does not appear to have been much inclined to mix the new mystical and symbolical ideas, with the old historical or quasi-historical traditions of the craft. My own view, therefore, is, that the Ashmolean influence on Freemasonry, of which so much has been said, is not proved to have had any foundation in fact, though it is fair to state that I base this opinion on circumstantial evidence alone, which is always liable to be overthrown by apparently the most trifling discovery.

Hence, whilst admitting that Freemasonry may have received no slight tinge from the pursuits and fancies of some of its adherents, who were possibly more numerous than is generally supposed—and the larger their number, the greater the probability that some of the more influential among them may have indoctrinated their brethren with their peculiar wisdom—still I do not think that such a proceeding can with safety be ascribed to a particular set of men, much less to any one individual.[2]

To sum up. We may assume, I think, (1.) That while there was an abundance of astrologers, alchemists, charlatans, and visionaries of all kinds, who seem to have pursued their hobbies without let or hindrance, yet there was no organised *society* of any sort, unless the Astrologers' Feast, so often mentioned by Ashmole, be accounted one; (2.) That there is no trace of any *sect* of Rosicrucians or Fluddian philosophers;[3] (3.) That Hartlib's attempt at a "Macaria" ended as might have been supposed, and was never either anticipated or revived by himself or anybody else; and (4.) That there is no trace, as far as any remaining evidence is concerned, that the Freemasons were in any way connected with any one of the above, but on the contrary, that, although they had probably in a great measure ceased to be entirely operatives, they had not amalgamated with any one of the supposed Rosicrucian or Hermetic fraternities—of the actual existence of which there is no proof—still less that they were their actual descendants, or themselves under another name.[4] To assume this, indeed, would be to falsify the whole of authentic Masonic history, together with the admittedly genuine documents upon which it rests.

I have now finished this portion of my task, which has, I am conscious, somewhat exceeded its allotted limits, though I am equally well aware that I have only succeeded in collecting some

[1] See next chapter.

[2] Mr John Yarker, however, pronounces Elias Ashmole to have been, *circa* 1686, "the leading spirit, both in Craft Masonry and in Rosicrucianism;" and is of opinion that his diary establishes the fact "that both Societies fell into decay together, and both revived together in 1682." He adds, "It is evident, therefore, that the Rosicrucians—who had too freely written upon their instruction, and met with ridicule—found the Operative Guild conveniently ready to their hand, and grafted upon it their own Mysteries. Also, from this time Rosicrucianism disappears, and Freemasonry springs into life, with all the possessions of the former" (Speculative Freemasonry, an historical lecture, delivered March 31, 1883, p. 9). *Cf. ante*, p. 129.

[3] If it is held, that by some process of evolution the *fraternity* of the Rosie Cross became the first *English* Freemasons—Hermeticism, as a possible factor in the historical problem, is at once shut out, and the Masonic traditions as contained in the "Old Charges") are quietly ignored, to say nothing of Scottish Freemasonry, of which the Fluddian philosophy would in this case prove to be an unconscious plagiarism!

[4] In the common practice of sweeping everything into their net, Masonic writers too often follow the example of Autolycus, described as "*a collector of unconsidered trifles.*"

of the materials for an exhaustive chapter on the subjects above treated, not in writing such a chapter itself.

Many of my conclusions, I doubt not, will be disputed, and many more may be overturned by a more thorough investigation. It is quite possible that, buried in the dust of long-forgotten works of Hermetic learning, or enshrined amidst the masses of manuscripts contained in our great collections, there may still exist the materials for a far more perfect, if, indeed, not a complete elucidation of this dark portion of our annals. The indulgent reader will, however, pardon my errors. It is impossible not to stumble in the midst of intense darkness; and in the course of my explorations I have but too often found, not only the cave to be dark, but that the guides are blind. I can truly say, with Nennius, that my work has been "non quidem ut volui sed ut potui,"[1] and my motto must be the modest one of the Greek sculptors, of ΈΠΟΊΕΙ, since I feel myself to be rather the finger-post pointing the way to others, than I a guide.

[1] Historia Britonum, chap. i.

CHAPTER XIV.

EARLY BRITISH FREEMASONRY.

ENGLAND.—III.

ASHMOLE—MASONS' COMPANY—PLOT—RANDLE HOLME—THE "OLD CHARGES."

ALTHOUGH the admission of Elias Ashmole into the ranks of the Freemasons may have been, and probably was, unproductive of the momentous consequences which have been so lavishly ascribed to it, the circumstances connected with his membership of what in South Britain was then a very obscure fraternity—so little known, indeed, that not before the date of Ashmole's reception or adoption does it come within the light of history—are, nevertheless, of the greatest importance in our general inquiry, since, on a close view, they will be found to supply a quantity of information derivable from no other source, and which, together with the additional evidence I shall adduce from contemporary writings, will give us a tolerably faithful picture of *English* Freemasonry in the seventeenth century.

The entries in Ashmole's "Diary" which relate to his membership of the craft are three in number, the first in priority being the following:—

"1646. Oct. 16, 4.30. P.M.—I was made a Free Mason at Warrington in Lancashire, with Coll: Henry Mainwaring of Karincham in Cheshire. The names of those that were then of the Lodge, [were] Mr Rich Penket Warden, Mr James Collier, Mr Rich. Sankey, Henry Littler, John Ellam Rich: Ellam & Hugh Brewer."[1]

The "Diary" then continues:—

"Oct. 25.—I left Cheshire, and came to London about the end of this month, viz., the 30th day, 4 *Hor. post merid.* About a fortnight or three weeks before [*after?*] I came to London, Mr Jonas Moore brought and acquainted me with Mr William Lilly: it was on a Friday night, and I think on the 20th of Nov."

"Dec. 3.—This day, at noon, I first became acquainted with Mr John Booker."

It will be seen that Ashmole's initiation or admission into Freemasonry, preceded by upwards of a month, his acquaintance with his astrological friends, Lilly and Booker.

In ascending the stream of English Masonic history, we are deserted by all known contemporary testimony, save that of the "Old Charges" or "Constitutions," directly we have passed the year 1646. This of itself would render the proceedings at Warrington in that year

[1] Copied from a facsimile plate, published by Mr W. H. Gee, 28 High Street, Oxford.

of surpassing interest to the student of Masonic antiquities. That Ashmole and Mainwaring,[1] adherents respectively of the Court and the Parliament, should be admitted into Freemasonry at the same time and place, is also a very noteworthy circumstance. But it is with the internal character, or, in other words, the composition, of the lodge into which they were received that we are chiefly concerned. Down to the year 1881 the prevalent belief was, that although a lodge was in existence at Warrington in 1646,[2] all were of the "craft of Masonry" except Ashmole and Colonel Mainwaring. A flood of light, however, was suddenly shed on the subject by the research of Mr W. H. Rylands, who, in perhaps the very best of the many valuable articles contributed to the now defunct *Masonic Magazine*, has so far proved the essentially *speculative* character of the lodge, as to render it difficult to believe that there could have been a single *operative* Mason present on the afternoon of October 16, 1646. Thus Mr Richard Penket[h], the *Warden*, is shown to have been a scion of the Penketh of Penketh, and the last of his race who held the family property.[3]

The two names which next follow were probably identical with those of James Collyer or Colliar, of Newton-le-Willows, Lancashire, and Richard Sankie, of the family of Sonkey, or Sankey of Sankey, as they were called, landowners in Warrington from a very early period; they were buried respectively at Winwick and Warrington—the former on January 17, 1673-4, and the latter on September 28, 1667.[4] Of the four remaining Freemasons named in the "Diary," though without the prefix of "Mr," it is shown by Rylands that a gentle family of Littler or Lytlor existed in Cheshire in 1646; while he prints the wills of Richard Ellom, Freemason of Lyme [Lymme], and of John Ellams, husbandman, of Burton, both in the county of Cheshire—that of the former bearing date September 7, 1667, and of the latter June 7, 1689. That these were the Ellams named by Ashmole cannot be positively affirmed, but they were doubtless members of the same yeoman family, a branch of which had apparently settled at Lymm, a village in Cheshire, about five miles from Warrington. Of the family of Hugh Brewer, nothing has come to light beyond the fact that a person bearing this patronymic served in some military capacity under the Earl of Derby in 1643.

The proceedings at Warrington in 1646 establish some very important facts in relation to the antiquity of Freemasonry, and to its character as a speculative science. The words Ashmole uses, "the names of those who were *then* of the lodge," implying as they do either

[1] Ashmole's first wife was the daughter of Colonel Mainwaring's uncle.

[2] See "Masonic History and Historians," by Masonic Student [the Rev. A. F. A. Woodford], Freemason, Aug. 6, 1881.

[3] "From the Herald's visitation of Lancashire, made by St George in 1613, it appears that Richard Penketh of Penketh, who died *circa* 1570, married Margaret, daughter of Thomas Sonkey of Sonkey [gent.], and had a son, Thomas Penketh of Penketh, county Lancaster, who married Cecilye, daughter of Roger Charnock of Wellenborough, county Northampton, Esq., whose son Richard (dead in 1652), married Jane, daughter of Thomas Patrick of Bispham, in the county of Lancaster. This, no doubt, was the Richard Penketh who was a Freemason at Warrington in 1646" (W. Harry Rylands, F.S.A., "Freemasonry in the Seventeenth Century," Warrington, 1646—Masonic Magazine, London, Dec. 1881).

[4] Rylands prints the will of James Colliar, which was executed April 18, 1668, and proved March 21, 1674. It bears the following endorsement:—"*Captin* James Collier's Last Will and Testament." He also observes, in the excellent fragment of Masonic history to which I have already alluded:—"The hamlet of Sankey, with that of Penketh, lies close to Warrington, and, coupled with the fact that at no very distant date a Penketh married a Sankey of Sankey, as mentioned above, it is not extraordinary to find two such near neighbours and blood relations associated together as Freemasons."

that some of the *existing* members were absent, or that at a previous period the lodge-roll comprised other and *additional* names beyond those recorded in the "Diary," amply justify the conclusion that the lodge, when Ashmole joined it, was not a new creation. The term "Warden," moreover, which follows the name of Mr Rich. Penket, will of itself remove any lingering doubt whether the Warrington Lodge could boast a higher antiquity than the year 1646, since it points with the utmost clearness to the fact, that an actual official of a subsisting branch of the Society of Freemasons was present at the meeting.

The history or pedigree of the lodge is therefore to be carried back beyond October 16, 1646, but how far, is indeterminable, and in a certain sense immaterial. The testimony of Ashmole establishes beyond cavil that in a certain year (1646), at the town of Warrington, there was in existence a lodge of Freemasons, presided over by a Warden, and largely (if not entirely) composed of speculative or non-operative members. Concurrently with this, we have the evidence of the Sloane MS., 3848 (13),[1] which document bears the following attestation:—

> "Finis p me
> Eduardu^{s}: Sankey
> decimo sexto die Octobris
> Anno Domini 1646."

Commenting upon the proceedings at the Warrington meeting, Fort remarks, "it is a subject of curious speculation as to the identity of Richard Sankey, a member of the above lodge. Sloane's MS., No. 3848, was transcribed and finished by one Edward Sankey, on the 16th day of October 1646, the day Elias Ashmole was initiated into the secrets of the craft."[2] The research of Rylands has afforded a probable, if not altogether an absolute, solution of the problem referred to, and from the same fount I shall again draw, in order to show that *an* Edward Sankey, "son to Richard Sankey, gent.," was baptized at Warrington, February 3, 1621-2.[3]

It therefore appears that on October 16, 1646, *a* Richard Sankey was present in lodge, and that *an* Edward Sankey copied and attested one of the old manuscript Constitutions; and that a Richard Sankey of Sankey flourished at this time, whose son Edward, if alive, we must suppose would have then been a young man of four or five and twenty.[4] Now, as it seems to me, the identification of the Sankeys of Sankey, father and son, with the Freemason and the copyist of the "Old Charges" respectively, is rendered as clear as anything lying within the doctrine of probabilities can be made to appear.

I assume, then, that a version of the old manuscript Constitutions, which has fortunately come down to us, was in circulation at Warrington in 1646. Thus we should have, in the year named, speculative, and, it may be, also operative masonry, co-existing with the actual use, by lodges and brethren, of the Scrolls or Constitutions of which the Sloane MS., 3848 (13), affords an illustration in point. Upon this basis I shall presently contend, that, having

[1] As the "Old Charges," or "Constitutions," will be frequently referred to in the present chapter, I take the opportunity of stating that in every case where figures within parentheses follow the title of a manuscript, as above, these denote the corresponding number in Chapter II.

[2] Fort, The Early History and Antiquities of Freemasonry, p. 137.

[3] Rylands, Freemasonry in the Seventeenth Century, citing the Warrington Parish Registers.

[4] As Rylands gives no further entry from the Parish Registers respecting *Edward*, though he cites the burial of "*Chas.*, son to Richard Sankey, Ap. 30, 1635," the inference that the former was living in 1646 is strengthened.

traced a system of Freemasonry, combining the speculative with the operative element, together with a use or employment of the MS. legend of the craft, as prevailing in the first half of the seventeenth century—when contemporary testimony fails us, as we continue to direct our course up the stream of Masonic history, the evidence of manuscript Constitutions, successively dating further and further back, until the transcripts are exhausted, without apparently bringing us any nearer to their common original, may well leave us in doubt at what point of our research between the era of the *Lodge* at Warrington, 1646, and that of the *Loge* at York, 1355, a monopoly of these ancient documents by the working masons can be viewed as even remotely probable.

The remaining entries in the "Diary" of a Masonic character are the following :—

"March, 1682.

"10.—About 5 P.M. I rec^{d} : a Sumons to app^{r} at a Lodge to be held the next day, at Masons Hall London.

"11.—Accordingly I went, & about Noone were admitted into the Fellowship of Free Masons,

"S^{r} William Wilson[1] Knight, Capt. Rich : Borthwick, M^{r} Will : Woodman, M^{r} W^{m} Grey, M^{r} Samuell Taylour & M^{r} William Wise.

"I was the Senior Fellow among them (it being 35 yeares since I was admitted) There were p^{r}sent beside my selfe the Fellowes after named.

"M^{r} Tho : Wise M^{r} of the Masons Company this p^{r}sent yeare. M^{r} Thomas Shorthose, M^{r} Thomas Shadbolt, Waindsford Esq^{r} M^{r} Nich : Young M^{r} John Shorthose, M^{r} William Hamon, M^{r} John Thompson, & M^{r} Will : Stanton.[2]

"Wee all dyned at the halfe Moone Taverne in Cheapeside, at a Noble dinner prepaired at the charge of the New = accepted Masons."

From the circumstance, that Ashmole records his attendance at a meeting of the *Freemasons*, held in the hall of the Company of *Masons*, a good deal of confusion has been engendered, which some casual remarks of Dr Anderson, in the Constitutions of 1723, have done much to confirm. By way of filling up a page, as he expresses it, he quotes from an old Record of Masons, to the effect that, "the said Record describing a *Coat* of *Arms*, much the same with *that* of the LONDON COMPANY of *Freemen* Masons, it is generally believ'd that the said *Company* is descended of the ancient *Fraternity;* and that in former Times no Man was *Free* of that *Company* until he was install'd in some *Lodge* of *Free* and *Accepted Masons*, as a necessary Qualification." "But," he adds, "that laudable Practice seems to have been long in Dissuetude."[3]

Preston, in this instance not unnaturally, copied from Anderson, and others of course have followed suit; but as I believe myself to be the only person who has been allowed access

[1] Born at Leicester, a builder and architect; married the widow of Henry Pudsey, and through her influence obtained knighthood in 1681. Built Four Oaks Hall (for Lord ffolliott); also Nottingham Castle. Was the sculptor of the image of Charles II. at the west front of Lichfield Cathedral. Died in 1710 in his seventieth year (The Forest and Chase of Sutton, Coldfield, 1860, p. 101).

[2] All the persons named in this paragraph—also Mr Will. Woodman and Mr William Wise, who are mentioned in the earlier one, were members of the Masons' Company. Thomas Wise was elected Master, January 1, 1682. By —— *Waindsford, Esq.*, is probably meant *Rowland Raineford*, who is described in the records of the Company as "late apprentice to Robert Beadles, was admitted a freeman, Jan. 15, 166$\frac{7}{8}$;" and William Hamon is doubtless identical with William Hamond, who was present at a meeting of the Company on April 11, 1682. John Shorthose and Will. Stanton were Wardens.

[3] Anderson. The Constitutions of the Freemasons, 1723, p. 82.

to the books and records of the *Masons'* Company for purposes of historical research, the design of this work will be better fulfilled by a concise summary of the results of my examination, together with such collateral information as I have been able to acquire, than by attempting to fully describe the superstructure of error which has been erected on so treacherous a foundation.

This I shall proceed to do, after which it will be the more easy to rationally scrutinise the later entries in the "Diary."

The Masons' Company, London.

The original grant of arms to the "Hole Crafte and felawship of Masons," dated the twelfth year of Edward IV. [1472-1473], from William Hawkeslowe, Clarenceux King of Arms, is now in the British Museum.[1] No crest is mentioned in the grant, although one is figured on the margin,[2] with the arms, as follows:—Sable on a chevron engrailed between three square castles triple-towered argent, masoned of the first, a pair of compasses extended silver. *Crest*, on a wreath of the colours a castle as in the arms, but as was often the case slightly more ornamental in form.

This grant was confirmed by Thomas Benolt, Clarenceux, twelfth Henry VIII. or 1520-21, and entered in the visitation of London made by Henry St George, Richmond Herald in 1634.

At some later time the engrailed chevron was changed for a plain one, and the old ornamental towered castles became single towers, both in the arms and crest. The arms thus changed are given by Stow in his "Survey of London," 1633, and have been repeated by other writers since his time. A change in the form of the towers is noticed by Randle Holme in his "Academie of Armory," 1688.[3] "Of olde," he says, "the towers were triple towered;" and to him we are indebted for the knowledge that the arms had columns for supporters. These arms he attributes to the "Right Honored and Right Worshipfull company of ffree-Masons."

Seymour in his "Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster," 1735,[4] gives the date of the incorporation of the company "about 1410, having been called Free-Masons, a Fraternity of great Account, who having been honour'd by several Kings, and very many of the Nobility and Gentry being of their Society," etc. He describes the colour of the field of the arms, *azure* or blue.

Maitland in his "History and Survey of London," 1756,[5] describes the arms properly, and adds that the motto is "In the Lord is all our Trust." Although of considerable antiquity, he says that the Company was "only incorporated by Letters Patent on the 29th of Charles II., 17th September, anno 1677, by the name of the Master, Wardens, Assistants, and Commonalty of the Company of Masons of the City of London," etc.[6]

Berry in his "Encyclopædia Heraldica"[7] states that it was incorporated 2d of Henry II., 1411, which may be a misprint for 12th of Henry IV., 1410-11, following Stow (1633), or

[1] Addl. MS. 19, 135.

[2] A facsimile in colours will be found in the *Masonic Magazine*, vol. ii., p. 87, and the text of the document is there given at length.

[3] Page 204, *verso*; and Mas. Mag., Jan. 1882.

[4] Vol. ii., book iv., p. 381.

[5] P. 1248.

[6] Rec. Roll, Pat. 29, Car. ii., p. 10, n. 3.

[7] Vol. i., Masons (London).

ARMS OF MASONS, CARPENTERS, ETC.

TILERS *OF TOURS*

TILERS
LA ROCHELLE

MASONS
SAUMUR

MASONS
TOURS

TILERS *PARIS*

CARPENTERS
VILLEFRANCHE

JOINERS
METZ

CARPENTERS
BAYONNE

MASONS *BEAULIEU*

MS. ROLL DATED 1688
MUSEUM 53 GOLDEN SQUARE

ARMS OF THE MASONS
GERMAN
from an old drawing
A.D. 1515
(Heideloff)

MS. ROLL DATED 1686
LODGE OF ANTIQUITY No 2

CARPENTERS
ANGERS

JOINERS
PERONNE

JOINERS
AMIENS

JOINERS *LONDON*
Stow 1633

MARBLERS
LONDON
Stow 1633

MASON'S COMPANY
LONDON
Stow 1633

CARPENTERS
LONDON
Stow 1633

MASON'S COMPANY
EDINBURGH
Burke (description)

W. H. Rylands Del.

Thomas C. Jack, London & Edinburgh

Wm. H. Smith Sculp.

for the date at which the arms were granted—12th Edw. IV. He adds that the Company was re-incorporated September 17, 12th Charles II., 1677. Here is again an error. By no calculation could the 12th Charles II. be the year 1677; it was the 29th regnal year of that king as stated by Maitland from the Patent Roll.

On the annexed plate will be found the arms of the companies as given by Stow in 1633; and with them a number of arms of the French and German companies of Masons, Carpenters, and Joiners taken from the magnificent work of Lacroix and Seré, "Le Moyen Age et la Renaissance."[1] The latter show the use of various building implements, the square, compasses, rule, trowel, in the armorial bearings of the Masons, etc. of other countries. To these are added in the plate, for comparison, the arms as painted upon two rolls of the "Old Charges," both *dated* in the same year, viz., 1686,—one belonging to the Lodge of Antiquity, No. 2; and the other preserved in the museum at 33 Golden Square. Only the former of these bears any names, which will be considered in another place when dealing with the early English records of Freemasonry. It is, however, interesting to note that the arms are precisely similar to those figured by Stow in 1633, and that in each case they are associated with the arms of the City of London, proving beyond doubt that both these rolls, which are handsomely illuminated at the top, were originally prepared for London Lodges of Masons or Freemasons.

In a future plate I shall give a coloured representation of the arms, showing the original coat as granted in the reign of Edward IV. and other forms subsequently borne.

As it is with the later, rather than the earlier history of the Masons' Company, that we are concerned, I shall dwell very briefly on the latter period. One important misstatement, however, which has acquired general currency, through its original appearance in a work of deservedly high reputation,[2] stands in need of correction. Mr Reginald R. Sharpe,[3] who in 1879 was kind enough to search the archives of the City of London, for early references to the terms *Mason* and *Freemason*, obliged me with the following memorandum:—

"Herbert in his book on the 'Companies of London,' refers to 'lib. lx., fo. 46' among the Corporation Records for a list of the Companies who sent representatives to the Court of Common Council for the year 50 Edw. III. [1376-1377]. He probably means Letter Book H., fo. 46 b., where a list of that kind and of that date is to be found. In it are mentioned the 'Fre masons' and 'Masons,' but the representatives of the former are struck out and added to those of the latter.

"The term 'Fre[e]masons' never varies; 'Masons' becomes 'Masouns' in Norman French; and 'Cementarii' in Latin."

The preceding remarks are of value, as they dispel the idea that in early civic days the Masons and Freemasons were separate companies.[4] The former body, indeed, appears to have absorbed the Marblers,[5] of whom Seymour (following Stow) says—"The Company called by

[1] 1848-51.

[2] Herbert, Companies of London, vol. i., p. 34.

[3] I take the opportunity of stating, that for the information thus obtained, as well as for permission to examine the Records of the Masons' and Carpenters' Companies, I am primarily indebted to Sir John Monckton, Town-Clerk of London, and President of the Board of General Purposes (Grand Lodge of England), who, in these and numerous other instances, favoured me with letters of introduction to the custodians of ancient documents.

[4] See *ante*, Chap. VI., p. 304.

[5] "Merblers—Workers in Marble. In his will, made in 1494, Sir Brian Rocliffe says, 'volo quod Jacopus Remus, *marbeler*, in Poules Churcheyerde in London, faciat meum epitaphium in Templo'" (The Fabric Rolls of York Minster, Surtees Soc., vol. xxxv., Glossary, p. 347).

the Name of Marblers, for their excellent knowledge and skill in the art of insculping Figures on Gravestones, Monuments, and the like, were an antient Fellowship, but no incorporated Company of themselves, tho' now joined with the Company of Masons.

"Arms :—*Sable, a chevron between two Chissels in Chief, and a Mallet in Base, Argent.*"[1]

Down to the period of the Great Fire of London, the Company of Carpenters would appear to have stood at least on a footing of equality with that of the Masons. If, on the one hand, we find in the early records, mention of the King's Freemason,[2] on the other hand there is as frequent allusion to the King's Carpenter,[3] and promotion to the superior office of Surveyor of the King's Works was as probable in the one case as in the other.[4] The city records show that at least as early as the beginning of the reign of Edward I. (1272), two master Carpenters, and the same number of master Masons, were sworn as officers to perform certain duties with reference to buildings, and walls, and the boundaries of land in the city, evidently of much the same nature as those confided to a similar number of members of these two companies, under the title of City Viewers, until within little more than a century ago.[5] In the matter of precedency the Carpenters stood the 25th and the Masons the 31st on the list of companies.[6] Nor was the freedom of their craft alone asserted by members of the junior body. If the Masons styled themselves *Free* Masons, so likewise did the Carpenters assume the appellation of *Free* Carpenters,[7] though I must admit that no instance of the latter adopting the common prefix, otherwise than in a collective capacity, has come under my notice.[8]

According to a schedule of wages for all classes of artificers, determined by the justices of

[1] Robert Seymour, A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster, 1735, bk. iv., p. 892. Randle Holme describes the Marblers as *ston-cutters* (Harl. MS. 2035, fol. 207, *verso*).

[2] This title is applied by Anderson, apparently following Stow, in the Constitutions of 1723 and 1738, to Henry Yevele, of whom Mr Papworth says, "he was director of the king's works at the palace of Westminster, and Master Mason at Westminster Abbey, 1388-95." See Chap. VII., p. 342.

[3] *Cf.* E. B. Jupp, Historical Account of the Company of Carpenters, 1848, p. 165. During the erection of Christ Church College, Oxford, 1512-17, John Adams was the Freemason, and Thomas Watlington the Warden of the Carpenters (Transactions, Royal Institute of British Architects, 1861-62, pp. 37-60).

[4] In the reign of Henry VIII. the office of Surveyor of the King's Works was successively held by two members of the Carpenters' Company (Jupp, *op. cit.*, p. 174).

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 8, 188, 193. The form of oath taken by the Viewers on their appointment is preserved in the City Records, and commences—

"The Othe of the Viewers,
Maister Wardens of Masons
and Carpenters."

[6] According to a list made in the 8th year of Henry VIII. (1516-17), the only one which had for its precise object the settling of the precedency of the companies. In 1501-2 the Carpenters stood the 20th, and the Masons the 40th, on the general list, the members of the former company being thirty in number, whilst those of the latter only mounted up to eleven (Jupp, Historical Account of the Company of Carpenters, Appendix A.).

[7] An address of the Carpenters' Company to the Lord Mayor on Nov. 5, 1666, complains of the "ill conveniences to the said Citty and freemen thereof, especially to the *Free Carpenters* vpon the entertainemt of forriners for the rebuilding of London" (Jupp, Historical Account of the Company of Carpenters, p. 278).

[8] It is probable, however, that if the ordinances of more craft guilds had come down to us, the prefix "free," as applied to the trade or calling of individuals, would be found to have been a common practice. Thus the rules of the Tailors' Guild, Exeter, enact, "that euery seruant that ys of the forsayd crafte, that takyt wagys to the waylor (*value*) of xxs. and a-boffe [*above*], schall pay xxd. to be a *ffre Sawers* (*Stitcher*) to us and profyth [of the] aforsayd fraternyte" (Smith, English Gilds, p. 314).

the peace in 1610,[1] we find that the superior or Master Freemason was hardly on a footing of equality with the Master Carpenter, *e.g.:*

		With Meat. s. d.	Without Meat. s. d.
A Freemason which can draw his plot, work, and set accordingly, having charge over others—	Before Michaelmas,	8 0	12 0
	After Michaelmas,	6 0	10 0
A master carpenter, being able to draw his plot, and to be master of work over others—	Before Michaelmas,	8 0	14 0
	After Michaelmas,	6 0	10 0

I am far from contending that the details just given possess anything more *than* an *operative* significance; but the classification into "rough masons capable of taking charge over others," Freemasons *simpliciter*, and Freemasons who can draw plots—by justices of the peace, in a sparsely populated county—affords a good illustration of the difficulties which are encountered, when an attempt is made to trace the actual meaning of the operative term, by which the members of our speculative society are now described.

After the Great Fire of London, the demand for labour being necessarily great, "foreigners" as well as freemen readily obtained employment, much to the prejudice of the masons and carpenters, as well as to other members of the building trades. By a Statute of 1666, entitled "An act for Rebuilding the Citty of London," [2] it was ordained "That all Carpenters, Brickelayers, Masons, Plaisterers, Joyners, and other Artificers, Workemen, and Labourers, to be employed on the said Buildings [in the City of London], who are not Freemen of the said Citty, shall for the space of seaven yeares next ensueing, and for soe long time after as untill the said buildings shall be fully finished, have and enjoy such and the same liberty of worke-ing and being sett to worke in the said building as the Freemen of the Citty of the same Trades and Professions have and ought to enjoy, Any Usage or Custome of the Citty to the contrary notwithstanding: And that such Artificers as aforesaid, which for the space of seaven yeares shall have wrought in the rebuilding of the Citty in their respective Arts, shall from and after the said seaven yeares have and enjoy the same Liberty to worke as Freemen of the said Citty for and dureing their naturall lives. Provided alwayes, that said Artificers claiming such priviledges shall be lyeable to undergoe all such offices, and to pay and performe such Dutyes in reference to the Service and Government of the Citty, as Freemen of the Citty of their respective Arts and Trades are lyeable to undergoe, pay, and performe."

This statute materially affected the interests, and diminished the influence, of the two leading companies connected with the building trades. In 1675, Thomas Seagood, a tiler and bricklayer, was chosen by the Court of Aldermen as one of the four City Viewers, an innovation upon the invariable usage of selecting these officials from the Masons' and Carpenters' Companies. As three years later there occurred a similar departure from the ordinary custom, it has been suggested that as the fire of London had occasioned the erection of wooden houses to be prohibited, the Court of Aldermen considered that a bricklayer would be a better judge of the new buildings than a carpenter, and as good a judge as a mason; though it may well

[1] "With meat," a Freemason and master bricklayer were each to receive 6s.; "a rough mason, which can take charge over others," 5s.; and a bricklayer, 4s. (The Rates of Wages of Servants, Labourers, and Artificers, set down and assessed at Oakham, within the County of Rutland, by the Justices of the Peace there, the 28th day of April, Anno Domini, 1610—Archæologia, vol. xi., pp. 200, 203).

[2] 18 and 19, Car. II., c. viii., § xvi. Compare with "Fitzalwyne's Assize" (*Liber Albus*, Rolls Series, p. xxix).

excite surprise that a Glazier, a Weaver, and a Glover were successively chosen Viewers in the years 1679, 1685, and 1695.[1]

The masons, carpenters, bricklayers, joiners, and plasterers of London, feeling themselves much aggrieved at the encroachments of "forreigners" who had not served an apprenticeship, made common cause, and jointly petitioned the Court of Aldermen for their aid and assistance, but though the matter was referred by the civic authorities to a committee of their own body, there is no evidence that the associated companies obtained any effectual redress.[2]

These details are of importance, for, however immaterial, upon a cursory view, they may seem to the inquiry we are upon, it will be seen as we proceed, that the statutory enactments passed for the rebuilding of London and of St Paul's Cathedral, by restricting the powers of the companies, may not have been without their influence in paving the way for the ultimate development of English Freemasonry into the form under which it has happily come down to us.

It was the subject of complaint by the free carpenters, and their grievance must have been common to all members of the building trades, that by pretext of the Stat. 18 and 19, Car. II., c. viii.,[3] a great number of artificers using the trade of carpenters, procured themselves to be made free of London, of other companies; whilst many others were freemen of other companies, not by the force of the said Act, and yet used the trade of carpenters. Such artificers, it was stated, refused to submit themselves to the by-laws of the Carpenters' Company, whereby the public were deceived by insufficient and ill workmanship. Even members of the petitioners' own company, it was alleged, had "for many years past privately obtained carpenters free of other companies to bind apprentices for them, and cause them to be turned over unto them," there being no penalty in the by-laws for such offences. "By means whereof," the petition goes on to say, "the carpenters free of other companies are already grown to a very great number; your Petitioners defrauded of their Quarterage and just Dues, which should maintain and support their increasing Poor; and their Corporation reduced to a Name without a Substance."[4]

The charter granted to the Masons' Company in the 29th year of Charles II. (1677)—confirming, in all probability, the earlier instrument which was (in the opinion of the present Master[5]) burnt in the Great Fire—provides that the privileges of the Masons' Company are not to interfere with the rebuilding of the Cathedral Church of St Paul.

[1] Jupp, Historical Account of the Company of Carpenters, p. 192.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 283.

[3] See § xvi. of this Act, *ante*, p. 147.

[4] The Humble Petition of the Master, Warden, and Assistants of the Company of Carpenters to the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Commons of the City of London, *circa* 1690 (Jupp, *op. cit.*, Appendix I.). See, however, "The Ancient Trades Decayed, Repaired Again. Written by a Country Tradesman," London, 1678, p. 51, where the hardship endured by a person's trade being different from that of the company of which he is free, is pointed out; and it is contended that "it would be no prejudice to any of the Companies, for every one to have his liberty to come into that Company that his trade is of, without paying anything more for it."

[5] Mr John Hunter, for many years clerk of the company, to whom I am very greatly indebted for the patience and courtesy which he exhibited on the several occasions of my having access to the records, of which his firm are the custodians. Richard Newton was appointed clerk of the Masons' Company on June 14, 1741, to whom succeeded Joseph Newton, since which period the clerkship has continued in the same firm of solicitors, viz., John Aldridge, Frederick Gwatkin, John Hunter, and A. J. C. Gwatkin.

Richard Newton succeeded Mr Grose, an eminent attorney in Threadneedle Street, who in June 1738 was unanimously chosen clerk of the Company, in the room of Miles Man, Esq., resigned—and retired on being appointed Clerk to the Lieutenancy of the City of London, the present clerk of the latter body, Henry Grose Smith, being his lineal descendant.

At that time, except by virtue of the operation of the statute before alluded to,[1] no one could exercise the trade of a mason without belonging to, or by permission of, the Masons' Company.

Incidental to the jurisdiction of the company were certain powers of search, which we find exercised so late as 1678. In the early part of that year the minutes record that "a search was made after unlawful workers," and various churches appear to have been thus visited, amongst others, St Paul's. On April 25 in the same year a second search was made, which is thus recorded: "Went to Paul's with Mr Story, and found 14 foreigners." Afterwards, and apparently in consequence of the proceedings last mentioned, several "foreigners" were admitted members, and others licensed by the Masons' Company.

The "Freedom" and "Court" books of the company alike commence in 1677, which has rendered the identification of some of its members exceedingly difficult, inasmuch as, unless actually present at the subsequent meetings, their connection with the company is only established by casual entries, such as the binding of apprentices and the like—wherein, indeed, a large number of members, whose admissions date before 1677, are incidentally referred to. Still, it is much to be regretted that an accurate roll of the freemen of this guild extends no higher than 1677. One *old* book, however, has escaped the general conflagration, and though it only fills up an occasional *hiatus* in the list of members preceding the Great Fire, it contributes, nevertheless, two material items of information, which in the one case explains a passage in Stow[2] of great interest to *Freemasons*, and in the other by *settling* one of the most interesting points in Masonic history, affords a surer footing for backward research than has hitherto been attained.

The record, or volume in question, commences with the following entry:—

[1620].—"The ACCOMPTE of James Gilder, William Ward, and John Abraham, Wardens of the company of ffremasons."

The title, "Company of Freemasons," appears to have been used down to the year 1653, after which date it gives place to "Worshipful Company," and "Company of Masons."

The point in Masonic history which this book determines, is "that Robert Padgett, Clearke to the Worshippfull Society of the Free Masons of the City of London," in 1686, whose name—together with that of William Bray,[3] Freeman of London and Free-mason—is appended to the MS. "Constitutions" (23) in the possession of the Lodge of Antiquity,[4] was *not* the clerk of the Masons' Company. The records reveal, that in 1678 "*Henry* Paggett, Citizen and Mason," had an apprentice bound to him. Also, that in 1709, *James* Paget was the Renter's Warden. But the clerk not being a *member* of the company, his name was vainly searched for by Mr Hunter in the records post-dating the Great Fire. The minutes of 1686 and 1687 frequently mention "the clerk" and the payments made to him, but give no name. The old "Accompte Book," however, already mentioned, has an entry under the year 1687, viz., "Mr Stampe, Cleark," which, being in the same handwriting as a similar one in 1686, also referring to the clerk, but without specifying him by name, establishes the fact, that "the Worshippfull *Society* of the Free Masons of the City of London," whose clerk transcribed the "Constitutions" in the possession of our oldest English Lodge, and the "*Company* of Masons" in the same city, were distinct and separate bodies.

[1] 18 and 19 Car. II., c. viii., § xvi.

[2] Ed. 1633, p. 630. Given in full at p. 176, note 4, *post*.

[3] This name does not appear in any record of the Masons' Company.

[4] *Ante*, Chap. II., p. 68.

Whether Valentine Strong, whose epitaph I have given in an earlier chapter,[1] was a member of the Company, I have failed to positively determine, but as Mr Hunter entertains no doubt of it, it may be taken that he was. At all events, five of his sons, out of six,[2] undoubtedly were, viz., Edward and John, admitted April 6, 1680, the latter "made free by service to Thomas Strong," the eldest brother, whose own admission preceding, it must be supposed, the year 1677, is only disclosed by one of the casual entries to which I have previously referred; Valentine on July 5, 1687; and Timothy on October 16, 1690. Also Edward Strong, junior, made free by service to his father in 1698.

In terminating my extracts from these records, it is only necessary to observe, that no meeting of the Masons' Company appears to have taken place on March 11, 1682. Neither Ashmole, Wren, nor Anthony Sayer were members of the company. The books record nothing whatever under the years 1691 or 1716-17, which would lend colour to a great convention having been held at St Paul's, or tend to shed the faintest ray of light upon the causes of the so-called "Revival." The words "Lodge" or "Accepted" do not occur in any of the documents, and in all cases members were "admitted" to the freedom. Thomas Morrice (or Morris) and William Hawkins, Grand Wardens in 1718-19, and 1722 respectively, were members of the company, the former having been "admitted" in 1701, and the latter in 1712.

The significance which attaches to the absence of any mention whatever, of either William Bray or Robert Padgett, in the records of the Masons' Company, will be duly considered when the testimony of Ashmole and his biographers has been supplemented by that of Plot, Aubrey, and Randle Holme, which, together with the evidence supplied by our old manuscript "Constitutions," will enable us to survey seventeenth century masonry as a whole, to combine the material facts, and to judge of their mutual relations.

Before, however, passing from the exclusive domain of operative masonry, it may be incidentally observed that by all writers alike, no adequate distinction between the Freemasons of the Lodge, and those of the guild or company, has been maintained. Hence, a good deal of the mystery which overhangs the early meaning of the term. This, to some slight extent, I hope to dispel, and by extracts from accredited records, such as parish registers and municipal charters, to indicate the actual positions in life of those men who, in epitaphs and monumental inscriptions extending from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, are described as Freemasons.

To begin with, the "Accompte Book" of the Masons' Company informs us that from 1620 to 1653 the members were styled "ffremasons."[3] If there were earlier records, they would doubtless attest a continuity of the usage from more remote times. Still, as it seems to me, the extract given by Mr Sharpe from the City Archives[4] carries it back, inferentially, to the reign of Edward III.

In "The Calendar of State Papers"[5] will be found the following entry: "1604, Oct. 31. —Grant of an incorporation of the Company of Freemasons, Carpenters, Joiners, and Slaters of the City of Oxford." Richard Maude, Hugh Daives, and Robert Smith, "of the Citty of

[1] XII., p. 40.

[2] It is highly probable that Valentine Strong was a member of the London company; but if not, he must, I think, have belonged to a similar one in some provincial town. *Cf. ante*, p. 40.

[3] *Ibid.*, note 3.

[4] *Ante*, p. 145.

[5] Domestic Series, 1603-1610, p. 163.

Oxon, Freemasons," so described in a receipt given by them, December 20, 1633, the *contractors* for the erection of "new buildings at St John's College,"[1] were probably members of this guild.

A charter of like character was granted by the Bishop of Durham, April 24, 1671, to "Miles Stapylton, *Esquire*, Henry Frisoll, *gentleman*, Robert Trollap, Henry Trollap," and others, "exerciseing the severall trades of ffree Masons, Carvers, Stone-cutters, Sculptures [Marblers], Brickmakers, Glaysers, Penterstainers, Founders, Neilers, Pewderers, Plumbers, Mill-wrights, Saddlers and Bridlers, Trunk-makers, and Distillers of all sorts of strong waters."[2]

This ancient document has some characteristic features, to which I shall briefly allude. In the first place, the Freemasons occupy the post of honour, and the two Trollops are known by evidence *aliunde* to have been members of that craft. On the north side of a mausoleum at Gateshead stood, according to tradition, the image or statue of Robert Trollop, with his arm raised, pointing towards the town hall of Newcastle, of which he had been the architect, and underneath were the following quaint lines:[3]

"Here lies Robert Trowlup
Who made yon stones roll up
When death took his soul up
His body filled this hole up."

The bishop's charter constitutes the several crafts into a "comunitie, ffellowshipp, and company;" names the first wardens, who were to be four in number, Robert Trollap heading the list, and subject to the proviso, that one of the said wardens "must allwaies bee a ffree mason;" directs that the incorporated body "shall, upon the fower and twentieth day of June, comonly called the feast of *St John Baptist*, yearely, for ever, *assemble* themselves together before nine of the clock in the fore noone of the same day, and there shall, by the greatest number of theire voices, elect and chuse fouer of the said fellowshippe to be theire wardens, and one other fitt person to be the clarke; ∴ ∴ and shall vpon the same day *make freemen and brethren;* and shall, vpon the said fover and twentieth day of June, and att three other feasts or times in the yeare—that is to saie, the feast of St Michael the Archangel, *St John Day in Christeninas*, and the five and twentieth day of March, ∴ for ever assemble themselves together, ∴ ∴ and shall alsoe consult, agree vpon, and set downe such orders, acts, and constitucons ∴ ∴ as shall be thought necessarie." Absence from "the said assemblies" without "any reasonable excuse" was rendered punishable by fine, a regulation which forcibly recalls the quaint phraseology of the Masonic poem:[4]

[1] This rests on the authority of some extracts from documents in the State Paper Office, sent to the Duke of Sussex by Mr (afterwards Sir Robert) Peel, April 26, 1830, and now preserved in the Archives of the Grand Lodge. Hughan, to whom I am indebted for this reference, published the extracts in the *Voice of Masonry*, October 1872.

[2] From a transcript of the original, made by Mr W. H. Rylands. On the dexter margin of the actual charter with others are the arms of the [Free] Masons, and on the sinister margin those of the Sculptures [marblers]. These arms will be given in their proper colours on a future plate.

[3] R. Surtees, History and Antiquities of the County of Durham, vol. ii., 1820, p. 120. According to the Gateshead Register, "Henry Trollop, free-mason," was buried November 23, 1677, and "Mr Robert Trollop, masson," December 11, 1686 (*Ibid.* See further, T. Pennant, Tour in Scotland, edit. 1790, vol. iii., p. 310).

[4] The Halliwell MS. (1), line 111.

"And to that semblé he must nede gon,
But he have a reesonabul skwsacyon,
That ys a skwsacyon, good and abulle,
To that semblé withoute fabulle."

The charter and funds of the corporation were to be kept in a "chist," of which each warden was to have a key.[1] Lastly, the period of apprenticeship, in all cases, was fixed at seven years.

The value of this charter is much enhanced by our being able to trace two, at least, of the persons to whom it was originally granted. Freemason and mason would almost seem, from the Gateshead Register, to have been words of indifferent application, though, perhaps, the explanation of the varied form in which the burials of the two Trollops are recorded may simply be, that the entries were made by different scribes, of whom one blundered—a supposition which the trade designation employed to describe Robert Trollop does much to confirm.

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.[2] The "making of freemen and brethren" is a somewhat curious expression, though it was by no means an unusual regulation that the freedom of a guild was to be conferred openly. Thus No. XXXVI. of the "Ordinances of Worcester" directs "that no Burges be made in secrete wise, but openly, bifore sufficiaunt recorde."[3]

Whether the words "freemen" and brethren" are to be read disjunctively or as convertible terms, it is not easy to decide. In the opinion of Mr Toulmin Smith, the Craft Guild of Tailors, Exeter, "reckoned three classes," namely—(1.) the Master and Wardens, and all who had passed these offices, forming the livery men; (2.) the shop-holders or master tailors, not yet advanced to the high places of the Guild; and (3.) the "free-sewers" or journeymen sewing masters, who had not yet become shop-holders.[4]

[1] "The very soul of the Craft-Gild was its meetings, which were always held with certain ceremonies, for the sake of greater solemnity. The box, having several locks, like that of the trade-unions, and containing the charters of the Gild, the statutes, the money, and other valuable articles, was opened on such occasions, and all present had to uncover their heads" (Brentano, on the History and Development of Gilds, p. 61). It may be useful to state that all my references to Brentano's work are taken from the reprint in a separate form, and not from the historical Essay prefixed to Smith's "English Gilds."

[2] 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'" (English Gilds, introduction, by Lucy Toulmin Smith, p. xxxii). *Cf. ante*, Chap. XII., p. 55; Fabric Rolls of York Minster, Surtees Soc., vol. xxxv. (*pleghdai*), p. 11; Harl. MS. 6971, fol. 126; and Smith, English Gilds, pp. 8, 31, 76, and 274.

[3] Smith, English Gilds, p. 390. The rules of the "Gild of St George the Martyr," Bishops Lynn, only permitted the admission of new-comers at the yearly general assembly, and by assent of all, save good men from the country (*Ibid.*, p. 76).

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 324. The Ordinances of this Craft Guild, which, in their general tenor date from the last half of the

It is consistent with this analogy, that the "brethren" *made* at Gateshead, on each 24th of June, were the passed apprentices or journeymen out of their time, who had not yet set up in business on their own account; and the parallelism between the guild usages of Exeter and Gateshead is strengthened by the circumstance that the free-sewers,[1]—*i.e.*, stitchers—or journeymen sewing masters, are also styled "ffree Brotherys" in the Exeter Ordinances.

These regulations ordain that "alle the ffeleshyppe of the Bachelerys" shall hold their feast "at Synte John-ys day in harwaste,"—the principal meeting thus taking place as at Gateshead, on the day of St John the Baptist—every shopholder was to pay 8*d.* towards it, every servant at wages 6*d.*, and "euery yowte (*out*) Broder" 4*d.*[2]

There were four regular days of meeting in the year, and on these occasions, the Oath, the Ordinances, and the Constitutions were to be read.[3]

It is improbable that all apprentices in the Incorporated Trades of Gateshead, attained the privileges of "full craftsmen" on the completion of the periods of servitude named in their indentures, and their position, I am inclined to think, *mutatis mutandis*, must have approximated somewhat closely to that of the Tailors of Exeter;[4] on the other hand, and in a similarly incorporated body, *i.e.*, not composed exclusively of Masons, we find by a document of 1475, that each man "worthy to be a master" was to be made "*freman* and fallow."[5]

It may be mentioned, moreover, that in the Records of the Alnwick Lodge (1701-1748), no distinction whatever appears to be drawn between "freemen" and "brethren." A friend, to whom I am indebted for many valuable references,[6] has suggested, that as there is sufficient evidence to support the derivation of "Freemason" from "Free Stone Mason," Free-man mason, and Free-mason—*i.e.*, *free* of a Guild or Company—it is possible that my deductions may afford satisfaction to every class of theorist. Before, however, expressing the few words with which I shall take my leave of this philological *crux*,[7] some additional examples of the use of the word "Freemason" will not be out of place, and taken with those which have been given in earlier chapters,[8] will materially assist in making clear the conclusions at which I have arrived.

The earliest use of the expression in connection with *actual* building operations—so far, at least, as research has yet extended—occurs in 1396, as we have already seen, and I

fifteenth century, enact, "That all Past Masters shall be on the Council of the Guild, and have the same authority as the Wardens; also, that the Master, and not less than five Past Masters, together with two of the Wardens, must assent to every admittance to the Guild" (*Ibid.*, p. 329).

[1] Besides Free Masons, Free Carpenters, Free Sewers, and the "Free Vintners" of London, there were the "Free Dredgers" of Faversham, chartered by Henry II., and still subsisting as the corporation of "free fishermen and free dredgermen" of the same hundred and manor in 1798. Each member had to serve a seven years' apprenticeship to a *freeman*, and to be a married man, as indispensable qualifications for admission (E. Hasted, Historical and Topographical Survey of Kent, 1797-1801, vol. vi., p. 352); also the "ffree Sawiers," who in 1651, "indited a fforreine Sawier at the Old Bayly" (Jupp, *op. cit.*, p. 160); "Free Linen Weavers" (Minutes, St Mungo Lodge, Glasgow, Sept. 25, 1784); and lastly, the "Free Gardeners," who formed a *Grand Lodge* in 1849, but of whose prior existence I find the earliest trace, in the "St Michael Pine-Apple Lodge of Free Gardeners in Newcastle," established in 1812 by *warrant* from the "St George Lodge" of North Shields, which was itself derived from a Lodge "composed of Soldiers belonging to the Forfar Regiment of Militia" (E. Mackenzie, A Descriptive and Historical Account of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1827, vol. ii., p. 597).

[2] Smith, English Gilds, p. 313. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 315. [4] See Chap. VII., p. 380.

[5] Chap. VIII., p. 401. See, however, p. 414, note 2. [6] Mr Wyatt Papworth.

It is somewhat singular that the word *Freemason* is not given in Johnson's Dictionary, 1st edit., 1755.

[7] II., p. 66; VI., pp. 302-308; VII., *passim*; VIII., p. 407 and XI., p. 488, note 1.

shall pass on to the year 1427, and from thence proceed downwards, until my list overlaps the formation of the Grand Lodge of England. It may, however, be premised, that the examples given are, as far as possible, representative of their class, and that to the best of my belief, a large proportion of them appear for the first time in a collected form. For convenience sake, each quotation will be prefaced by the date to which it refers. Arranged in this manner, we accordingly find under the years named:—

1427.—John Wolston and John Harry, Freemasons, were sent from Exeter to Beere to purchase stone.[1]

1490, Oct. 23.—"Admissio Willi Atwodde Lathami."

The Dean and Chapter of Wells granted to William Atwodde, "ffremason," the office previously held in the church by William Smythe, with a yearly salary. The letter of appointment makes known, that the salary in question has been granted to Atwodde for his good and faithful service in his art of "ffremasonry."[2]

1513, Aug. 4.—By an indenture of this date, it was stipulated that John Wastell, to whom allusion has been already made,[3] should "kepe continually 60 fre-masons workyng."[4]

1535.—"Rec. of the goodman Stefford, ffre mason for the holle stepyll wt Tymbr, Iron, and Glas, xxxviij*l*."[5]

1536.—John Multon, Freemason, had granted to him by the prior and convent of Bath "the office of Master of all their works commonly called freemasonry, when it should be vacant."[6]

1550.—"The free mason hewyth the harde stones, and hewyth of, here one pece, & there another, tyll the stones be fytte and apte for the place where he wyll laye them. Euen so God the heavenly free mason, buildeth a christen churche, and he frameth and polysheth us, whiche are the costlye and precyous stones, wyth the crosse and affliccyon, that all abhomynacyon & wickednes which do not agree unto thys gloryous buyldynge, myghte be remoued & taken out of the waye . i. Petr . ii."[7]

God a free mason.

1590-1, March 19.—"John Kidd, of Leeds, Freemason, gives bond to produce the original will of William Taylor, junr., of Leeds."[8]

1594.—On a tomb in the church of St Helen, Bishopsgate Street, are the following inscriptions[9]:—

South side—

"HERE | LYETH THE BODIE OF WILLIAM KERWIN OF THIS CITTIE OF LON | DON
FREE | MASON WHOE DEPARTED THIS LYFE THE 26 TH DAYE OF DECEMBER ANŌ | 1594."

[1] From the Exeter Fabric Rolls; published in Britton's Hist. and Antiq. of the Cath. Ch. of Exeter, 1836, p. 97; also by the late E. W. Shaw in the *Freemasons' Mag.*, Ap. 18, 1868; and in the *Builder*, vol. xxvii., p. 78. John Wolston, I am informed by Mr James Jerman of Exeter, was Clerk of the Works there in 1426.

[2] "Nos dedisse et concisse Willielmo Atwodde ffremason, pro suo bono et diligenti servicio in arte sua de ffremasonry," etc. (Rev. H. E. Reynolds, Statutes of Wells Cathedral, p. 180).

[3] Chap. VI., p. 306.

[4] Malden, Account of King's College, Cambridge, p. 80.

[5] Records of the Parish of St Alphage, London Wall (City Press, Aug. 26, 1882).

[6] Transactions, Royal Institute of British Architects, 1861-62, pp. 37-60.

[7] Werdmuller, A Spyrytuall and Moost Precyouse Pearle, tr. by Bishop Coverdale, 1550, fol. xxi.

[8] From the Wills Court at York, cited in the *Freemasons' Chronicle*, April 2, 1881.

[9] W. H. Rylands, An Old Mason's Tomb (Masonic Magazine, September 1881). A brief notice of Kerwin's epitaph will also be found in the *European Magazine*, vol. lxiv., 1813, p. 200.

North side—

"Ædibvs Attalicis Londinvm qui decoravi : Me dvce svrgebant alijs regalia tecta :
Exigvam tribvvnt hanc mihi fata domv̄ : Me dvce conficitvr ossibvs vrna meis :"[1]

Although the arms of the Kerwyn family appear on the monument, "the west end presents, from a Masonic point of view, the most interesting portion of the tomb. In a panel, supported on each side by ornamental pilasters,[2] is represented the arms of the Masons as granted by William Hawkeslowe in the twelfth year of Edward IV. (1472-3): —On a chevron engrailed, between three square castles, a pair of compasses extended—the crest, a square castle, with the motto, God is our Guide. It is interesting to find the arms here rendered as they were originally granted, with the chevron engrailed, and with the old square four-towered castles, and not the plain chevron and single round tower, as now so often depicted."

In the opinion of Mr Rylands, this is the earliest instance of the title "Freemason" being associated with these arms.[3]

1598.—The Will of Richard Turner of Rivington . co. Lanc . dated July 1, proved Sept. 19. An inventory of Horses, Cows, Sheep, tools etc. total £57 . 16 . 4.[4]

1604, Feb. 12.—"Humfrey son of Edward Holland ffremason bapt[ized]."[4]

1610-13.—Wadham College, Oxford, was commenced in 1610 and finished in 1613. In the accounts "the masons who worked the stone for building are called Free masons, or Freestone Masons, while the rest are merely called labourers. It is curious that the three statues over the entrance to the hall and chapel were cut by one of the free masons (William Blackshaw)."[5]

1627-8.—Louth steeple repaired by Thomas Egglefield, Freemason, and steeple mender.[6]

1638.—The will of Richard Smayley of Nether Darwen. co. Lanc. ffree Mayson (apparently a Catholic), dated the 8th, proved the 30th of May. In the inventory of his goods—£65 . 9 . 0 —with horses, cattle, sheep, and ploughs, there occur, "one gavelocke [*spear*], homars, Chesels, axes, and other Irne [*iron*] implem^ts belonging to a Mayson."[4]

1689.—On a tombstone at Wensley, Yorkshire, appear the words, "George Bowes, Free Mason." The Masons' Arms, a chevron charged with a pair of open compasses between three castles, is evidently the device on the head of the stone.[7]

[1] "The Fates have afforded this narrow house to me, who hath adorned London with noble buildings. By me royal palaces were built for others. By me this tomb is erected for my bones."

[2] "At the base of the left hand pilaster is a curious ornament, having in the upper division a rose with five petals, and in the lower what may also be intended to represent a rose."

[3] From Stow we learn more of the tomb and the family of William Kerwin; he writes:—"*In the South Ile of this Church, is a very faire Window with this inscription:* 'This window was glazed at the charges of *Joyce Featly*, Daughter to *William Kerwyn* Esquire, and Wife to *Daniel Featly*, D.D. *Anno Domini* 1632'" ("Remaines," a supplement to the "Survey," 1633, p. 837).

[4] W. H. Rylands, MS. collection. In the Manchester Registers *an* Edward Holland is styled "gentleman."

[5] Orlando Jewitt, The late or debased Gothic buildings of Oxford, 1850.

[6] Archæologia, vol. x., p. 70.

[7] T. B. Whytehead, in the *Freemason*, Aug. 27, 1881. . . . "buried Decem. ye 26, 1689" (Par. Reg.).

1701.—The orders (or rules) of the Alnwicke Lodge are thus headed:—"Orders to be observed by the Company and Fellowship of Free Masons[1] att a lodge held at Alnwick Septr. 29, 1701, being the genll. head meeting day."[2]

1708, Dec. 27.—Amongst the epitaphs in Holy Trinity Churchyard, Hull, is the following, under the above date:—"Sarah Roebuck, late wife of John Roebuck, Freemason."[3]

1711, April 29.—"Jemima, daughter of John Gatley, freemasson, Bapt[ized]."[4]

1722, Nov. 25.—In the churchyard of the parish of All Saints at York, there is the tomb of Leonard Smith, Free Mason.[5]

1737, Feb.—In Rochdale Churchyard, under the date given, is the following epitaph:—"Here lyeth Benj. Brearly Free Mason."[6]

The derivation of the term "Freemason" lies within the category of Masonic problems, respecting which, writers know not how much previous information to assume in their readers, and are prone in consequence to begin on every occasion *ab ovo*, a mode of treatment which is apt to weary and disgust all those to whom the subject is not entirely new.

In this instance, however, I have endeavoured to lead up to the final stage of an inquiry presenting more than ordinary features of interest, by considering it from various points of view in earlier chapters.[7] The records of the building-trades, the Statutes of the Realm, and the Archives of Scottish Masonry, have each in turn contributed to our stock of information, which, supplemented by the evidence last adduced, I shall now proceed to critically examine as a whole.

In the first place, I must demur to the conclusion which has been expressed by Mr Wyatt Papworth, "That the earliest use of the English *term* Freemason was in 1396." Though in thus dissenting at the outset from the opinion of one of the highest authorities upon the subject, the difference between our respective views being, however, rather one of form than of substance, I am desirous of placing on record my grateful acknowledgments of much valuable assistance rendered throughout the progress of this work, by the friend to whose dictum in this single instance, I cannot yield my assent, especially in regard to the true solution of the problem with which I am now attempting to deal.

[1] This singular combination of titles will be hereafter considered, in connection with the equally suggestive endorsements on the Antiquity (23) and Scarborough (28) MSS.

[2] From the account of this lodge, published by Hughan in the *Masonic Magazine*, vol. i., p. 214; and from the MS. notes taken by Mr F. Hockley from the Alnwicke records. The 12th of the "Orders," referred to in the text, is as follows:—"Item, thatt 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 Master or Wardens therewith, For every time so offending shall pay £3 . 6 . 8."

[3] T. B. Whytehead, in the *Freemason*, citing Gent's History of Hull, p. 54.

[4] W. H. Rylands, in the *Freemason*, Aug. 7, 1883, citing the registers of the parish church of Lymm, Cheshire. It will be remembered that Richard Ellam was styled of "Lyme (Lymm), Cheshire, freemason."

[5] G. M. Tweddell, in the *Freemason*, July 22, 1882, citing Thomas Gent's History of York, 1730.

[6] James Lawton, in the *Freemasons' Chronicle*, Feb. 3, 1883.

[7] To use the words of Father Innes:—"I have been obliged to follow a method very different from that of those who have hitherto treated it, and to beat out to myself, if I may say so, paths that had not been trodden before, having thought it more secure to direct my course by such glimpses of light as the more certain monuments of antiquity furnished me, then to follow, as so many others have done, with so little advantage to the credit of our antiquities, the beaten road of our modern writers" (A Critical Essay on the Ancient Inhabitants of Scotland, 1729, preface, p. x).

That the word Freemason appears for the first time in 1396, in any records that are extant relating directly to building operations, is indeed clear and indisputable.[1] But the same descriptive term occurs in other and earlier records, as I have already had occasion to remark.[2] In 1376-77—50 Edw. III.—the number of persons chosen by the several mysteries to be the Common Council of the City of London was 148, which divided by 48—at which figure Herbert then places the companies—would give them an average of about 3 representatives each. Of these the principal ones sent 6, the secondary 4, and the small companies 2.[3] The names of all the companies are given by Herbert, together with the number of members which they severally elected to represent them. The Fab^{r}m. chose 6, the Masons 4, and the Freemasons 2. The Carpenters are not named, but a note explains *Fab^{r}m* to signify *Smiths*, which if a contraction of *Fabrorum*, as I take it to be, would doubtless include them. The earliest direct mention of the Carpenters' Company occurs in 1421, though as the very nature of the trade induces the conviction that an association for its protection must have had a far earlier origin, Mr Jupp argues from this circumstance and from the fact of two Master Masons, and a similar number of Master Carpenters having been sworn, in 1272, as officers to perform certain duties[4] with regard to buildings, that there is just ground for the conjecture that these Masons and Carpenters were members of existing guilds.[5] This may have been the case, but unquestionably the members of both the callings—known by whatever name—must have been included in the Guilds of Craft, enumerated in the list of 1376-77.

Verstegan, in his Glossary of "Ancient English Words," *s.v.* Smithe, gives us:—"To smite, hereof commeth our name of a Smith, because he Smitheth or smiteth with a Hammer. Before we had the Carpenter from the *French*, a Carpenter was in our Language also called a Smith, for that he smiteth both with his Hammer, and his Axe; and for distinction the one was a Wood-smith, and the other an Iron-smith, which is nothing improper. And the like is seen in *Latin*, where the name of *Faber* serveth both for the Smith and for the Carpenter, the one being *Faber ferrarius*, and the other *Faber lignarius*."[6]

[1] As the authority on which this statement rests, has been insufficiently referred to in Chap. VI., p. 308, I subjoin it in full, from a transcript made by Rylands, which I have collated with the actual document in the Library of the British Museum.

In the Sloane Collection, No. 4595, page 50, is the following copy of the original document, dated 14th June, 19th Richard II., or A.D. 1396.

14 June. Pro Archiepiscopo Cantuar.

(Pat. 19 R. 2. p 2. m. 4.) Rex omnibus ad quos &c. Salutem Sciatis quod concessimus Venerabili in Christo Patri Carissimo Consanguineo nostro Archiepiscopo Cantuar. quod ipse pro quibusdam operationibus cujusdam Collegii per ipsum apud Villam Maidenston faciend. viginti et quatuor lathomos vocatos ffre Maceons et viginti et quatuor lathomos vocatos ligiers per deputatos suos in hac parte capere et lathomos illos pro denariis suis eis pro operationibus hujusmodi rationabiliter solvend. quousque dicti operationes plenarie facte et complete existant habere et tenere possit. Ita quod lathomi predicti durante tempore predicto ad opus vel operationes nostras per officiarios vel ministros nostros quoscumque minime capiantur.

In cujus &c.

Teste Rege apud Westm xiiij die Junii

Per breve de Privato Sigillo.

[2] Chap. VI., p. 304; and Chap. XIV., p. 145.

[3] Herbert, Companies of London, vol i., pp. 33, 34.

[4] Almost identical with those afterwards confided to a similar body under the title of city viewers, see *ante*, p. 146.

[5] Hist. of the Carpenters' Company, p. 8.

[6] Restitution of Decayed Intelligence in Antiquities concerning the.....English Nation, 1634, p. 231. *Cf. ante*, Chap. I., pp. 38, 44.

As it is almost certain that the Company of Fab^rm. comprised several varieties of the trade, which are now distinguished by finer shades of expression, I think we may safely infer that the craftsmen who in those and earlier times were elsewhere referred to as *Fabri lignarii* or *tignarii*, must have been included under the somewhat uncouth title behind which I have striven to penetrate.[1]

In this view of the case, the class of workmen, whose handicraft derived its *raison d'être* from the various uses to which wood could be profitably turned, were in 1376-7 associated in one of the *principal* companies, returning six members to the common council. It could hardly be expected that we should find the workers in stone, the infinite varieties of whose trade are stamped upon the imperishable monuments which even yet bear witness to their skill, were banded together in a fraternity of the second class. Nor do we; for the Masons and the Freemasons, the city records inform us, *pace* Herbert, were in fact one company, and elected six representatives. How the mistake originated, which led to a separate classification in the first instance, it is now immaterial, as it would be useless to inquire. It is sufficiently clear, that in the fiftieth year of Edward III. there was a use of the term *Free-mason*, and that the persons to whom it was applied were a section or an offshoot of the Masons' Company, though in either case probably reabsorbed within the parent body. Inasmuch, however, as no corporate recognition of either the Masons or the Freemasons of London can be traced any further back than 1376-7, it would be futile to carry our speculations any higher. It must content us to know, that in the above year the trade or handicraft of a Freemason was exercised in the metropolis. In my judgment, the Freemasons and Masons of this period—*i.e.*, those referred to as above in the city records—were parts of a single fraternity, and if not *then* absolutely identical, the one with the other, I think that from this period they became so. In support of this position there are the oft-quoted words of Stow,[2] "*the masons, otherwise termed 'free-masons,'* were a society of ancient standing and good reckoning;" the monument of William Kerwin;[3] and the records of the Masons' Company; not to speak of much indirect evidence, which will be considered in its proper place.

Whilst, however, contending that the earliest use of "Freemason" will be found associated with the freedom of a company and a city, I readily admit the existence of other channels through which the term may have derived its origin. The point, indeed, for determination, is not so much the relative antiquity of the varied meanings under which the word has been passed on through successive centuries, but rather the particular *use* or *form*, which has merged into the appellation by which the present Society of Freemasons is distinguished.

The absence of any mention of *Free*masons in the York Fabric Rolls[4] is rather singular,

[1] The only other branch of carpentry represented in the list of companies (1375), appears under the title of *Wodmog^s*, which Herbert explains as meaning "Woodsawyers (mongers)." This is very confusing, but I incline to the latter interpretation, *viz.*, woodmongers, or vendors of wood, which leaves all varieties of the smith's trade under the title Fab^rm. This Company of Wodmog^s had 2 representatives.

[2] Survey of London, 1633, p. 630. *Post*, p. 176, note 4.

[3] *If* Valentine Strong was a member of the London Company of Masons, the title *Freemason* on his monument (1662) would be consistent with the name used in the company's records down to 1653; but even if the connection of the Strong family with the London Guild commenced with Thomas Strong, the son, it is abundantly clear that Valentine, the father, must have been a member of some provincial company of Masons (see Chap. XII., p. 40).

[4] The references to *masons*, on the contrary, are very numerous; the following, taken from the testamentary

and by some has been held to uphold what I venture to term the guild theory,—that is to say, that the prefix *free* was inseparably connected with the freedom of a guild or company. However, if the records of one cathedral at all sustain this view, those of others[1] effectually demolish the visionary fabric which has been erected on such slight foundation. The old operative regulations were of a very simple character; indeed Mr Papworth observes—"The 'Orders' supplied to the masons at work at York Cathedral in 1355 give but a poor notion of there being then existing in that city anything like a guild claiming in virtue of a charter given by Athelstan in 926, not only over that city, but over all England."

That *Freemason* was in use as a purely operative term from 1396 down to the seventeenth, and possibly the eighteenth, century, admits of no doubt whatever; and discarding the mass of evidence about which there can be any diversity of opinion, this conclusion may be safely allowed to rest on the three allusions to "Freemasonry"[2] as an operative art, and the metaphor employed by Bishop Coverdale in his translation from Werdmuller. In the former instance the greater may well be held to comprehend the less, and the "art" or "work" of "Freemasonry" plainly indicates its close connection with the *Freemasons* of even date. In the latter we have the simile of a learned prelate,[3] who, it may be assumed, was fully conversant with the craft usage, out of which he constructed his metaphor. This, it is true, only brings us down to the middle of the sixteenth century, but there are especial reasons for making this period a halting-place in the progress of our inquiry.

The statute 5 Eliz., c. IV., passed in 1562, though enumerating, as I have already observed, every other known class of handicraftsmen, omits the Freemasons, and upon this circumstance I hazarded some conjectures which will be found at the close of Chapter VII.

It is somewhat singular, that approaching the subject from a different point of view, I find in the seventh decade of the sixteenth century, a period of transition in the use of Freemason, which is somewhat confirmatory of my previous speculations.

Thus in either case, whether we trace the guild theory *up*, or the strictly operative theory *down*—and for the time being, even exclude from our consideration the separate evidence respecting the Masons' Company of London—we are brought to a stand still before we quite reach the era I have named. For example, assuming as I do, that John Gatley and Richard Ellam of Lymm, John Roebuck, George Bowes, Valentine Strong, Richard Smayley, Edward Holland, Richard Turner, William Kerwin, and John Kidd, derived in each case their title of Freemason from the freedom of a guild or company—still, with the last named worthy, in 1591, the roll comes to an end.[4] Also, *descending* from the year 1550, the records of the building trades afford very meagre notices of operative Freemasons.[5] I am far

registers of the Dean and Chapter, being one of the most curious:—"Feb. 12, 1522-3. Christofer Horner, mason, myghtie of mynd and of a hooll myndfulness. To Sanct Petur wark all my tuyllis [tools] within the mason lughe [lodge]."

[1] Exeter, Wells, and Durham. See under the years 1427 and 1490; also Chap. VI., p. 308.

[2] See above under the years 1490 and 1536, and Chap. VI., p. 408, note 4.

[3] Miles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter, who published a translation of the Bible in 1535.

[4] Culling from all sources, it can only be carried back to 1581 (see next page, note 10).

[5] Further examples of the use of the word *Freemason*, under the years 1597, 1606, 1607, and 1624, will be found in *Notes and Queries*, Aug. 31, 1861, and Mar. 4, 1882; and the *Freemasons' Chronicle*, Mar. 26, 1881. The former journal—July 27, 1861—cites a will dated 1641, wherein the testator and a legatee are each styled "Freemason;" and—Sept. 1, 1866—mentions the baptism of the son of a "Freemason" in 1685, also his burial under the same title in 1697.

from saying that they do not occur,[1] but having for a long time carefully noted all references to the word Freemason from authentic sources, and without any idea of establishing a foregone conclusion, I find, when tabulating my collection, such entries relating to the last half of the sixteenth century are conspicuous by their absence.

In 1610, there is the Order of the Justices of the Peace, indicating a class of rough masons able to take charge over others, as well as apparently two distinct classes of Freemasons.[2] A year or two later occurs the employment of Freemasons at Wadham College, Oxford. In 1628, Thomas Egglefield, Freemason and Steeple-mender, is mentioned, and five years after there is the reference to Maude and others, Freemasons and Contractors.

Such a contention, as that the use of Freemason as an operative term, came to an abrupt termination about the middle of the seventeenth century, is foreign to the design of these remarks, and though I am in possession of no references which may further elucidate this phase of Masonic history during the latter half of the century, the records of the Alnwick Lodge,[3] extending from 1701 to 1748, may be held by some to carry on the use of Freemason as a purely operative phrase until the middle of the eighteenth century.

My contention is, that the class of persons from whom the Freemasons of Warrington,[4] Staffordshire,[5] Chester,[6] York[7], London,[8] and their congeners in the seventeenth century, derived the descriptive title which became the *inheritance* of the Grand Lodge of England, were *free men*,[9] and Masons of Guilds or Companies.

Turning to the early history of Scottish Masonry, the view advanced with regard to the origin of the title, which has now become the common property of all speculative Masons throughout the universe, is strikingly confirmed.

Having in an earlier chapter[10] discussed, at some length, the use of the title Freemason from a Scottish stand-point, I shall not weary my readers with a recapitulation of the arguments there adduced, though I cite the leading references below, in order to facilitate what I have always at heart, viz., the most searching criticism of disputed points, whereon I venture to dissent from the majority of writers who have preceded me in similar fields of inquiry.[11]

As cumulative proofs that the Society of Freemasons has derived its name from the Freemen Masons of more early times, the examples in the Scottish records have an especial value.

[1] It is fair to state, that the fount upon which I have chiefly drawn for my observations on the early Masons, viz., Mr Papworth's "Essay on the Superintendents of English Buildings in the Middle Ages," becomes dried up, at this point of our research, in accordance with the limitations which the author has prescribed to himself.

[2] According to the Stat. 11 Hen. VII., c. xxii. (1495), a *Free*mason was to take less wages than a *Master* Mason.

[3] These will be duly examined at a later stage.

[4] Ashmole, Diary, Oct. 16, 1646.

[5] Plot, Natural History of Staffordshire, 1686, p. 316-318.

[6] Harl. MS. 2054 (12).

[7] Hughan, History of Freemasonry in York, 1871.

[8] Gould, The Four Old Lodges, 1879, p. 46.

[9] "Wherever the Craft Gilds were legally acknowledged, we find foremost, that the right to exercise their craft, and sell their manufactures, *depended upon the freedom of their city*" (Brentano, History and Development of Gilds, p. 65).

[10] Chap. VIII., p. 410, *q.v.* See further, *Master frie mason* (1581), p. 409; *frei men Maissones* (1601), p. 383; *frie mesones* of Ednr. (1636), p. 407; *frie mason* (Melrose, 1674), p. 450; and *frie Lodge* (1658), p. 41.

[11] The references in Smith's "English Gilds," to the exercise of a trade being contingent on the possession of its freedom, are so numerous, that I have only space for a few examples. Thus in the City of Exeter no cordwainer was allowed to keep a shop, "butte he be a ffraunchised man" (p. 333); "The Old Usages" of Winchester required that "non ne shal make burelle werk, but if he be of ye ffraunchyse of ye toun" (p. 351); and the "Othe" of the Mayor contained a special proviso, that he would "meyntene the fraunchises and *free custumes* whiche beth gode in the saide toune" (p. 416).

Examined separately, the histories of both English and Scottish Masonry yield a like result to the research of the philologist, but unitedly, they present a body of evidence, all bearing in one direction, which brushes away the etymological difficulties, arising from the imperfect consideration of the subject as a whole.

Having now pursued, at some length, an inquiry into collateral events, hitherto very barely investigated, and expressed with some freedom my own conjectures respecting a portion of our subject lying somewhat in the dark, it becomes necessary to return to Ashmole, and to resume our examination of the evidence which has clustered round his name.

It is important, however, to carefully discriminate between the *undoubted* testimony of Ashmole, and the opinions which have been *ascribed* to him. So far as the former is concerned—and the reader will need no reminder that *direct* allusions to the Masonic fraternity are alone referred to—it comes to an end with the last entry given from the "Diary" (1682); but the latter have exercised so much influence upon the writings of all our most trustworthy historians, that their careful analysis will form one of the most important parts of our general inquiry.

In order to present this evidence in a clear form, it becomes necessary to dwell upon the fact, that the entries in the "Diary" record the attendance of Ashmole at two Masonic meetings only—viz., in 1646 and 1682 respectively.

This "Diary" was not printed until 1717. Rawlinson's preface to the "History of Berkshire" saw the light two years later;[1] and the article *Ashmole* in the "Biographia Britannica" was published in 1747. During the period, however, intervening between the last entry referred to in the "Diary" (1682) and its publication (1717), there appeared Dr Plot's "Natural History of Staffordshire" (1686),[2] in which is contained the earliest critico-historical account of the Freemasons. Plot's remarks form the ground-work of an interesting note to the memoir of Ashmole in the "Biographia Britannica;" and the latter, which has been very much relied upon by the compilers of Masonic history, is scarcely intelligible without a knowledge of the former. There were also occasional references to Plot's work in the interval between 1717 and 1747, from which it becomes the more essential that, in critically appraising the value of statements given to the world on the *authority* of Ashmole, we should have before us all the evidence which can assist in guiding us to a sound and rational conclusion.

This involves the necessity of going, to a certain extent, over ground with which, from previous research, we have become familiar; but I shall tread very lightly in paths already traversed, and do my best to avoid any needless repetition of either facts or inferences that have been already placed before my readers.

I shall first of all recall attention to the statement of Sir William Dugdale, recorded by Aubrey in his "Natural History of Wiltshire." No addition to the text of this work was made after 1686—Aubrey being then sixty years of age—and giving the entry in question no earlier date (though in my opinion this might be safely done), we should put to ourselves the inquiry, what distance back can the expression, "many years ago," from the mouth of a man of sixty, safely carry us? Every reader must answer this question for himself, and I shall merely postulate, that under any method of computation, Dugdale's *verbal* statement must be presumed to date from a period somewhere intermediate between October 16, 1646, and March 11, 1682.

[1] Chap. XII., p. 17.

[2] *Cf. ante*, Chaps. II., p. 73; VII., p. 351; and XII., pp. 4, 16, 44.

It is quite certain that it was made *before* the meeting occurred in the latter year at the Masons' Hall.

Ashmole informs us:

"1656. September. 13. About 9 *hor. ante merid.*. I came first to Mr Dugdale's at Blyth-Hall."

"December 19. I went. towards Blyth-Hall." A similar entry occurs under the date of March 27 in the following year; after which we find:

"1657. May. 19. I accompanied Mr Dugdale in his journey towards the Fens 4. *Hor.* 30 minites *ante merid.*"

Blyth-Hall seems to have possessed great attractions for Ashmole, since he repeatedly went there between the years 1657 and 1660. In the latter year he was appointed Windsor Herald, and in 1661 was given precedency over the other heralds. He next records:

"1662 August. I accompanied Mr Dugdale in his visitation of Derby and Nottingham shires."

"1663. March. I accompanied Mr Dugdale in his visitation of Staffordshire and Derbyshire."

"August 3. 9 *Hor. ante merid.*. I began my journey to accompany Mr Dugdale in his visitations of Shropshire and Cheshire."

Further entries in the "Diary" relate constant visits to Blyth-Hall in 1665 and the three following years; and seven months after the death of his second wife, the Lady Mainwaring, Ashmole thus describes his third marriage:

"1668. November. 3. I married Mrs Elizabeth Dugdale, daughter to William Dugdale, Esq., Norroy King of Arms, at Lincoln's Inn Chapel."

As the ideas of the two antiquaries necessarily became very interchangeable from the year 1656, and in 1663 they were together in Staffordshire, Ashmole's native county, we shall not, I think, go far astray if, without assigning the occurrence any exact date, we at least assume that the *earliest* colloquy of the two Heralds,[1] with regard to the Society of Freemasons, cannot with any approach to accuracy be fixed at any *later* period than 1663. I arrive at this conclusion, not only from the intimacy between the men, and their both being officials of the College of Arms, but also because they went together to make the Staffordshire "Visitation," which, taken with Plot's subsequent account of the "Society," appears to me to justify the belief, that the prevalence of Masonic lodges in his native county, was a circumstance of which Ashmole could hardly have been unaware—indeed the speculation may be hazarded, that the "customs" of Staffordshire were not wholly without their influence, when he cast in his lot with the Freemasons at Warrington in 1646; and in this view of the case, the probability of Dugdale having derived a portion of the information which he afterwards passed on to Aubrey, from his brother Herald in 1663, may, I think, be safely admitted.

It will not be out of place, if I here call attention to the extreme affection which Ashmole appears to have always entertained for the city of his birth. His visits to Lichfield were very frequent, and he was a great benefactor to the Cathedral Church, in which he commenced his

[1] Sir William Dugdale was born September 12, 1605, and died February 10, 1686. His autobiography is to found in the 2d edition of his "History of St Paul's Cathedral," and was reprinted by W. Hamper, with his "Diary" and Correspondence, in 1827. He was appointed Chester Herald in 1644, and became Garter-King-at-Arms—his son-in-law declining the appointment—in 1677.

early life as a chorister.[1] In 1671, he was, together with his wife, "entertained by the Bailiffs at a dinner and a great banquet." Twice the leading citizens invited him to become one of their Burgesses in Parliament. It is within the limits of probability, that the close and intimate connection between Ashmole and his native city, which only ceased with the life of the antiquary, may have led to his being present at the Masons' Hall, London, on March 11, 1682. Sir William Wilson, one of the "new accepted" Masons on that occasion, and originally a Stonemason, was the sculptor of the statue of Charles II., erected in the Cathedral of Lichfield at the expense of, and during the episcopate of, Bishop Hacket,[2] and it seems to me that we have in this circumstance an explanation of Ashmole's presence at the Masons' Hall, which, not to put it any higher, is in harmony with the known attachment of the antiquary for the city and Cathedral of Lichfield—an attachment not unlikely to result, in his becoming personally acquainted with any artists of note, employed in the restoration of an edifice endeared to him by so many recollections.

Sir William Wilson's approaching "admission" or "acceptance" may therefore have been the disposing cause of the *Summons* received by Ashmole, but leaving this conjecture for what it is worth, I pass on to Dr Plot's "Natural History of Staffordshire," the publication of which occurred in the same year (1686) as the transcription of the Antiquity MS. (23) by Robert Padgett, a synchronism of no little singularity, from the point of view from which it will hereafter be regarded.

Although Plot's description of Freemasonry, as practised by its votaries in the second half of the seventeenth century, has been reprinted times without number, it is quite impossible to exclude it from this history. I shall therefore quote from the "Natural History of Staffordshire,"[3] premising, however, that if I am unable to cast any new light upon the passages relating to the Freemasons, it arises from no lack of diligence on my part, as I have carefully read every word in the volume from title-page to index.

Dr Plot's Account of the Freemasons, A.D. 1686.

§ 85. "To these add the *Customs* relating to the *County*, whereof they have one, of admitting Men into the *Society* of *Free-Masons*, that in the *moorelands*[4] of this *County* seems to be of greater request, than any where else, though I find the *Custom* spread more or less all over the *Nation*; for here I found persons of the most eminent quality, that did not disdain to be of this *Fellowship*. Nor indeed need they, were it of that *Antiquity* and *honor*, that is pretended

[1] Dr T. Harwood, History of Lichfield, 1806, pp. 61, 69, 441.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 72. Dr John Hacket was made Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry at the Restoration, and in that situation exhibited a degree of munificence worthy of his station, by expending £20,000 in repairing his Cathedral, and by being a liberal benefactor to Trinity College, Cambridge, of which he had been a member. He died in 1670.

[3] Dr Plot's copy (Brit. Mus. Lib., containing MS. notes for a second edition), chap. viii., §§ 85-88, pp. 316-318. Throughout this extract, the original notes of the Author in the only printed edition (1686), are followed by his name.

[4] This word is explained by the Author at chap. ii., § 1, p. 107, where he thus quotes from Sampson Erdeswick's "Survey of Staffordshire:"—"The moorlands is the more northerly mountainous part of the county, laying betwixt Dove and Trent, from the three Shire-heads; southerly, to Draycote in the Moors, and yeildeth lead, copper, rance, marble, and mill-stones."

Erdeswick's book was not published during his life-time. His MSS. fell into the hands of Walter Chetwynd of Ingestrie, styled by Bishop Nicolson, "venerande antiquitatis cultor maximus." Plot was introduced into the county by Chetwynd, and liberally assisted by his patronage and advice (Erdeswick, A Survey of Staffordshire, edited by Dr T. Harwood, 1844, preface, p. xxxvii).

in a large *parchment volum*[1] they have amongst them, containing the *History* and *Rules* of the craft of *masonry*. Which is there deduced not only from *sacred writ*, but *profane story*, particularly that it was brought into *England* by *S^t Amphibal*,[2] and first communicated to *S. Alban*, who set down the *Charges* of *masonry*, and was made paymaster and Governor of the *Kings* works, and gave them *charges* and *manners* as *S^t Amphibal* had taught him. Which were after confirmed by King *Athelstan*, whose youngest son *Edwyn* loved well masonry, took upon him the *charges*, and learned the *manners*, and obtained for them of his Father a *free-Charter*. Whereupon he caused them to assemble at *York*, and to bring all the old *Books* of their *craft*, and out of them ordained such *charges* and *manners*, as they then thought fit: which *charges* in the said *Schrole* or *Parchment volum*, are in part declared; and thus was the *craft* of *masonry* grounded and confirmed in *England*.[3] It is also there declared that these *charges* and *manners* were after perused and approved by King *Hen.* 6. and his *council*,[4] both as to *Masters* and *Fellows* of this right Worshipfull *craft*."[5]

§ 86. "Into which *Society* when any are admitted, they call a *meeting* (or *Lodg* as they term it in some places), which must consist at lest of 5 or 6 of the *Ancients* of the *Order*, whom the *candidats* present with *gloves*, and so likewise to their *wives*, and entertain with a *collation* according to the Custom of the place: This ended, they proceed to the *admission* of them, which cheifly consists in the communication of certain *secret signes*, whereby they are known to one another all over the *Nation*, by which means they have maintenance whither ever they travel: for if any man appear though altogether unknown that can shew any of these *signes* to a *Fellow* of the *Society*, whom they otherwise call an *accepted mason*, he is obliged presently to come to him, from what company or place soever he be in, nay, tho' from the top of a *Steeple*[6] (what hazard or inconvenience soever he run), to know his

[1] See *ante*, Chap. II., MS. 40, p. 73.

[2] All that is recorded of this Saint is, that he was a Roman Missionary, martyred almost immediately after his arrival in England. *Cf. ante*, Chap. II., p. 85.

[3] These assertions belong to the period which began towards the close of the Middle Ages, and continued until the end of the seventeenth century, if not later, when all the wild stories of King Lud, Belin, Bladud, Trinovant or Troy Novant (evidently a corruption of Trinobantes), Brutus and his Trojans, sprang up with the soil, and, like other such plants, for a time flourished exceedingly. For references to these wholly imaginary worthies—of whose actual existence there is not the faintest trace—as well as for a bibliographical list of their works drawn up with a precision worthy of Allibone, the reader may consult Leland, Pits, and Bale, but especially the last named. King Cole is also another of these heroes, though some writers have made him a publican of later date in Chancery Lane! The subject, however, is not one of importance.

[4] This evidently refers, though in a confused manner, like so many other similar notices, to the Statutes of Labourers (*ante*, Chap. VII., p. 351, Stat. 3, Hen. VI., c. I., *q.v.*). *Cf.* the statements at p. 75 of the Constitutions (1738), copied by Preston in his "Illustrations of Masonry," edit. 1792, p. 200. There can hardly be a doubt as to the "old record," under whose authority Anderson and Preston shield themselves, being the "*Schrole* or *Parchment Volum*" referred to by Plot.

[5] Ex Rotulo membranaceo penes Cœmentariorum Societatem.—PLOT.

[6] The *London Journal* of July 10, 1725, gives a parody of the Entered Apprentice Song, of which the fifth verse runs—

"If on House ne'er so high,
A Brother they spy,
As his Trowel He dextrously lays on,
He must leave off his Work,
And come down with a Jerk,
At the Sign of an Accepted Mason."

See also the Rev. A. F. A. Woodford's reprint of the Sloane MSS. 3329, p. xvi.

pleasure, and assist him; *viz.*, if he want *work* he is bound to find him some; or if he cannot doe that, to give him *mony*, or otherwise support him till *work* can be had; which is one of their *Articles;* and it is another, that they advise the *Masters* they work for, according to the best of their *skill*, acquainting them with the goodness or badness of their *materials;* and if they be any way out in the *contrivance* of their *buildings*, modestly to rectify them in it; that *masonry* be not dishonored: and many such like that are commonly known: but some others they have (to which they are *sworn* after their fashion), that none know but themselves, which I have reason to suspect are much worse than these, perhaps as bad as this *History* of the *craft* it self; than which there is nothing I ever met with, more false or incoherent."

§ 87. "For not to mention that S^t^ *Amphibalus* by judicious persons is, thought rather to be the *cloak*, than *master* of S^t^ *Alban;* or how unlikely it is that S^t^ *Alban* himself in such a barbarous Age, and in times of persecution, should be *supervisor* of any *works;* it is plain that King *Athelstan* was never marryed, or ever had so much as any natural issue; (unless we give way to the fabulous *History* of *Guy* Earl of *Warwick*, whose eldest son *Reynburn* is said indeed to have been marryed to *Leoneat*, the supposed daughter of *Athelstan*,[1] which will not serve the turn neither) much less ever had he a lawfull son *Edwyn*, of whom I find not the least umbrage in *History*. He had indeed a *Brother* of that name, of whom he was so jealouse, though very *young* when he came to the crown, that he sent him to *Sea* in a *pinnace* without *tackle* or *oar*, only in company with a *page*, that his death might be imputed to the *waves* and not *him;* whence the Young *Prince* (not able to master his passions) cast himself headlong into the *Sea* and there dyed. Who how unlikely to learn their *manners;* to get them a *Charter;* or call them together at *York;* let the *Reader* judg."

§ 88. "Yet more improbable is it still, that *Hen.* the 6 and his *Council*, should ever peruse or approve their *charges* and *manners*, and so confirm these right Worshipfull *Masters* and *Fellows*, as they are call'd in the *Scrole:* for in the third of his reigne (when he could not be 4 years old) I find an *act* of *Parliament* quite abolishing this *Society*. It being therein ordained, that no *Congregations* and *Confederacies* should be made by *masons*, in their general *Chapters* and *Assemblies*,[2] whereby the good course and effect of the *Statutes* of *Labourers*, were violated and broken in subversion of *Law:* and that those who caused such *Chapters* or *Congregations* to be holden, should be adjudged *Felons;* and that those *masons* that came to them should be punish't by *imprisonment*, and make *fine* and *ransom* at the *King's* will.[3] So very much out was the *Compiler* of this *History* of the *craft* of *masonry*,[4] and so little skill had he in our *Chronicles* and *Laws*. Which *Statute* though repealed by a subsequent *act* in the 5 of Eliz.,[5] whereby *Servants* and *Labourers* are compellable to serve, and their *wages* limited; and all *masters* made punishable for giving more wages than what is taxed by the *Justices*, and the *servants* if they take it, &c.[6] Yet this *act* too being but little observed, 'tis still to be feared these *Chapters* of *Free-masons* do as much mischeif as before, which, if one may

[1] Job Rowse's Hist. of Guy, E. of Warw.—PLOT. It may be here remarked that the famous Dun Cow was, in all probability, an Aurochs, the slaying of which single-handed would suffice to ennoble a half savage chieftain.

[2] See *ante*, Chap. VII., p. 354.

[3] Ferd Pulton's Collect. of Statutes, 3 Hen. 6, chap. i.—PLOT. The Acts of Parliament quoted by the Doctor have been amply considered in Chap. VII., *ante*.

[4] See *post*, pp. 175, 176. [5] Lord Cook's [*Coke's*] Institutes of the Laws of Engl., part 3, chap. 35.—PLOT.

[6] Ferd. Pulton's Collect. of Statutes, 5 Eliz., chap. 4.—PLOT.

estimate by the penalty, was anciently so great, that prehaps it might be usefull to examin them now."

In the extracts just given, we have the fullest picture of the Freemasonry which preceded the era of Grand Lodges, that has come down to us in contemporary writings, and the early Masonic "customs" so graphically portrayed by Dr Plot will be again referred to before I take final leave of my present subject.

Among the subscribers to the "Natural History of Staffordshire" were Ashmole, Robert Boyle, Sir William Dugdale, John Evelyn, Robert Hook, and Sir Christopher Wren.

It now only remains at this stage to consider the character and general reputation of the writer, to whom we are so much indebted for this glimpse of light in a particularly dark portion of our annals.

Evelyn, who was a good judge of men, says of Plot: "Pity it is that more of this industrious man's genius were not employed so as to describe every county of England."[1] It must be confessed, however, that extreme credulity appears to have been a noticeable feature of his character. Thus a friendly critic observes of him: "The Doctor was certainly a profound scholar; but, being of a convivial and facetious turn of mind, was easily imposed on, which, added to the credulous age in which he wrote, has introduced into his works more of the marvellous than is adapted to the present more enlightened period."[2]

In Spence's "Anecdotes" we meet with the following: "Dr Plot was very credulous, and took up with any stories for his 'History of Oxfordshire.' A gentleman of Worcestershire was likely to be put into the margin as having one leg rough and the other smooth, had he not discovered the cheat to him out of compassion; one of his legs had been shaved."[3]

Edward Lhuyd,[4] who succeeded Plot as keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, in a letter still preserved, gives a very indifferent character of him to Dr Martin Lister. "I think," says Lhuyd, "he is a man of as bad morals as ever took a doctor's degree. I wish his wife a good bargain of him, and to myself, that I may never meet with the like again."[5]

Plot's "morals" were evidently at a low ebb in the estimation of his brother antiquaries, for Hearne, writing on November 6, 1705, thus expresses himself: "There was once a very remarkable stone in Magd. Hall library, which was afterwards lent to Dr Plott, who never returned it, replying, when he was asked for it, that *'twas a rule among antiquaries to receive, and never restore!*"[6]

But as it is with our author's veracity, rather than with his infractions of the decalogue, that we are concerned, one of the marvellous stories related by him in all good faith may here be fittingly introduced.

A "foole" is mentioned, "who could not only tell you the changes of the Moon, the times of Eclipses, and at what time Easter and Whitsuntide fell, or any *moveable* feast

[1] Diary, July 11, 1675.

[2] Rev. Stebbing Shaw, History and Antiquities of Staffordshire, vol. i., 1798, preface, p. vi. Some further remarks on the subject by the same and other commentators will be found in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. lxii., p. 694; vol. lxv., p. 897; and vol. lxxiv., p. 519.

[3] Rev. J. Spence, Anecdotes of Books and Men, ed. 1820 (Singer), p. 333.

[4] Or Llwyd, of Jesus College, Oxford, an eminent antiquary and naturalist, born about 1670, died in 1709. He was the author of a learned work entitled, "Archæologia Britannica." *Cf.* Leland's Itinerary, vol. ii., 1711 (Hearne), preface, p. iii; and Gentleman's Magazine, vol. lxxvii., 1807, pt. i., p. 419.

[5] Athenæ Oxonienses (Bliss), vol. iv., col. 777.

[6] Reliquiæ Hearnianæ (P. Bliss), 1857, vol. i., p. 47.

whatever, but at what time any of them had, or should fall, at any distance of years, past or to come."[1]

Upon the whole, in arriving at a final estimate of the value of Plot's writings, and especially of the work from which an extract has been given, we shall at least be justified in concluding, with Chalmers, that "In the eagerness and rapidity of his various pursuits he took upon trust, and committed to writing, some things which, upon mature consideration, he must have rejected."[2]

Between 1686 and 1700 there are, at least, so far as I am aware, only two allusions to English Freemasonry by contemporary writers—one in 1688, the other in 1691. The former is by the *third* Randle Holme,[3] which I shall presently examine in connection with Harleian MS., No. 2054, and the old Lodge at Chester; the latter by John Aubrey, in the curious memorandum to which it will be unnecessary to do more than refer.[4]

One further reference, indeed, to the Freemasons, or rather, to the insignia of the Society, is associated by a later writer with the reign of William and Mary—February 1688-9 to December 1694—and although unconnected with the progressive development or evolution of Ashmolean ideas, which I am endeavouring to chronicle, may perhaps be more conveniently cited at this than at any later period.

Describing the two armouries in the Tower of London as "a noble building to the northward of the White Tower," Entick goes on to say—"It was begun by King James II., and by that prince built to the first floor; but finished by King William, who erected that magnificent room called the New or Small Armoury, in which he, with Queen Mary his consort, dined in great form, having all the warrant workmen[5] and labourers to attend them, dressed in white gloves and aprons, the usual badges of the Order of Freemasonry."[6]

As a revised issue of the "Book of Constitutions" was published in 1756—the year in which the above remarks first appeared—*also* under the editorial supervision of the Rev. John Entick, it would appear to me, either that his materials for the two undertakings became a little mixed up, or that a portion of a sentence intended for one work has been accidentally

[1] Plot, Natural History of Staffordshire, chap. viii., § 67. He also gravely states, that "one John Best, of the parish of Horton, a man 104 years of age, married a woman of 56, who presented him with a son so much like himself, that according to his informant, the god-father of the child, 'nobody doubted but that he was the true father of it'" (*Ibid.*, chap. viii., § 3, p. 269).

[2] Biographical Dictionary, vol. xvi., 1816, p. 65.

[3] The Academie of Armory; or, a Store-house of Armory and Blazon, etc. By Randle Holme, of the City of Chester, Gentleman Sewer in Extraordinary to his late Majesty King Charles 2. And sometime Deputy for the Kings of Arms. Printed for the author, Chester, 1688, fol.

[4] See Chap. XII., *passim*.

[5] This would include all the *master* tradesmen, *e.g.*, the Master Mason and the Master Carpenter. Robert Vertue (who built, in 1501, a chamber in the Tower of London), Robert Jenyns, and John Lobins are called "ye Kings iii Mr Masons," about 1509, when estimating for a tomb for Henry VII. (Wyatt Papworth). In the reign of Henry VII., or in that of his successor, two distinct offices were created: those of Carpenter of the King's Works in England, and of Chief Carpenter in the Tower (Jupp, Historical Account of the Company of Carpenters, p. 166). In the thirty-second year of Henry VIII., the yearly salaries of Thomas Hermiden and John Multon, *Masons;* John Russell and Wm. Clement, *Carpenters;* John Ripley, *Chief Joiner;* and William Cunne, *Plumber*, respectively, "to the King," were in each case £18, 5s., *i.e.*, 1*s.* a day—whilst those of Richard Ambros and Cornelius Johnson, severally, "Master Carpenter" and "Master Builder" *in the Tower*, were only £12, 3s. 4d. (*Ibid.*, p. 169).

[6] W. Maitland, History of London, continued by Entick, 1756, p. 168; and see London and its Environs Described, 1761, vi. 171.

dovetailed with a similar fragment appertaining to the other. However this may be, the readers of this history have the passage before them, and I shall not make any attempt to forecast the judgment which they may be disposed to pass upon it.

A short notice of Ashmole from the pen of Edward Lhwyd was given in Collier's "Historical Dictionary" in 1707,[1] but his connection with the Masonic fraternity was first announced by the publication of his own "Diary" in 1717,[2] from a copy of the original MS. in the Ashmolean Museum, made by Dr Plot, and afterwards collated by David Parry, M.A., both in their time official custodians of the actual "Diary."[3]

In 1719 two posthumous works were published by E. Curll, and edited by Dr Rawlinson, viz., Aubrey's "Natural History and Antiquities of Surrey," and Ashmole's "History and Antiquities of Berkshire." The former, containing the dedication and preface of Aubrey's "Natural History of Wiltshire," and the latter, the account of the Freemasons, which I have already given.[4] Subsequent editions of Ashmole's "Berkshire" appeared in 1723[5] and 1736, to both of which the original preface, or memoir of Ashmole, written by Rawlinson, was prefixed.

By those who, at the present time, have before them the identical materials from which Rawlinson composed his description of our Society—and the most cursory glance at his memoir of Ashmole, will satisfy the mind, that it is wholly based on the antiquary's "Diary," and the notes of John Aubrey—the general accuracy of his statements will not be disputed. Upon his contemporaries, however, they appear to have made no impression whatever, which may, indeed, be altogether due to their having been published anonymously, though even in this case, there will be room for doubt whether the name of Rawlinson would have much recommended them to credit.

Dr Richard Rawlinson, the fourth son of Sir Thomas Rawlinson, Lord Mayor of London in 1706, was born in 1690, educated at St John's College, Oxford, and admitted to the degree of D.C.L. by diploma in 1719.[6] It has been stated on apparently good authority, that he was not only admitted to holy orders, but was also a member of the non-juring episcopate, having been regularly consecrated in 1728.[7]

He evinced an early predilection for literary pursuits, and was employed in an editorial capacity before he had completed his twenty-fifth year. The circumstances, however, as related in the "Athenæ Oxonienses," are far from redounding to his credit.

[1] 2d ed., Supplement, 2d Alphabet, *s.v.*

[2] Memoirs of the Life of Elias Ashmole, Esq., published by Charles Burman, Esq., 1717.

[3] To the preface, which is dated February 1716-7, is appended the signature of *Charles* Burman, said to have been Plot's stepson. As the doctor married a Mrs Burman, whose son *John*, at the decease of his stepfather, became possessed of his MSS. (Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. iv., col. 776), this is likely to have been the case.

[4] *Ante.*, Chap. XII., pp. 5, 17.

[5] London, printed for W. Mears and J. Hooke, 1723; Reading, printed by William Cardan, 1736. Another edition was begun in 1814 by the Rev. Charles Coates, author of "A History of Reading," but not completed. There are two copies of the first edition in the Bodleian Library, with MS. notes—one with those of Dr Rawlinson, the other by E. Rowe Mores (Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. iv., col. 860).

[6] Chalmers, Biog. Dict. Thomas Rawlinson, the eldest son, like his younger brother, was a great collector of books. Addison is said to have intended his character of *Tom Folio* in the "Tatler," No. 158, for him. While he lived in Gray's Inn, he had four chambers so completely filled with books, that it was necessary to remove his bed into the passage. After his death, in 1725, the sale of his manuscripts alone occupied sixteen days (*Ibid.*).

[7] Reliquiæ Hearnianiæ (P. Bliss), 1857, vol. ii., p. 847 (editorial note).

"In 1714, a work called 'Miscellanies on Several Curious Subjects,' was published by E. Curll, and at p. 43 appeared a copy of a letter from Robert Plott, LL.D., design'd to be sent to the Royal Society in London. He has, however, no claim to the authorship. The original letter is now among Dr Rawlinson's collections in the Bodleian,[1] and the fabrication of Plot's name must be ascribed to the Doctor, who was editor, or rather the collector, of Curll's 'Miscellanies.' The latter part of the letter Dr Rawlinson has omitted, and altering the word *son* to *servant*, has compleatly erased the name and substituted the initials R. P." "Why he should have been guilty of so unnecessary a forgery," says Dr Bliss, "is not easy to determine; unless he fancied Plott's name of greater celebrity than the real author, and adopted it accordingly to give credit to his book."[2]

After the preceding example of the manner in which the functions of an editor were discharged by Rawlinson in 1714, the unfavourable verdict passed upon his subsequent compilation of 1719 will excite no surprise.

The following is recorded in the "Diary" of Thomas Hearne:—

"Ap. 18. [1719]. a present hath been made me of a book called the 'Antiquities of Barkshire,' by Elias Ashmole, Esq., London, printed for E. Curll, in Fleet Street, 1719, 8vo, in three volumes. It was given me by my good friend Thomas Rawlinson, Esq. As soon as I opened it, and looked into it, I was amazed at the abominable impudence, ignorance, and carelessness of the publisher,[3] and I can hardly ascribe all this to any one else, than to that villain, Curll. Mr Ashmole is made to have written abundance of things since his death. ∴ ∴ I call it a rhapsody, because there is no method nor judgment observed in it, nor one dram of true learning."[4]

Rawlinson was a zealous Freemason, a grand steward in 1734, and a member about the same time of no less than four lodges,[5] but could not, I think, have joined the Society much before 1730, as none of the memoranda or newspaper cuttings of any importance preserved in his masonic collection at the Bodleian Library bear any earlier date,—that is to say, if I have not overlooked any such entries.[6] His active interest in Freemasonry, if the collection made by him is any criterion, appears to have ceased about 1738. It is hardly possible that he *could* have been a Freemason *before* 1726, as in that year Hearne mentions his return from abroad, after "travelling for several years," also that "he was four years together at Rome."[7]

Rawlinson was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society, July 29, 1714, Martin Folkes and

[1] Miscell. 390.

[2] Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. iv., col. 775.

[3] In an editorial note, Dr Bliss says, "Hearne was little aware that this was his *very good*, and notoriously *honest friend*, Richard Rawlinson." See further, F. Ouvry, Letters to T. Hearne, 1874, No. 39.

[4] Reliquiæ Hearnianiæ, vol. ii., p. 422. For a corroboration of Hearne's opinion, see Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. iv., col. 360.

[5] Viz., Nos. 37, The Sash and Cocoa Tree, Upper Moore Fields; 40, The St Paul's Head, Ludgate Street; 71, The Rose, Cheapside; and 94, The Oxford Arms, Ludgate Street.

[6] This collection was described by the Rev. J. S. Sidebottom of New College, Oxford, in the *Freemasons' Monthly Magazine*, 1855, p. 81, as "a kind of masonic album or common-place book, in which Rawlinson inserted anything that struck him either as useful or particularly amusing. It is partly in manuscript, partly in print, and comprises some ancient masonic charges, constitutions, forms of summons, a list of all the lodges of his time under the Grand Lodge of England, together with some extracts from the *Grub Street Journal*, the *General Evening Post*, and other Journals of the day. The date ranges from 1724 to 1740." As stated above, I found, myself, nothing worth recording either before 1730, or after 1738.

[7] Reliquiæ Hearnianiæ, vol. ii., p. 594.

Dr Desaguliers being chosen Members on the same day. He became a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, May 10, 1727.

His death occurred at Islington, April 5, 1755. By his will, dated June 2, 1752, he desired that at his burial in the chapel, commonly called Dr Bayly's Chapel, in St John's College, Oxford, his pall might be supported by six of the senior fellows of the said college, "to each of whom I give," so the words run, "one guinea, which will be of more use to them than the usual dismal accoutrements at present in use."

A large number of valuable MSS. he ordered to be safely locked up, and not to be opened until seven years after his decease,—a precaution, in the opinion of Dr Taylor, taken by the testator, "to prevent the right owners recovering their own," but this insinuation is without foundation, as the papers, the publication of which the Doctor wished delayed, were his collections for a continuation of the "Athenæ Oxonienses," with Hearne's "Diaries," and two other MSS.[1]

There are several codicils to the will, and the second, dated June 25, 1754, was attested, amongst others, by J. Ames,[2] presumably Joseph Ames, author of "Typographical Antiquities," 1749, and one of the editors of the "Parentalia."

Rawlinson's Library of printed books and books of prints was sold by auction in 1756; the sale lasted 50 days, and produced £1164. There was a second sale of upwards of 20,000 pamphlets, which lasted 10 days, and this was followed by a sale of the single prints, books of prints, and drawings, which lasted 8 days.[3]

Ashmole's connection with the Society is not alluded to in the "Constitutions" of 1723, but in the subsequent edition of 1738, Dr Anderson, drawing his own inferences from the actual entries in the "Diary," transmutes them into facts, by amending the expressions of the diarist, and making them read—prefaced by the words, "Thus Elias Ashmole in his 'Diary,' page 15, *says*,"—"I was made a Free Mason at Warrington, Lancashire, with Colonel Henry Manwaring, *by* Mr Richard Penket the Warden, and the *Fellow Crafts* (there mention'd) on 16 Oct. 1646."[4]

The later entry of 1682 was both garbled and certified in a similar manner, though, except in the statement that Sir Thomas Wise and the seven other Fellows, present, besides Ashmole at the reception of the New-Accepted Masons were "old Free Masons,"[5] there is nothing that absolutely conflicts with the actual words in the "Diary."

We next come to the memoir of Ashmole in the "Biographia Britannica," published in 1747, upon which I have already drawn at some length in the preceding chapter.

According to his biographer, Dr Campbell, "on the sixteenth of October 1646, he [Ashmole] was elected a brother of the ancient and honourable Society of Free and Accepted Masons, which he looked upon as a very distinguishing character, and has therefore given us a very particular account of the lodge established at Warrington in Lancashire; and in some of his manuscripts there are very valuable collections relating to the history of the Free Masons."

The subject is then continued in a copious footnote, which is itself still further elucidated, after the manner of those times, by a number of subsidiary references, and to these I shall in

[1] Chalmers, Biog. Dict., vol. xxvi., 1816, *s.v.* Rawlinson.

[2] The Deed of Trust and Will of Richard Rawlinson, 1755, pp. 1, 22.

[3] Chalmers, *loc. cit.*

[4] Constitutions, 1738, p. 100.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 102.

every case append the letter C., in order that my own observations and those of Dr Campbell may be distinguishable. The note thus takes up the thread :—

"He [Ashmole] made very large collections on almost all points relating to English history, of which some large volumes are remaining at Oxford, but much more was consumed in the fire at the Temple,[1] which will be hereafter mentioned. What is hinted above, is taken from a book of letters, communicated to the author of this life by Dr Knipe,[2] of Christ-church, in one of which is the following passage relating to this subject. 'As to the Ancient society of Free-Masons, concerning whom you are desirous of knowing what may be known with certainty, I shall only tell you, that if our worthy brother, E. Ashmole, Esq; had executed his intended design, our fraternity had been as much obliged to him as the brethren of the most noble Order of the Garter.[3] I would not have you surprized at this expression, or think it at all too assuming. The Soveraigns of that order have not disdained our fellowship, and there have been times when Emperors[4] were also Free-Masons. What from Mr E. Ashmole's collection I could gather, was, that the report of our society's taking rise from a Bull granted by the Pope, in the reign of Henry III., to some Italian Architects, to travel over all Europe, to erect chapels, was ill-founded.[5] Such a Bull there was, and those Architects were Masons; but this Bull in the opinion of the learned Mr Ashmole, was confirmative only, and did not by any means create our fraternity, or even establish them in this kingdom.[6] But as to the time and manner of that establishment, something I shall relate from the same collections. St Alban, the Proto-Martyr of England, established Masonry here, and from his time it flourished more or less, according as the world went, down to the days of King Athelstane, who, for the sake of his brother Edwin, granted the Masons a charter, tho' afterwards growing jealous of his brother, it is said he caused him together with his Page, to be put into a boat and committed to the sea, where they perished.[7] It is likely that Masons were affected by his fall, and

[1] Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. ii., col. 888.—C. "1679. Jan. 26.—The fire in the Temple burned my library" (Diary).

[2] It has not yet been satisfactorily determined who *this* Dr Knipe was; and perhaps the present note, if it passes under the eye of any Oxford reader interested in Masonic research, may lead to the realisation of how much good work may yet be done in the way of fully examining the Ashmole MSS. *Cf.* Freemasons' Magazine, January to June 1863, pp. 146, 209, 227.

[3] The design, here attributed to Ashmole, of writing a History of Freemasonry, rests entirely upon the authority of Dr Knipe. It is difficult to believe that such a positive statement could have been a pure invention on his part; and yet, on the other hand, it is lacking in all the elements of credibility.

[4] This statement takes us outside the British Isles, and may either point to an embodiment of the popular belief, such as I have ventured to indicate in Chap. XII., pp. 29, 33, respecting the origin of the Society; or—in the opinion of those who cherish a theory the more ardently because it involves an absolute surrender of all private judgment—it may tend, not only to establish, but to crown the view of Masonic history associated with the Steinmetzen, by implying that the imperial confirmations of their ordinances must be taken as proof of the admission of the German emperors into the Stonemasons' Fraternity!

[5] History of Masonry, p. 3.—C. See *ante*, Chap. XII., pp. 16-18. It should be borne in mind that in 1747, when Dr Knipe wrote the letters from which an extract is professedly given, Rawlinson was only in his fifty-eighth year. The "Republic of Letters" was then a very small one. It is unlikely that the memoir of Ashmole given in the "Biographia Britannica" was prepared without assistance from members of the Royal Society; and in that portion of it dealing with his admission into Freemasonry, it seems especially probable that we should find the traces of information supplied by some of the Fellows of that learned body who were also Freemasons. Rawlinson, then, we may usefully bear in mind, was at once an F.R.S., a prominent Freemason, and a distinguished man of letters.

[6] *Vide* Chap. XII., p. 31.

[7] Ex Rotulo membranaceo penes Cementariorum Societatem.—C. This is evidently copied from a similar note by Dr Plot (*ante*, p. 164).

suffered for some time, but afterwards their credit revived, and we find under our Norman Princes, that they frequently received extraordinary marks of royal favour. There is no doubt to be made, that the skill of Masons, which was always transcendent, even in the most barbarous times, their wonderful kindness and attachment to each other, how different soever in condition, and their inviolable fidelity in keeping religiously their secret, must expose them in ignorant, troublesome, and suspicious times, to a vast variety of adventures, according to the different fate of parties, and other alterations in government. By the way, I shall note, that the Masons were always loyal, which exposed them to great severities when power wore the trappings of justice, and those who committed treason, punished true men as traitors. Thus in the third year of the reign of Henry VI, an Act of Parliament passed to abolish the society of masons,[1] and to hinder, under grievous penalties, the holding chapters, lodges, or other regular assemblies. Yet this act was afterwards repealed, and even before that King Henry VI, and several of the principal Lords of his court became fellows of the craft.[2] Under the succeeding troublesome times, the Free-Masons thro' this kingdom became generally Yorkists, which, as it procured them eminent favour from Edward IV, so the wise Henry VII, thought it better by shewing himself a great lover of Masons to obtrude numbers of his friends on that worthy fraternity, so as never to want spies enough in their lodges, than to create himself enemies, as some of his predecessors had done by an ill-timed persecution.[3] As this society has been so very ancient, as to rise almost beyond the reach of records, there is no wonder that a mixture of fable is found in it's history, and methinks it had been better, if a late insidious writer[4] had spent his time in clearing up the story of St Alban, or the death of Prince Edwin, either of which would have found him sufficient employment, than as he has done in degrading a society with whose foundation and transactions, he is visibly so very little acquainted,[5] and with whose history and conduct Mr Ashmole, who understood them so much better, was perfectly satisfied, &c."[6]

"I shall add to this letter" (writes Campbell), "as a proof, of it's author's being exactly right as to Mr Ashmole, a small note from his diary, which shews his attention to this society, long after his admission, when he had time to weigh, examine, and know the Masons secret."[7]

Dr Campbell then proceeds to give the entries, dated the 10th and 11th of March 1682, relating the meeting at Masons' Hall, only through interpolating the word "by" before the name of Sir William Wilson—an error into which subsequent copyists have been beguiled—he rather leaves an impression upon the mind, that the "new-accepted masons" were parties to their own reception, in a sense never contemplated by Elias Ashmole.

The Rev. S. R. Maitland says, "I do not know whether there ever was a time when readers looked out the passages referred to, or attended to the writer's request that they would 'see,' 'compare,' etc. such-and-such things, which, for brevity's sake, he would not transcribe: but if readers ever did this, I am morally certain that they have long since ceased to do it."[8] Concurring in this view, I have quoted the passage above, and also those from Dr Plot's work, at length; as, believing their right comprehension by my readers to be essential, I dare

[1] Fred. Pulton's Collect. of Statutes, 3 Hen. VI, chap. i.—C.
[2] History of Masonry, p. 29.—C.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 19.—C. The three allusions by Dr Campbell to a "History of Masonry" will be presently examined.
[4] Dr Plot.
[5] Plot's Nat. History of Staffordshire, pp. 316, 317, 318.—C.
[6] Dr W. to Sir D. N., June 9, 1687.—C.
[7] Diary, p. 66.—C.
[8] The Dark Ages, 1844, p. 36.

not content myself with referring even to such well-known books—to be met with in the generality of public libraries—as the "Biographia Britannica" and the "Natural History of Staffordshire."

It is not my intention to dwell at any length upon the discrepancies which exist between the several versions of Ashmole's connection with the Society. Still, when extracts professedly made from the actual "Diary" are given to the world in a garbled or inaccurate form, through the medium of such works of authority as the "Book of Constitutions" and the "Biographia Britannica," a few words of caution may not be out of place against the reception as evidence of colourable *excerpta* from the Ashmolean MSS., whether published by Dr Anderson—under the sanction of the Grand Lodge—in 1738, or by Findel and Fort, in 1862 and 1876 respectively. It has been well observed, that "if such licence be indulged to critics, that they may expunge or alter the words of an historian, because he is the sole relater of a particular event, we shall leave few materials for authentic history."[1] The contemporary writers to whom I last referred have severally reproduced, and still further popularised, the misleading transcripts of Doctors Anderson and Campbell. The former by copying from the "Constitutions" of 1738—though the authority he *quotes* is that of Ashmole himself[2]—and the latter[3] by relying apparently on the second edition of the "Diary," published in 1774, which adopts the interpolation of Dr Campbell, changes "*were*" into "*was*," and makes Ashmole, after reciting his summons to the Lodge at Masons' Hall on March 10, 1682, go on to state:—

"[March] 11. Accordingly I went, and about noon *was* admitted into the fellowship of Free-Masons, *by* Sir William Wilson, Knight, Captain Richard Borthwick, Mr William Wodman, Mr William Grey, Mr Samuel Taylour, and Mr William Wise."[4]

The preceding extract presents such a distorted view of the real facts—as related by Ashmole—that I give it without curtailment. Compared with the actual entry as shown at p. 143, and overlooking minor discrepancies,[5] it will be seen, that the oldest Freemason present at the meeting is made to declare, that he was "admitted into the fellowship" by the candidates for reception. Yet this monstrous inversion of the ordinary method of procedure at the admission of guild-brethren—which, as a travesty of Masonic usage and

[1] "Quod si hæc licentia daretur arti criticæ, ut si quæ in aliquo scriptore facta legimus commemorata, quæ ab aliis silentio involvantur, illa statim expungenda, aut per contortam emendationem in contrarium plane sensum forent convertenda, nihil fere certum aut constans in historicorum scriptorum commentariis reperiretur" (Professor Breitinger, Zurich, to Edward Gibbon, Lausanne: Gibbon's Miscellaneous Works, edited by Lord Sheffield, 1814, vol. i., p. 479).

[2] "In Ashmole's 'Diary' we find the following," etc. (Findel, History of Freemasonry, 2d English edit., 1869, p. 113*n*).

[3] From Fort's description, it might be inferred that Ashmole was "admitted into the fellowship by Sir William Wilson, Knt.," *solus*, as he cites no other names (History and Antiquities of Freemasonry, p. 137).

[4] The edition of Ashmole's "Diary," from which the above is extracted, was published, together with the life of William Lilly, the astrologer, in 1774. Lilly's autobiography (of which the latter was a reprint) first appeared in 1715, a memorandum on the fly-leaf stating—"The Notes at the Bottom of the Page, and the continuation to the time of his death, were the Performance of his good Friend Mr Ashmole." At p. 43, a footnote, explanatory of the text, is followed by the letters D. N., which is, so far, the only clue I have obtained towards the identification of the "Sir D. N." referred to by Dr Knipe.

[5] *E.g.* The Christian names of Borthwick, Woodman, and Grey, though shortened by Ashmole to Rich., Will., and Wm., respectively, are fully set out in the publication of 1774. This process, however, is reversed in the cases of Will. Wo*o*dman and Samue*l* Taylour, so styled by the antiquary—the former becoming Wodman, and the latter losing the final *l* of his Christian name in the reprint.

ceremonial, is without a parallel—has been quietly passed over, and, in fact, endorsed, by commentators of learning and ability, by whose successive transcriptions of a statement originally incorrect, the original error has been increased, as a stone set rolling down hill accelerates its velocity.[1]

It has been observed by De Quincey, that "the labourers of the mine, or those who dig up the metal of truth, are seldom fitted to be also labourers of the mint—that is, to work up the metal for current use." Of this aphorism, as it seems to me, Dr Knipe—whose diligence and good faith I do not impeach—affords a conspicuous illustration. The paucity and inaccuracy of Ashmole's biographers leave much to be desired. It is, therefore, the more to be regretted, that the solitary "witness of history," whose contribution towards his memoir was based on original documents, notably the "collection" of papers, or materials for a contemplated work on Freemasonry, should have been unequal to the task of summarising with greater minuteness, the conclusions of the eminent man whom he describes as "our worthy brother," and by citing references that have now escaped us, have so far widened the area over which research can be profitably directed, as to carry us back to a period at least as far removed from Ashmole's time as the latter is from our own.

In his communication to the writer of Ashmole's life, Dr Knipe ignored the distinction which should always exist between the historian, properly so called, and the contributor or purveyor to history. "Those who supply the historian with facts must leave much of the discrimination to him, and must be copious, as well as accurate, in their information."[2] From the facts collected and arranged by antiquaries, the history of past ages is in a great measure composed. The services of this class of writers are invaluable to the historian, and he frequently applies and turns to account, in a manner which they never contemplated, facts which their diligence has brought to light.[3]

It has been well remarked that "we admire the strange enthusiast, who, braving the lethargic atmosphere of the Academic library, ventures in, and draws forth the precious manuscript from the stagnant pools, whose silent waters engulph the untouched treasures collected by Bodley or Laud, Junius or Rawlinson, Gale or Moor or Parker: yet fully as new and important is the information obtained from the trite, well known, and familiar authorities, which have only waited for the Interrogator, asking them to make the disclosure."[4]

If, then, either from a want of capacity on the part of Dr Knipe, or from the absence of the critical faculty in Dr Campbell, the memoir of Ashmole in the "Biographia Britannica" must be pronounced a very inferior piece of workmanship: let us, however, see whether, whilst anything like a *prècis* of his real views is withheld from our know-

[1] *Cf.* Lewis, On the Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics, vol. i., p. 227.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. i., p. 295. "It is useful to observe on a large scale, and to collect much authentic material, which will afterwards undergo the winnowing process" (*Ibid.*).

[3] "It is difficult to draw the line between those facts which are important, and those which are unimportant to the historian. A power of seizing remote analogies, and of judging by slight though sure indications, may extract a meaning from a fact which, to an ordinary sight, seems wholly insignificant" (Lewis, *loc. cit.*).

[4] Sir F. Palgrave, History of Normandy and of England, vol. i., 1851, p. 18; *Cf.* Guizot, Hist. de la Civilisation en France, 27ième leçon, p. 63. "Facts pregnant with most signal truths have, until our own times, continued uninvestigated and unimproved; though plain and patent, presented to every reader, fruitlessly forcing themselves upon our notice, against which historians were previously constantly hitting their feet, and as constantly spurning out of their path" (Palgrave, *loc. cit.*).

ledge, we can extract any information from the references to authorities which, however trite and familiar in the estimation of the two doctors, now derive what vitality they may possess from the circumstance of filling up a casual footnote in a work of such high reputation.

Among the references given by Dr Knipe, there are two upon which I shall slightly enlarge. The first is to a "History of Masonry," the second a letter or communication from "Dr W. to Sir D. N., June 9, 1687." Taking these in their order—what is this "History of Masonry," to which allusion was made in 1747? It is something quite distinct from the histories given in the Constitutions of 1723 or 1738, and in the "Pocket Companions." The pagination, moreover, indicated in the notes—viz., 3, 19, and 29—not only shows that in the work cited, more space was devoted to the account of *English* Masonry in the Middle Ages than we find in any publication of even date, with which it is possible to collate these references, but by resting the allusion to the Papal Bulls on the authority of page 3, materially increases the difficulties of identification. Dr Anderson fills sixty pages of his "Book of Constitutions"[1] before he names the first Grand Master or Patron of the Freemasons of England, and not until page 69 of that work do we reach Henry III., in connection, moreover, with which king there appears (in the "Constitutions" referred to) no mention of the Bulls.[2] The "Pocket Companions" were successively based on the Constitutions of 1723 and 1738, and no separate and independent "History of Masonry" was published, so far as I am aware, before the appearance of "Multa Paucis"[3] in 1763-4. It is true that in the inventory of books belonging to the Lodge of Relief, Bury, Lancashire—present No. 42—in 1756, we find, "History of Masonry (Price 3s.);"[4] but, as suggested by Hughan—and mentioned by the compiler in a note—this was probably Scott's "Pocket Companion" and "History of Masonry" 1754.

One of the further references by Dr Knipe to the work under consideration, is given as his authority for the statement, that Henry VII. used the Freemasons as spies—an item of Masonic history not to be found in any publication of the craft with which I am acquainted. A friend has suggested, that the "History" referred to, may have been that of Ashmole himself in its incomplete state. This, however, forcibly recalls the story of the relic exhibited as Balaam's sword, and the explanation of the *cicerone*, when it was objected that the prophet had no sword, but only wished for one, that it was the identical weapon he wished he had!

One expression, indeed, in the Memoir—"Book of Letters"—lets in a possible, though not, in my judgment, a probable, solution of the difficulty. The "*Book* of Letters, communicated by Dr Knipe" to the author of the life, *may* have been a bound or stitched volume of correspondence, paged throughout for facility of reference, and labelled "History of Masonry" by the sender. If this supposition is entertainable, it may be also assumed that the several letters would be arranged in due chronological order—a view of the case which is not only consistent with, but also to some extent supported by, the variation of method adopted by Dr Campbell in citing the authority for Ashmole's alleged dissent from the conclusions of Dr Plot, as a letter from Dr W. to Sir D. N., under a given date. As militating, however, against this hypothesis,

[1] Ed. 1738.

[2] Neither Henry III. nor the Papal Bulls are mentioned in the Constitutions of 1723.

[3] Chap. XII., p. 37.

[4] E. A. Evans, History of the Lodge of Relief, No. 42, p. 24. The "History of Freemasonry" is unfortunately no longer in the possession of the lodge.

it has been shewn that whilst Dr Campbell's references to the "History of Masonry" range from page 3 to page 29 of that work or volume, the entire subject-matter which their authority covers, is contained within the limits of a single letter—a letter, moreover, plainly replying to such questions as we may imagine the compiler of the memoir would have addressed to some Oxford correspondent, and which is only reconcilable with any other view of the facts by assuming that two other persons of *lost identity*—but the result of whose labours has happily been preserved—severally *preceded* Campbell and Knipe in the collection and preparation of materials for a similar biography of Ashmole.[1]

The letter or communication, which is made the authority for Ashmole having expressed disapproval of the statements in Plot's "Natural History of Staffordshire," is equally enigmatical, and I have quite failed to identify either the Dr W. or the Sir D. N., cited as the writer and recipient respectively of that document. Doctors Wilkins, Wharton, and Wren were all on friendly terms with Ashmole; but Wilkins died in 1672, Wharton in 1677, and Dr, became Sir Christopher Wren in 1674. The only trace of Sir D. N. I can find occurs, as previously stated,[2] in a note to Lilly's autobiography, which, as *all* the notes were professedly written by Ashmole, though not printed until after his death (1715), may point to the identity of what in these days would be termed his literary executor, with the individual to whom was addressed the letter of June 9, 1687.

The solution of these two puzzles I leave, however, to those students of our antiquities who, diverging from the high road, are content to patiently explore the by-paths of Masonic history, where, indeed, even should they find in this particular instance nothing to reward their research, their labours cannot fail to swell the aggregate of materials, upon which the conclusions of future historians may be as safely founded, as I shall venture to hope they will be gratefully recorded.

With the exceptions of the allusion to "the wise Henry VII.," the statement that Ashmole contemplated writing a History of the Craft, and the so-called "opinion" of the antiquary respecting the Papal Bull granted in the reign of Henry III., there is nothing in the memoir which we cannot trace in publications of earlier date. A great part of it is evidently based on Rawlinson's preface to the "Antiquities of Berkshire,"[3] of which the words, "Kings themselves have not disdain'd to enter themselves into this Society," are closely paraphrased by Dr Knipe, though the term "Emperors"—unless a free rendering of "Kings"—I take to be the coinage of his own brain. The view expressed with regard to the introduction of Freemasonry into England, is apparently copied from the Constitutions of 1738; whilst the allusions to Henry VI. and Edward IV.[4] are evidently based on the earlier or original edition of the same work.

[1] The *second* edition of the "Biographia Britannica," vol. i., 1778, contained a reprint of the article "*Ashmole*;" and as readers generally consult a work of reference *in its latest form*, the allusion to a "History of Masonry" in 1778, when not only "Multa Paucis" (*ante*, p. 37), but also several editions of Preston's "Illustrations," were in general circulation, would be devoid of the significance attaching to a like reference in the edition of 1747. Plot's *parchment volum*, or *History* of the *craft*, and Knipe's "History of Masonry," each allude to Hen. VI., but differ as to the origin of the Society. The words, moreover, "*ex rotulo membranaceo*," etc., are used by the *latter* doctor to describe something quite distinct from the "History."

[2] *Ante*, p. 173, note 4.

[3] *Ante*, Chap. XII., p. 17.

[4] In the Constitutions of 1738, p. 75, we read:—"A Record in the Reign of Edw. IV. says, the *Company of* Masons, *being otherwise termed* Free Masons, *of Auntient Staunding and good Reckoning, by means of affable, and kind Meetings*

To what extent, it may now be asked, does this memoir of Ashmole by Dr Campbell add to the stock of knowledge respecting the former's connection with our Society, and the conditions under which Freemasonry either flourished, or was kept alive during the first half of the seventeenth century? I am afraid very little. It generally happens that different portions of a mythico-historical period[1] are very unequally illuminated. The earlier parts of it will approximate to the darkness of the mythical age, while the later years will be distinguished from a period of contemporary history by the meagreness, rather than by the uncertainty of the events.[2] This is precisely what we find exemplified by the annals of the Craft, of which those most remote in date, are based to a great extent upon legendary materials, whilst later ones—extending over an epoch commencing with early Scottish Masonry in the sixteenth century, and ending with the formation of an English Grand Lodge in 1717—though closing what in a restricted sense I have ventured to describe as the pre-historic or mythico-historical period,[3] really deal with events which come within the light of history, although many of the surrounding circumstances are still enveloped in the most extreme darkness.

If, indeed, the extent to which Masonic archæology has been a loser, through the non-publication of Ashmole's contemplated work, can be estimated with any approach to accuracy, by a critical appraisement of the fragment given in his memoir—the worthlessness of the latter, regarded from an historical point of view, may well leave us in doubt, whether, except as to circumstances respecting which he could testify as an eye or ear witness, the history designed by "our worthy brother," would have fulfilled any other purpose, than reducing to more exact demonstration the learned credulity of the writer.

If Ashmole really expressed the *opinion* which has been ascribed to him, with regard to the Papal Bull in Henry III.'s time being *confirmative* only, and *if* the "collection" dipped into by Dr Knipe gave chapter and verse for the statement, the exhumation of the lost Ashmolean documents would seem a thing very greatly to be desired.

Yet, on the other hand, it is quite possible that if we could trace opinions to their actual sources, and assuming Ashmole to have really expressed the belief which has been ascribed to him, it might be found to repose upon no more substantial foundation, than the reveries of those philosophers who, to use the words of the elder Disraeli, "have too often flung over the gaping chasms, which they cannot fill up, the slight plank of a vague conjecture, or have

dyverse tymes, and as a loving Brotherhood use to do, did frequent this mutual Assembly in the tyme of Henry VI., in the twelfth year of his Most Gracious Reign, viz., A.D. 1434, when Henry was aged thirteen years." Dr Anderson's *authority* for this statement is probably the following:—"The Company of *Masons*, being otherwise termed *Free-masons*, of ancient standing and good reckoning, by meanes of affable and kinde meetings divers times, and as a loving Brotherhood should use to doe, did frequent this mutuall assembly in the time of King Henry the fourth, in the twelfth yeere of his most gracious Reigne" (Stow, The Survey of London, 1633, p. 630. In the earlier editions of 1603 and 1618, the compiler observes of the London Guild of Masons,—"but of what antiquitie that Company is, I haue not read"). *Cf. ante*, pp. 144, 149, 158.

[1] *I.e.*, The transition period between fable and contemporary history. Niebuhr observes:—"Between the completely poetical age, which stands in a relation to history altogether irrational, and the purely historical age, there intervenes in all nations a mixed age, which may be called the mythic-historical" (History of Rome, 3d edit., translated by Archdeacon Hare and Bishop Thirlwall, 1837, vol. i., p. 209).

[2] *Cf.* Lord Bacon, De Sapientia Veterum, præf. (Works, edit. Montagu, 1825, vol. xi., p. 271); and Lewis, On the Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics, vol. i., p. 282.

[3] Chaps. I. and XII., p. 2.

constructed the temporary bridge of an artificial hypothesis: and thus they have hazarded what yields no sure footing."[1]

Having, however, sufficiently placed on record my belief, that the seed of the tradition or fable of the Bulls, is contained in the early history of the Friars,[2] I shall not waste time over a minute dissection of possible causes which may have influenced the judgment of Elias Ashmole. *Ex pede Herculem.* From the fragment before them, I shall leave my readers to form their own conclusions with regard to the measure of indebtedness, under which we should have been placed by Dr Knipe, had his labours resulted in presenting us with the entire history, *executed* as well as *designed* by the eminent antiquary, of whose collection of papers, or materials for a work on Freemasonry, we, alas, know nothing beyond what may be gleaned from the scraps of information which have found their way into the pages of the "Biographia Britannica."

Having duly considered the actual testimony of the antiquary, as well as the opinions which have been somewhat loosely attributed to him, let us proceed to another part of our subject. I am in doubt whether to call it the next, for in examining seventeenth century Masonry as a whole, the parts are so connected, and so intimately dependent on each other, that it is not only impossible to separate them completely, but extremely difficult to decide in what order they should be taken.

First of all, however, it may be necessary to explain, that in deferring until a later stage, the general observations which have yet to be made, on the character of the Freemasonry into which Ashmole was admitted, I am desirous of placing before my readers all the evidence which may tend, either directly or even remotely, to clear away a portion of the obscurity still surrounding this early period of Masonic history.

Although the only contemporary writer (in addition to those already named), by whom either the Freemasons or their art, are mentioned in the last quarter of the seventeenth century, is Randle Holme[3]—yet the existence of several metropolitan lodges at this period was *subsequently* affirmed by Dr Anderson, who, in his summary of Masonic history, *temp.* William and Mary, states:—"Particular *Lodges* were not so frequent and mostly *occasional* in the *South*, except in or near the Places where great Works are carried on. Thus Sir *Robert Clayton* got an *occasional* Lodge of his Brother *Masters* to meet at St *Thomas's Hospital, Southwark*, A.D. 1693, and to advise the Governours about the best Design of rebuilding that Hospital as it now stands most beautiful; near which a *stated* Lodge continued long afterwards."

[1] Disraeli, Amenities of Literature, 1841, vol. iii., p. 360.

[2] Chap. XII., pp. 32, 33. It is possible, that in the opinion of some persons, the story of the Bulls will seem to have no ground or origin, as the authorities afford no explanation of the way by which it came into existence. However this may be, its pedigree, if it has one, must, in my judgment, be sought for outside the genuine traditions of the Society. Tradition will not supply the place of history. At best, it is untrustworthy and short-lived. Thus in 1770 the New Zealanders had no recollection of Tasman's visit. Yet this took place in 1643, less than one hundred and thirty years before, and must have been to them an event of the greatest possible importance and interest. In the same way the North American Indians soon lost all tradition of De Soto's expedition, although by its striking incidents it was so well suited to impress the Indian mind. *Cf.* Sir J. Lubbock, Pre-historic Times, 4th edit., p. 294; Dr J. Hawkesworth, Voyages of Discovery in the Southern Hemisphere, 1773, vol. ii., p. 388; and H. R. Schoolcraft, History of the Indian Tribes of the United States, 1853-1856, vol. ii., p. 12.

[3] *Ante*, p. 167.

"Besides that and the *old* Lodge of St *Paul's*, there was another in *Piccadilly* over against St *James's* Church, one near *Westminster* Abby, another near *Covent-Garden*, one in *Holborn*, one on *Tower-Hill*, and some more that assembled statedly."[1]

The value, however, of the preceding passages from the "Book of Constitutions," is seriously impaired by the paragraph which next follows them, wherein Anderson says—"The *King* was privately made a *Free Mason*, approved of their Choice of G. *Master* WREN, and encourag'd him in rearing St *Paul's Cathedral*, and the great *New* Part of Hampton-Court in the *Augustan Stile*, by far the finest *Royal* House in *England*, after an old Design of *Inigo Jones*, where a bright *Lodge* was held during the Building."[2]

A distinction is here drawn between *occasional* and *stated* lodges, but the last quotation, beyond indicating a possible derivation of the now almost obsolete expression, "bright Mason," is only of importance because the inaccuracies with which it teems render it difficult, not to say impossible, to yield full credence to any other statements, unsupported by no better source of authority.

Evelyn,[3] it may be incidentally observed, and also Ashmole[4] himself, were governors of St Thomas's Hospital, but in neither of their diaries, is there any allusion from which it might be inferred, that the practice of holding lodges there, was known to either of these persons. Ashmole's death, however, in the year preceding that in which Sir Robert Clayton is said to have assembled his Lodge, deprives the incident of an importance that might otherwise have attached to it, very much after the fashion of the precedent, afforded by the decease of Sir Robert Moray prior to the Masonic meeting of 1682, from which his absence, had he been alive, equally with his attendance, would have been alike suggestive of some curious speculation.[5]

We now come to the evidence, direct and indirect, which is associated with the name of Randle Holme, author of the celebrated "Academie of Armory," which has already been briefly referred to. The *third* Randle Holme, like his father and grandfather before him, was a herald and deputy to the Garter King of Arms, for Cheshire, Lancashire, Shropshire, and North Wales. He was born December 24, 1627, and died March 12, 1699-1700. In the "Academie of Armory," which I shall presently cite, are several allusions to the Freemasons. These, even standing alone, would be of great importance, as embodying certain remarks of a non-operative Freemason, A.D. 1688, in regard to the Society. For a simple reference, therefore, to this source of information, which had so far eluded previous research, as to be unnoticed by Masonic writers, Rylands would deserve the best thanks of his brother archæologists. But he has done far more than this, and in two interesting papers, communicated to the *Masonic Magazine*,[6] which conclude a series of articles, entitled, "Freemasonry in the Seventeenth

[1] Constitutions, 1738, pp. 106, 107. In the spelling, as well as in the use of capitals and italics, the original is closely followed.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 107. [3] Diary, Sept. 5, 1687.

[4] "1684—March 5.—11 *Hor. ante merid.* A green staff was sent me by the Steward of St Thomas's Hospital, with a signification that I was chosen one of the governors" (Ashmole, Diary).

[5] *Ante*, p. 98.

[6] See W. H. Rylands, Freemasonry in the Seventeenth Century, Chester, 1650-1700 (Masonic Magazine, January and February 1882). In this sketch, as well as in his notes on the Warrington meeting, A.D. 1646 (*ante*, p. 141, note 3), to which it is a sequel, the indefatigable research of the writer has been happily aided "by a species of fox-hound instinct, enabling him to scent out that game which, unearthed by previous sportsmen," still lurks in or between the

Century," we are presented with a more vivid picture of Masonic life, at a period distant some two centuries from our own, than has hitherto been limned by any artist of the craft. This has been accomplished, by research in the library of the British Museum, by piecing together all the items of information relating to the general subject lying ready to his hand, by instituting a careful search among the wills in the Chester Court of Probate, and lastly, by adding a facsimile of the material portions of an important manuscript, showing their original state in a manner which could never have been effected by printing types.[1]

Randle Holme is the central figure, around which a great deal is made to revolve; and it will become a part of our task to examine his testimony, of which, some more than the rest, may be said to be undesignedly commemorative of former usages—in the threefold capacity of text-writer, Freemason of the Lodge, and transcriber of the "Old Charges." In the two latter, he supplies evidence which carries us into the penultimate stage of our present inquiry, viz., the examination of our manuscript Constitutions, and of the waifs and strays in the form of Lodge records, from which alone it is at all possible to further illuminate the especially dark portion of our annals, immediately preceding the dawn of accredited history, wherein we may be said to pass gradually from a faint glimmer into nearly perfect light.

Reserving, therefore, for its proper place an explanation of the grounds upon which I deem the evidence of the "Old Charges" to form an essential preliminary to our passing a final judgment upon the scope and character of Freemasonry in the seventeenth century, I shall proceed to deal with Randle Holme, and the various circumstances which concur in rendering him so material a witness at the bar of Masonic history.

The following is from the "Academie of Armory:"—

"A Fraternity, or Society,[2] or Brotherhood, or Company; are such in a corporation, that are of one and the same trade, or occupation, who being joyned together by oath and covenant, do follow such orders and rules, as are made, or to be made for the good order, rule, and support of such and every of their occupations. These several Fraternities are generally governed by one or two Masters, and two Wardens, but most Companies with us by two Aldermen, and two Stewards, the later, being to receive and pay what concerns them."[3]

On page 111, in his review of the various trades, occurs: "Terms of Art used by Free Masons-Stone Cutters;" and then follows: "There are several other terms used by the Free-Masons which belong to buildings, Pillars and Columbs."

Next are described the "Terms of Art used by Free-Masons;" and at page 393,[4] under the heading of "Masons Tools," Randle Holme thus expresses himself: "I cannot but Honor the Felloship of the Masons because of its Antiquity; and the more, *as being a Member of*

close covers of parish registers. Both essays merit a careful perusal, and in limiting my quotations from them, I reluctantly acquiesce in the *dictum* of Daunou, that minute antiquarian discussions ought to be separated from actual history (Cours d'Études Historiques, 1842-47, tom. vii., p. 560).

[1] In cases of this kind, facsimiles of manuscripts are much more than mere specimens of palæography; they are essential elements for the critical knowledge of history. *Cf.* Palgrave, History of Normandy and England, vol. i., p. 749.

[2] The manner in which Randle Holme employs these terms, in 1688, may be usefully borne in mind when the passage is reached relating to his own membership of the *Society*. *Cf.* Chap. II., p. 68 (23); and Chap. XIV., p. 149.

[3] Bk. III., chap. iii., p. 61.

[4] *Ibid.*, chap. ix.

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." [1]

Later he speaks of "Free Masons" and "Free Masonry" tools; and, in his description of the "Use of Pillars," observes: "For it is ever a term amongst Work-men of the Free Masons Science, to put a difference between that which is called a *Column*, and that which they term a *Pillar*, for a *Column* is ever round, and the Capital and Pedestal answerable thereunto." [2] He continues: "Now for the better understanding of all the parts of a *Pillar*, or *Columb*, ∴ I shall in two examples, set forth all their words of Art, used about them; by which any Gentleman may be able to discourse a Free-Mason or other workman in his own terms." [3]

In Harleian MS. 5955, are a number of engraved plates, intended for the second volume of the "Academie of Armory," which was not completed. On one of these is the annexed curious representation of the arms of the Masons, or ffree Masons.

"The arms of this body," says Rylands, "have been often changed, and seem to be enveloped in considerable mystery in some of its forms." In the opinion of the same authority, the form given by Randle Holme is the first and only instance of the two columns being attached to the arms as supporters. "It is also worthy of remark," adds Rylands, "that he figures the chevron plain, and not engrailed as in the original grant to the Masons' Company of London. The towers are single, as in his description, and not the old square four-towered castles. The colours are the same as those in the original grant to the Company of Masons."

Randle Holme describes the columns as being of the "Corinthian order," and of Or, that is, gold. Two descriptions, differing in some slight particulars, are given, in the second or manuscript volume of the "Academie," of the plate, fig. 18, from which the facsimile, the same size as the original, has been taken, and placed at my service for insertion above, by the friend to whose research I am indebted for these quotations from the work of Randle Holme. One runs as follows, and the other I subjoin in a note: "He beareth, Sable, on a cheueron betweene three towers Argent: a paire of compasses extended of the first w^ch^ is the Armes of the Right Honored & Right Worshipfull company of ffree = Masons: whose escochion is cotized (or rather upheld, sustained, or supported) by two columbes or pillars of the Tuscan, or Dorick, or Corinthian orders." [4]

We now approach the consideration of Harleian MS. 2054, described in the catalogue, "Bibliothecæ Harleianæ," as "a book in folio consisting of many tracts and loose papers ∴ ∴ by the second Randle Holme and others ∴ ∴ and the third Randle Holme's Account of the Principal Matters contained in this Book."

Among the "loose papers" is a version of the "Old Charges" (12), which has been already

[1] In the use of Italics, I here follow Rylands, who observes of the above paragraph that it caused him to put together the notes, forming the essay to which I have previously referred. He adds, "It appears to have never before been noticed, and I need hardly call attention to its importance."

[2] Bk. III., chap. xiii., p. 460.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 466.

[4] Harleian MS. 2035, p. 56. *Masons*, or ffree Masons, S. on a cheueron betw. 3 towers A, a paire of compasses extended S (of olde the towers were triple towered), "the crest on a Wreath, a Tower A, the Escochion is cotized with two columes of the corinthion Order O. Motto is, In the Lord is all our Trust; the free Masons were made a company, 12. H. 1V." (*Ibid.*, p. 204, *verso*).

analysed with some particularity in an earlier chapter.[1] This copy of the "Constitutions" was transcribed by the *third* Randle Holme. I arrive at this opinion, in the main, from the general character of the handwriting, which is evidently identical with that of the person who wrote the table of contents prefixed to the volume. In the index of the younger Holme[2] are the words:—"Free Masons' Orders & Constitutions," which are repeated, almost as it were in *facsimile*, at the top of folio 29, the only difference being, that in the latter instance the word "the" begins the sentence, whilst the "&" is replaced by "and." The heading or title, therefore, of the MS. numbered 12 in my calendar or catalogue of the "Old Charges,"[3] is, "*The* Free Masons' Orders *and* Constitutions." The letter *f* and the long *s*, which in each case are twice used, are indistinguishable, and the final *s* in "Masons," "Orders," and "Constitutions," at both folios 2 and 29 is thus shown:—Orderꝭ.

I have further compared the acknowledged handwriting of the younger Holme (fol. 2) and that which I deem to be his (fol. 29), with another table of contents from the same pen, given in a separate volume of the Harleian Collection.[4] The chirography is the same throughout the series, and it only remains to be stated, that in setting down the transcription of the Masonic Constitutions, given in the Harleian MS. 2054, to the *third* Randle Holme, I find myself in agreement with Rylands, to whose minute analysis of Freemasonry at Chester in the seventeenth century, I must refer the curious reader who may be desirous of pursuing the subject to any greater length.[5]

As there were two Randle Holmes *before* the author of the "Academie," as well as two *after* him, it has seemed desirable on all grounds to disentangle the subject from the confusion which naturally adheres to it, through the somewhat promiscuous use by commentators, of the same Christian and surname, without any distinctive adverb to mark which of the *five* generations is alluded to.

The *third* Randle Holme cannot, indeed, in the present sketch, be confused with his *later* namesakes, but it is of some importance in this inquiry to establish the fact—if fact it be—that the author of the "Academie of Armory," the Freemason of the Chester Lodge, and the copyist to whose labours we are indebted for the form of the "Charges" contained in the Harleian MS. 2054, was one and the same person.

In the first place, it carries us up the stream of Masonic history by easier stages, than if, let us say, the *second* Randle Holme either transcribed MS. 12, or was the Freemason whose name appears in connection with it.

To make this clearer, it must be explained that the *first* Randle Holme, Deputy to the College of Arms for Cheshire, Shropshire, and North Wales, was Sheriff of Chester in 1615, Alderman in 1629, and Mayor in 1633-4. He was buried at St Mary's-on-the-Hill at Chester, January 30, 1654-5. His second son and heir was the *second* Randle Holme, baptized July 15, 1601, and became a Justice of the Peace, Sheriff of Chester during his father's Mayoralty, and was himself Mayor in 1643, when the city was besieged by the Parliamentarians. With his father, he was Deputy to Norroy King of Arms for Cheshire, Lancashire, and North Wales. He died, aged sixty-three, September 4, 1659, and was also buried at St Mary's-on-the-Hill. His eldest son and heir, by his first wife, Catherine, eldest daughter of Matthew Ellis of Over-

[1] II., p. 64. [2] Harleian MS. 2054, fol. 2, line 7. [3] Chap. II.

[4] "The third Randle Holme's List of the things of principal Note in this Book" (Harleian MS. 2072, fol. 1).

[5] Masonic Magazine, January and February 1882.

legh, co. Chester, gent., was the *third* Randle Holme.[1] It is therefore evident, that if the Masonic papers in Harleian MS. 2054 point to the father instead of to the son, their evidence must date from a period certainly not later than 1659; whereas, on a contrary view, the entry referring to the membership of *a* Randle Holme, and the transcription of the "Legend of the Craft," will be brought down to the second half of the seventeenth century.

Although by Woodford[2] the date of the Harleian MS. 2054—*i.e.*, the Masonic entries—has been approximately fixed at the year 1625, and by Hughan[3] following Mr Bond[4] at 1650, it must be fairly stated that the evidence on which they relied, has crumbled away since their opinions were severally expressed. It is possible, of course, that the author of the "Academie" may have made the transcript under examination so early as 1650, when he was in his *twenty-third year;* but apart altogether from the improbability of this having occurred, either by reason of his age[5] or from the unsettled condition of the times, a mass of evidence is forthcoming, from which it may safely be inferred that the list of Freemasons, members of the Chester Lodge, was drawn up, and the Constitutions copied, at a date about midway between the years of transcription of manuscripts numbered 13 and 23 respectively in Chapter II. That is to say, the gap between the Sloane MS. 3848 (13), certified by Edward Sankey in 1646, and the Antiquity (23), attested by Robert Padgett in 1686, is lessened, if not entirely bridged over, by another accredited version of the "Old Charges," dating *circa* 1665. The evidence, upon the authority of which this period of origin may, in my judgment, be assigned to Harleian MS. 2054 (13), will be next presented; and at the conclusion of these notes on Randle Holme and the Chester Freemasons, I shall more fully explain the design of which the latter are slightly anticipatory, and, connecting the "Old Charges" of more recent date with the actual living Freemasonry which immediately preceded the era of Grand Lodges, I shall follow the clue they afford to our earlier history, as far into the region of the past as it may with any safety be relied upon as a guide.

In the same volume of manuscripts as the transcript of the Constitutions by Randle Holme, and immediately succeeding it, is the following form of oath, in the same handwriting—"There is seu^rall words & signes of a free Mason to be revailed to y^u w^ch as y^u will answ: before God at the Great & terrible day of Iudgm^t y^u keep Secret & not to revaile the same to any in the heares of any pson w̄ but to the M^rs & fellows of the said Society of free Masons so helpe me God, xc."

This is written on a small scrap of paper, about which Rylands observes, "as it has evidently been torn off the corner of a sheet before it was used by Randle Holme, probably it is a rough memorandum."

The next leaf in the same volume contains some further notes by Randle Holme. These evidently relate to the economy of an existing Lodge, but some of the details admit of a varied

[1] W. H. Rylands, Freemasonry in the Seventeenth Century, Chester, 1650-1700.

[2] The "Old Charges" of British Freemasons, 1872 (preface, p. xi).

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 8; Masonic Sketches and Reprints, 1871, part ii., p. 23.

[4] Letter, dated June 8, 1869, from Edward A. Bond, British Museum, to W. P. Buchan (Freemasons' Magazine, July 10, 1869, p. 29).

[5] The "General Regulations" of 1721 (Grand Lodge of England) enact, that no man under the age of *twenty-five* is to be made a Mason. Unless, however, this law was a survival of a far older one, it has no bearing on the point raised in the text.

interpretation. Facsimiles of this page, and of the fragment of paper on which the "Oath" is written, are given by Rylands, but in each case I have preferred transcribing from the fair copy which he prints of these MSS.[1] The following are the entries relating, it is supposed, to the Chester Lodge:—

William Wade w^t. giue for to be a free Mason.

20s.	Robert Morris
10	Willm Street Aldm
15	John Hughes.
5	Sam Pike taylor
8	Willm Wade

Willm Harvey 20
Mich Holden 20
Pet downham 20
Tho ffoulkes 10
Will Hughes 8
Jo ffletcher 10
Seth Hilton 15
Ran̄ Holme 10
Ric Taylor 10
Ric Ratcliffe 20
Will Woods 5
Jo Parry 10
Tho Morris 10
Tho May 10
Will Robinson 20
James Mort 20
Jo Lloyd 20
Geo Harvey 20
Will Jackson 10
Robt Harvey 20
John Madock 10

for 1 li 9
for 10s. 9
for 15s. 1
for 5s. 1
for 8s. 1

[1] The Masonic entries in Harleian MS. 2054, were printed by Hughan in his "Masonic Sketches and Reprints," Pt. ii., p. 46. Those, however, giving the names of Wade and others, have never been accurately reproduced except in the *facsimile* prefixed to Rylands' essay. The fuller extract I have collated, both with the *facsimile* and the actual MS., but as regards the "Oath" must express my indebtedness to Rylands, for deciphering interlineations which I print above on his authority.

Commenting upon these items, Rylands observes: "The reason for the difference in the amount of the entrance fees paid, as given in the analysis at the end of the list, is not easy to explain. Why, it may be asked, are the first five names separated from the others, and given in different form? Are they superior officers of the Fellowship, and are we to understand the marks occurring before their names as recording the number of their attendances at the lodge, the number of votes recorded at some election, or the payment of certain odd amounts?"

It is not, however, so clear as to be reduced to actual demonstration, that the various sums enumerated in the analysis at the foot of the list represent the entrance-money paid by the initiates or "newly made" brethren. The irregular amounts (if not old scores) might just as well stand for the ordinary subscriptions of the members, since there would be nothing more singular in the custom of a graduated scale of dues, than in that of exacting a varying sum at the *admission* of new members or brethren.

The first five names could hardly be those of superior officers of the Fellowship, except on the supposition that William Wade received promotion at a very early stage of his Masonic life. The marks, indeed, are placed before the names of the five—and on this point I shall again offer a few remarks—but between the two, is a row of figures, denoting sums of money varying in amount from twenty to five shillings. The strokes or dashes can hardly be regarded as a tally of attendances, except—to bring in another supposition—we imagine that the twenty-one members whose names appear in a separate column, stood somehow on a different footing in the lodge, from the five, which rendered a record of their attendances unnecessary? Lastly, as to the payment of odd amounts, this is a feature characterising the entire body of entries, and therefore nothing can be founded upon it, which is not equally applicable to both classes or divisions of members.

Yet, if we reject this explanation, what shall we offer in its place?

Can it be, that the amounts below the words "William Wade w[t] give to be a free Mason," were received at the meeting, of which the folio in question is in part a register, and that the *five* names only are the record of those who attended? On this hypothesis, the clerk may have drawn the long horizontal lines opposite specific sums, and the crosses or vertical lines *may* represent the number of times each of these several amounts passed into his pocket. The column headed by the name of William Harvey, may be an inventory of the dues owing by absentees, and in this view, there were present, 5, and absent, 21, the total membership being 26. Those familiar with the records of old Scottish lodges will be aware, that frequently the brethren who attended were but few in number compared with those who absented themselves, the dues and fines owing by the latter being often largely in excess of the actual payments of the former.[1]

There is one, however, of Rylands' suggestions, to which it is necessary to return. He asks—may not the marks before the five names be understood as recording the number of votes at some election? That this is the true solution of these crossed lines, I shall not be so rash as to affirm, though, indeed, it harmonises with Masonic usage,[2] and is supported by some

[1] It may be worth remarking that excluding the two names, Hughes and Woods (8*s.* and 5*s.*), the number of those having 10*s.* and more attached to their names amounts to 19—exactly the number of scratches opposite the five names commencing the page; also no account is taken of the five names in the summary of amounts, which only accounts for the twenty-one entries. Further, Randle Holme could not have been both scribe and absentee!

[2] Chap. VIII., p. 395; and Freemasons' Magazine (Mother Kilwinning), Aug. 8, 1863, p. 96.

trustworthy evidence respecting the ancient practice at elections *dehors* the lodges of Freemasons.

The records of the Merchant Tailors, under the year 1573, inform us that at the election of Master and Wardens, the clerk read the names, and every one "made his mark or tick" against the one he wished to be chosen. "In the case of an equal number of ticks" (to quote directly from my authority), "the master pricks again."[1]

In the "Memorials of St John at Hackney,"[2] are given some extracts from the Minutes of the Select Vestry, among which, under the date of September 6, 1735, it is stated that the Vestry agreed "to scratch for the ten petitioners, according to the old method," which they did, and it is thus entered—

Hannah England, aged 66 years,	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i . . .	16
Elizabeth Holmes, aged 71 do.,	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i . .	18
Mary North, aged 59 do.,	i	1
Elizabeth Stanley, aged 60 do.,	i i i i i i i i	8

Having followed in the main, the beaten track of those commentators who have preceded me in an examination of the Masonic writings, preserved in volume 2054 of the Harleian MSS.; it becomes, however, at this stage, essential to point out, and, as it were, accentuate the fact, that, standing alone, and divested of the reference to William Wade, folio 34 of the MS. would contain nothing from which a person of ordinary intelligence might infer, that it related to the proceedings, or accounts, of a lodge or company of Masons or Freemasons. The names and figures would lend themselves equally well to the establishment of any other hypothesis having a similar basis in the usages of the craft guilds. But although the words "William Wade w^t^ giue for to be a free Mason," are brief—not to say enigmatical—the very brevity of the sentence which is given in Harleian MS. 2054, *at the commencement* of folio 34, if it does not prove the sheet to have been only a memorandum, suggests that it may be the continuation of a paragraph or entry from a previous folio, now missing.

It unfortunately happens, that dates, which might have aided in determining this point, are wholly wanting; but we are not without compensation for this loss, inasmuch as the baldness of the entries which are extant, induced Rylands to make the Holme MS. the subject of minute research, from which we get ground for supposing, that as at Warrington in 1646, so in Chester in 1665-75, and in the system of Freemasonry practised at both these towns, the speculative element largely preponderated. Also, that *all* the notes of Randle Holme, glanced at in these pages, were connected with the Lodge at Chester and its members, is placed beyond reasonable doubt; and that more of the latter than William Wade, were entitled to the epithet free Mason, by which he alone is described, will more clearly appear when the several occupations in life of the greater number of those persons whose names are shown on folio 34 of the Holme MS. are placed before my readers.

It may be remarked, however, that even prior to the exhumation of the Chester Wills by Rylands, the fact that the names of Randle Holme, author, herald, and son of the Mayor of

[1] Herbert, Companies of London, vol. i., p. 194.

[2] By R. Simpson, 1882, p. 133.

Chester, William Street, alderman, and Samuel Pike, tailor, are included in the list, shows very clearly that the Lodge, Company, or Society was not composed exclusively of *operative* masons.

Rylands has succeeded in tracing twenty out of the twenty-six names given in the list, but whether in every, or indeed, in any case, the persons who are proved by accredited documents to have actually existed at a period synchronising with the last thirty-six years of Randle Holme's life (1665-1700), are identical with their namesakes of the Chester association or fellowship, I shall, as far as space will permit, enable each of my readers to judge for himself. The names of William Street, alderman, Michael Holden, Peter Downham, Seth Hilton, Randle Holme, John Parry, Thomas Morris, Thomas May, and George Harvey, do not appear in the index of wills at Chester; but William Street and George Harvey are mentioned in the wills of Richard Ratcliffe and Robert Harvey respectively, which, for the purposes of their identification as persons actually living between the years 1665 and 1700, is quite sufficient.

It will be seen that namesakes of Holden, Downham, Hilton, Parry, *Thomas* Morris, and May, have not been traced; and if we add to this list the names of John and William Hughes —of whom Rylands observes—"I am only doubtful if in either of the documents here printed under the name of Hughes we have the wills of the Freemasons," there will then be—in the opinion of the diligent investigator who has made this subject pre-eminently his own—only seven persons out of the original twenty-six, who still await identification.

The following table, which I have drawn up from the appendix to Rylands' essay, places the material facts in the smallest compass that is consistent with their being adequately comprehended. It is due, however, to an antiquary who finds time, in the midst of graver studies, to exercise his faculty of microscopic research in the elucidation of knotty problems, which baffle and discourage the weary plodder on the beaten road of Masonic history—to state, that whilst laboriously disinterring much of the forgotten learning that lies entombed in our great manuscript collections, and bringing to the light of day, from the obscure recesses of parochial registers, many valuable entries relating to the Freemasons—his efforts do not cease with the attainment of the immediate purpose which stimulated them into action. Thus, in the papers, upon which I am chiefly relying for the present sketch of Randle Holme and the Freemasons of Chester, we are given, not only the details sustaining the argument of the writer, but also those, which by any latitude of construction can be held to invalidate the conclusions whereat he has himself arrived. Indeed, he goes so far as to anticipate some objections that may be raised, notably, that in the wills he prints, the title "Mason," and not "Freemason" (as in the will of Richard Ellom,[1] 1667), is used; also that since in *four* only, the testator is even described as "Mason," it may be urged that the remainder "are not, or may not, be the wills of the persons mentioned in the MS. of Randle Holme."

The names shown in italics are those of persons, with whose identification as *Freemasons*, Rylands entertains some misgivings.

[1] *Ante*, p. 141.

LIST OF NAMES FROM THE CHESTER REGISTER OF WILLS.

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	OCCUPATION.	WILL DATED.
Robert Morris	Chester	Glazier	1708
William Street[1]	Chester	Alderman	
John Hughes	Chester	Slater	1683
John Hughes	Chester	Husbandman	1708
Samuel Pyke	Chester	Tailor	1698
William Wade	Chester	Mason	1716
William Harvey	Chester	Alderman	1684[2]
Thomas Foulkes	Chester	Carpenter	1712[3]
William Hughes	Holt, co. Denbigh	Gentleman	1693
John Fletcher[4]	Chester	Clothworker	1665
Randle Holme[5]	Chester	Herald	
Richard Taylor, jun.	Chester	Merchant	1693
Richard Tayler[6]	Chester	Button Maker	1710
Richard Ratcliffe	Chester	Gentleman	1683[7]
William Woods[8]	Handbridge, co. Chester	Mason	1699[9]
William Robinson	Chester	Labourer	1680[10]
James Mort	Chester	Mason	1684[11]
John Lloyd	Chester	Mason	1675
George Harvey[12]	Chester	Bricklayer	
William Jackson	Chester	Tanner	1677
Robert Harvey	Chester	Alderman	1669
John Maddock	Chester	Alderman	1680

The above list comprises all the names which Rylands has succeeded in tracing. Those of the *three* Hughes—corresponding with the *two* persons of that name in Holme's MS.—and

[1] Appears as a legatee in the will of Richard Ratcliffe, Jan. 1683.

[2] *Proved*, 1687. [3] *Proved*, 1713.

[4] If the will of John Fletcher above be accepted as that of the Freemason, the date of Randle Holme's list cannot be later than 1665.

[5] The monument and epitaph of the *third* Randle Holme in the church of St Mary's, Chester, are described by Rylands, who cites Ormerod's "History of Cheshire," edit. 1875-6, p. 835.

[6] "Of the wills of Richard Taylor, merchant, and Richard Tayler, button maker, I should select the former" (Rylands). This opinion, in my judgment, is borne out by the will of John Maddocke, whose son-in-law and executor, a Richard Taylor, would appear to have been the *merchant* of that name. Amongst his residuary legatees the testator names "Ann Taylor and Elizabeth my daughter's children." Richard Tayler, from his will, could have had only one daughter (*Mary*) living in 1710. The children of the *merchant* are not named, but his wife was an *Elizabeth*.

[7] *Proved*, 1685.

[8] Rylands observes, "The name of Peter Bostock, *Mason*, is recorded as one of the executors of the will of William Woods, dated 1699. This date may perhaps help us in deciding the date of the document left by Randle Holme, as, had Peter Bostock been a mason when the list was compiled, his name ought, we may suppose, to have been included." With deference, this conclusion must be wholly demurred to. We have seen that the proposal or admission of William Wade, also a *mason*, formed the subject of a special entry by Randle Holme, and unless on the supposition that it represents the taking up, or desire to take up, the *freedom* of his trade, it must be held, I think, to plainly signify—as in the analogous case of William Woodman, and William Wise, of the Masons' Company, London (*ante*, p. 143)—that a *mason* of a *guild* or *company* was something very distinct from a *Freemason* of a *Lodge*.

[9] *Proved*, 1706. [10] *Proved*, 1685. [11] *Proved*, 1685.

[12] A remainderman under the will, and doubtless a relative, of the Robert Harvey whose name occurs next but one on the list.

of Richard Tayler, button-maker, may, however, be left out of consideration. This reduces the original twenty-six to twenty-four, from which, if we further deduct the names of Holden, Downham, Hilton, Parry, *Thomas* Morris, and May, there will remain eighteen, some of which, no doubt, and it may be all, were identical with those of the Freemasons, members of the Chester fellowship. In his classification or arrangement of the wills, Rylands has printed them in the same order as the testators' names are given by Holme. This, of course, was the most convenient method of procedure; but in dealing with an analysis of their dates, which is essential if a correct estimate of their value is desired, it becomes necessary to make a chronological abstract of the period of years over which these documents range.

For the purposes of this inquiry, I shall make no distinction between the fifteen persons whose wills have been printed and the three whose identification has been otherwise determined. To the former, therefore, I shall assign the dates when their respective wills were executed, to William Street and George Harvey those of the wills in which they are mentioned, and to Randle Holme the year 1700. This method of computation is doubtless a rough one; but, without assuming an arbitrary basis of facts, I am unable to think of any other which so well fulfils my immediate purpose, viz., to arrive at an approximate calculation with regard to the dates of decease of the eighteen. Thus we find that five die (execute, or are named in wills) between 1665 and 1677; six in 1680-1684; three in 1693-1699; and four in 1700-1716.

Now, Randle Holme was in his thirty-eighth year in 1665, the farthest point to which we can go back, if we accept the will of John Fletcher, clothworker, as that of the Freemason. If we do—and on grounds to be presently shown I think we safely may—the span of Holme's life will afford some criterion whereby we may judge of the inherent probability of his associates in the lodge, *circa* 1665, having succumbed to destiny in the same ratio as the testators whose wills have been examined. Holme died before he had quite completed his seventy-third year. Some of the Freemasons of A.D. 1665 must have been older, some younger, than himself. Among the latter we may probably include William Wade, who, as he outlived the herald a period of about sixteen years, it is possible that this nearly represented the difference between their ages—a supposition to which colour is lent by the character of the entry respecting him in the Holme MS. It would thus appear that he had not advanced beyond his twenty-second year when proposed for or admitted into the fellowship of Freemasons; and indeed, from this circumstance, I should be inclined to think either that the Holme MS. must be brought quite down to 1665, the date of John Fletcher's death, or that the disparity of years between Holme and Wade is not adequately denoted by the period of time separating the deaths of these men.

A material point for our examination is the trade or calling which is to be assigned to each of the eighteen.

Aldermen and Masons predominate, being four and four. There are two[1] gentlemen (including Holme), a merchant,[2] clothworker, glazier, tailor, carpenter, tanner, bricklayer, and labourer.

It will be seen that only *four* were of the *Mason's* trade, thus leaving fourteen (not to speak

[1] *Three*, if we accept *William* Hughes of Holt as the Freemason.

[2] An ambiguous term; in Scotland, retail dealers are often called "Merchants" at this day.

of the missing six), whose occupations in life, unless perhaps we except the bricklayer, and possibly the carpenter and glazier, had nothing in common with the operations of the stone-masons.

It is certain that a large number—and I should be inclined to say *all* the persons traced by Rylands as actually residing in the city or county of Chester between 1665 and 1716—must be accepted as the Freemasons with whose names their own correspond. In the first place, it may fairly be assumed that some at least, if for the present we go no further, of Holme's brethren in the fellowship were of a class with whom he could, in the social meaning of the term, associate. Indeed, this is placed beyond doubt by the MS. itself. William Street, alderman, falls plainly within this description. William and Robert Harvey and John Maddock, also aldermen, though their identification with the Freemasons depends upon separate evidence, must, I think, be accepted without demur as the persons Holme had in his mind when penning his list. Next, if regard is had to the fact that the index of the Chester Wills,[1] in two cases only, record duplicate entries of any of the twenty-six names in Holme's list,[2] it is in the highest degree improbable that in either of the remaining instances, where namesakes of the Freemasons are mentioned in the documents at the Probate Court, the coincidence can be put down as wholly fortuitous. If, moreover, the wills printed by Rylands are actually examined, the fact that many of the testators (and Freemasons) were so intimately connected with one another, as these documents make them out to have been, whilst strengthening the conviction that the men were members of the lodge, will supply, in the details of their intimacy and relationship, very adequate reasons for many of them being banded together in a fraternity.[3]

Here I part company, at least for a time, with Randle Holme. The evidence which his writings disclose, has been spread out before my readers. To a portion of it I shall return;[4] but it will be essential, first of all, to explain with some particularity the channel of evidence upon which I shall next embark.

As already stated, the preceding disquisition on Chester Freemasonry has been to some degree anticipatory of a few observations on our old manuscript Constitutions, in their collective character, which will next follow.

A passage in the interesting volume, which narrates the adventures of the French Lazarists, MM. Huc and Gabet, in the course of their expedition through Mongolia into Thibet, tends so much to illustrate the value of the "Old Charges" as historical muniments, connecting one century with another, and bridging over the chasm of ages, that I am induced to transcribe it.

[1] *I.e.*, of persons described as "of Chester." *Cf.* Masonic Magazine, Feb. 1882, pp. 309-319.

[2] John Hughes and Richard Taylor, or Tayler.

[3] Particularly William, Robert, and George Harvey; Richard Ratcliffe and William Street; and John Maddocke and Richard Taylor. In the last example, Maddocke by his will makes his "son-in-law, Richard Taylor," executor, and an inventory of his goods was taken by Rich. Taylor, *Senior*. As the other Richard Taylor is styled *Jun.* in his own will, this is a little confusing, though it doubtless identifies either father *or* son as the Freemason. For the reasons already expressed, I incline to the latter view. In the will of the *fourth* Randle Holme (1704), are named a niece, Barbara Lloyd, a cousin, Elizabeth, daughter of Peter ffoulks, and a brother-in-law, Edward Lloyd, gentleman.

[4] *I.e.*, to the "Academie of Armory," *ante*, pp. 180, 181.

"On the third day we came, in the solitude, upon an imposing and majestic monument of antiquity,—a large city utterly abandoned. ∴ ∴ Such remains of ancient cities are of no unfrequent occurrence in the deserts of Mongolia; but everything connected with their origin and history is buried in darkness. Oh, with what sadness does such a spectacle fill the soul! The ruins of Greece, the superb remains of Egypt,—all these, it is true, tell of death; all belong to the past; *yet when you gaze upon them, you know what they are;* you can retrace, in memory, the revolutions which have occasioned the ruins and the decay of the country around them. Descend into the tomb, wherein was buried alive the city of Herculaneum,—you find there, it is true, a gigantic skeleton, *but you have within you historical associations wherewith to galvanize it.* But of these old abandoned cities of Tartary, not a tradition remains; *they are tombs without an epitaph,* amid solitude and silence, uninterrupted except when the wandering Tartars halt, for a while, within the ruined enclosures, because there the pastures are richer and more abundant."[1]

The language of metaphor is not, in this instance, inconsistent with the language of fact. What is faith to one man is but fancy to another, or, to vary the expression, what is dross to one person, to another is precious ore. Thus, our old manuscript "Constitutions" will be variously regarded from the different points of view of individual inquirers. To the superficial observer, indeed, they may appear as "*tombs without an epitaph;*"[2] but the thoughtful Freemason, *looking* "*upon them, will know what they are,*"[3] nor will it be necessary to receive by induction an inkling of the speechless past. The vital spark of tradition has been handed on without being extinguished. "Like the electric fire, transmitted through the living chain, hand grasping hand,"[4] there has been no break, the transmission has gone on.

The laxity which notoriously exists with respect to the history of antiquity—a laxity justified to some extent by the necessity of taking the best evidence which can be obtained—has caused it to be laid down by a great authority, that "where that evidence is wholly uncertain, we must be careful not to treat it as certain, because none other can be procured."[5] On the other hand, it is necessary to bear in mind that "historical pyrrhonism may become more detrimental to historical truth than historical credulity. We may reject and reject till we attenuate history into sapless meagreness,—like the King of France, who, refusing all food lest he should be poisoned, brought himself to death's door by starvation."[6]

I adduce the preceding quotations, because the views to which I am giving expression,

[1] E. R. Huc. Travels in Tartary, Thibet, and China, translated by W. Hazlitt, 1852, pp. 71, 72.

[2] "A mythology, when regarded *irrespective of the manner in which it may have been understood by those who first reduced it into a system,* is obviously susceptible of any interpretation that a writer may choose to give it. Hence we have historical, ethnological, astronomical, physical, and psychological or ethical explanations of most mythological systems" (Mallet, Northern Antiquities, p. 477).

[3] "Original historical documents, such as inscriptions, coins, and *ancient charters,* may be compared with the fossil remains of animals and plants, which the geologist finds embedded in the strata of the earth, and from which, even when in a mutilated state, he can restore the extinct species of a remote epoch of the globe" (Lewis, On the Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics, vol. i., p. 202). *Cf.* Lyell, Principles of Geology, Bk. I., chap. i.; and Isaac Taylor, Process of Historic Proof, p. 83.

[4] Palgrave, History of Normandy and England, vol. i., p. 6.

[5] Lewis, Inquiry into the Credibility of the Early Roman History, vol. i., p. 16.

[6] Palgrave, History of Normandy and England, vol. i., p. 533.

with respect to the value of the "Old Charges" as *historical* evidence, carrying back the ancestry of the Society to a very remote period, may not remain unchallenged—and apart from the estimation in which these "muniments of title" are regarded by myself, it has seemed desirable to justify on broader grounds their somewhat detailed examination at this advanced stage of our research.

I shall next group the several versions of the old Masonic Constitutions in six classes or divisions. The Halliwell (1) and Cooke (2) MSS., as they stand alone, and do not fall properly within this description, will be excluded, whilst three manuscripts recently brought to light, and therefore omitted from my general list in Chapter II., will be included in the classification, under the titles of the "Lechmere"[1] (14*a*), the Colne No. 1 (22*a*), and the Colne No. 2 (25*a*).

I.—Lodge Records, *i.e.*, copies or versions of the "Old Charges," in actual Lodge custody, with regard to which, there is no evidence of a possible derivation through any other channel than a purely Masonic one.

Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 26, and 30.

II.—Now, or formerly, in the custody of Lodges or Individuals, under circumstances which in each case raises a presumption, of their being actually used at the admission or reception of new members.[2]

Nos 12, 13, 22, 25, 27, and 28.

III.—Rolls or Scrolls,[3] and Copies in Book form.

Nos. 4, 5, 8, 9, 14*a*, 15, 20, 21, 22*a*, 24, 25*a*, 29, and 31*a*.[4]

IV.—On Vellum or Parchment.

Nos. 6 and 7.

V.—On Ordinary Paper.[5]

Nos. 3, 11, 13, 14, and 31.

VI.—MSS. *not* enumerated in the preceding categories (32-51)—viz., Late Transcripts, Printed Copies, Extracts, or References in printed books.[6]

[1] Printed in the Masonic Monthly, Dec. 1882, p. 377.

[2] In omitting Nos. 25 (York, 4)—on which rests the theory of female membership—and 28 (Scarborough) from Class I., it may be remarked that they do not, at least in my judgment, reach the highest pinnacle of authority.

[3] Although many of the documents combine features which would justify their inclusion within more classes than one, each is shown above in that class or division *only*, which determines their relative authority as historical witnesses.

[4] See Chap. II., last page; and "Descriptive List of 'Old Charges,'" *post* (49).

[5] It will be seen that Nos. 3 (Lansdowne) and 11 (Harleian, 1942), both in their way departures from the ordinary text, and as such relied upon accordingly by theorists, are placed in the *fifth* class of these documents. Nos. 12 (Harleian, 2054), 13 (Sloane, 3848), 25 (York, 4), and 28 (Scarborough), all, for reasons which it is hoped have been sufficiently disclosed, are included in the *second* category.

[6] Of these the most important are, the Dowland (39), Plot (40), and Roberts (44) MSS. No. 39 is regarded by Woodford as representing the oldest *form* of the Constitutions, with the single exception of No. 25 (York, 4), which latter, in the passage recognising female membership, he considers, takes us back to "the Guild of Masons mentioned in the York Fabric Rolls." In No. 40 we have the earliest printed reference to the "Old Charges;" and in No. 44 an allusion to a "General Assembly," held Dec. 8, 1663, which, if based on fact, would make it by far the most valuable record of our Society.

The above classification will show the relative estimation in which—according to my judgment—the "Old Charges" should be regarded as authoritative or accredited writings.

In setting a value on these documents, I have endeavoured in each case to hold the scales evenly, and whilst in a few instances the inclusion of some within either of the two leading classes may, at the first view, appear as unreasonable as the exclusion of others, I trust that the principles by which I have been guided, in making what I shall venture to term an "historical inventory" of our manuscript Constitutions, may meet with the ultimate approval of the few antiquaries who will alone fully traverse the ground over which my remarks extend.

In all cases, however, where the places assigned to those MSS., which are grouped in the first or second class, may appear to have been wrongly determined, it will only be necessary to refer to the "descriptive list" at p. 194, where the form of each document, and the material on which it is written, together with the information already supplied in Chapter II., will afford criteria for the formation of an independent judgment.

The following table, which I have drawn up with some care, will serve the double purpose of saving trouble to those who take my statements on trust, whilst indicating to the more cautious reader the sources of authority upon which he must mainly rely for verifying them. The MSS. Nos. 3, 14, 22, and 25, in each case with an *a* superadded—Melrose No. 1, the Lechmere and the two Colnes—are *additions* to the general list given in Chapter II. Melrose No. 1 is indeed named in the text, though omitted from the roll of these documents. These are shown in the subjoined table in *italics*. No. 14*a*—in the possession of Sir Edward Lechmere—I bring down to a later date than has been assigned to it by Woodford (1646).[1] Its text resembles that of No. 13. Nos. 22*a* and 25*a*—preserved in the archives of the "Royal Lancashire Lodge," No. 116, Colne—have been transcribed by Hughan, on whose authority they are now described. No. 22*a*—of which the junior Colne MS. (25*a*) is a copy, though the latter does not contain the "Apprentice" Charges given in the former—presents some unimportant variations from the common readings.

The words *Lodge Record*, under the column headed "Form," describe in each case documents *coming from the proper custody*, and where there has apparently been *no interruption of possession*. Some of the other MSS. may have been, and doubtless were, veritable "Lodge Records" in the same sense, but having passed out of the *proper custody*, now fail in the highest element of proof. The muniments in Class II. stand indeed only one step below what I term "Lodge Records" as historical documents, and very slightly above the "Rolls" or "Scrolls," and copies in "Book Form;"[2] still between each of the three divisions there is a marked deterioration of proof, which steadily increases, until at the lower end of the scale the inference that some of the manuscripts were solely *used* for antiquarian purposes merges into absolute certainty.

[1] Freemason, Nov. 18, 1882.

[2] The authority of Dr Tregelles might be made to cover the inclusion of MSS. from the hands of anonymous copyists, in the first class. He observes: "Nor can it be urged as an objection of any weight, that we do not know *by whom* the ancient copies were written; if there had been any force of *argument* in the remark, it would apply quite as much to a vast number of the modern codices. If I find an anonymous writer, who appears to be intelligently acquainted with his subject, and if in many ways I have had the opportunity of testing and confirming his accuracy, I do not the less accept him as a witness of historic facts, than I should if I knew his name and personal circumstances." (The Greek New Testament, p. 176).

DESCRIPTIVE LIST OF THE "OLD CHARGES."

No.	Title.	Form.	Material.	Date.	Page. Chap. II.
1	Halliwell	Book	Vellum	Late 14th Century	60
2	Cooke	Book	Vellum	Early 15th Century	60
3	Lansdowne	Ordinary MS.	Paper	16th Century	61
3*a*	*Melrose*, No. 1	*Not known*	*Not known*	1581	66
4	Grand Lodge	Roll	Parchment	1583	61
5	York, No. 1	Roll	Parchment	17th Century	62
6 & 7	Wilson	Ordinary MS.	Vellum	17th Century	62
8	Inigo Jones	Book (folio MS.)	Paper	1607	63
9	Wood	Book	Parchment	1610	63
10	York, No. 3	Roll	Parchment	1630	63
11	Harleian, 1942	Ordinary MS.	Paper	17th Century	63
12	Harleian, 2054	Ordinary MS.	Paper	17th Century	64
13	Sloane, 3848	Ordinary MS.	Paper	1646	65
14	Sloane, 3323	Ordinary MS.	Paper	1659	65
14*a*	*Lechmere*	Roll	Parchment	Late 17th Century	[*Not cited*]
15	Buchanan	Roll	Parchment	17th Century	65
16	Kilwinning	Lodge Record	Paper	1675	65
17	Atcheson Haven	Lodge Record	Paper	1666	66
18	Aberdeen	Lodge Record	Paper	1670	66
19	Melrose, No. 2	Lodge Record	Paper	1674	66
20	Hope	Roll	Parchment	17th Century	67
21	York, No. 5	Roll	Paper	17th Century	67
22	York, No. 6	Roll	Parchment	17th Century	67
22*a*	*Colne*, No. 1	Roll	Paper	Late 17th Century	[*Not cited*]
23	Antiquity	Roll and Lodge Record	Parchment	1686	67
24	Supreme Council, No. 1	Roll	Parchment	1686	68
25	York, No. 4	Roll	Paper	1693	68
25*a*	*Colne*, No. 2	Roll	Paper	Early 18th Century	[*Not cited*]
26	Alnwick	Lodge Record	Paper	1701	69
27	York, No. 2	Roll	Parchment	1704	69
28	Scarborough	Roll (?)	Paper	1705	69
29	Papworth	Roll	Paper	1714	70
30	Gateshead	Lodge Record	Paper	1730	70
31	Rawlinson	Ordinary MS.	Paper	1730	71
31*a*	*Harris*	Roll	Parchment	18th Century	106

The documents above enumerated constitute the first five of the classes or divisions in which I have arranged the manuscript "Constitutions." Those composing the sixth or last group, not being of equal importance, will be described with less particularity. Nos. 32-37 are late transcripts, and the remainder, printed copies, extracts, or references, except the Harris MS., which, to avoid confusion, appears below as No. 49, though newly classified as No. 31*a* in the preceding list.[1]

[1] See Chap. II., last page.

"OLD CHARGES" (*continued*), CLASS VI.

No.	TITLE.	DATE.	No.	TITLE.	DATE.
32	Spencer	1726	42	Morgan	17th Century
33	Woodford	1728	43	Masons' Co.	17th Century
34	Supreme Council, No. 2	1728	44	Roberts	17th Century
35	Melrose, No. 3	1762	45	Briscoe	17th Century
36	Tunnah	1828	46	Baker	17th Century
37	Wren	1852	47	Cole	17th Century
38	Dermott	16th Century	48	Dodd	17th Century
39	Dowland	17th Century	49	*Harris*[1]	18th Century
40	Plot	17th Century	50	Batty Langley	18th Century
41	Hargrove	17th Century	51	Krause	18th Century

Such is the fallibility of judgment from internal evidence, that we may well lament our incapacity to trace every distinct version of the "Old Charges" from the hands of the scribe, to its first possessor, and thence through its successive places of deposit. But we are precluded from dealing with these documents according to the rules of legal testimony; we can neither cross-examine nor confront the original copyists. "If insufficient, we cannot summon more than are to be had; if uninformed, we must not indoctrinate them; if silly, we cannot make them wise. When they stop short, we cannot extract an additional word. Livy may be a credulous writer, but how shall we supply his place if we tell Livy to go down?"[2]

Whilst, however, fully conceding that "the forensic treatment of history is the application of a process entirely unsuitable to the materials," nevertheless, as it seems to me, in dealing with the "Old Charges" as historical muniments, a classification of their relative authority, based on legal principles, is an essential preliminary.

When, in a court of law, *ancient documents* are tendered in support of *ancient possession*, care is especially taken to ascertain the *genuineness* of the ancient documents produced; and this may in general be shown, *primâ facie*, by proof that they come from the *proper custody*.[3] It is not, however, necessary *that they should be found in the best and most proper place of deposit*,[4] but it must appear that the instrument comes from such custody, as though not strictly proper in point of law, is sufficient to afford a reasonable presumption in favour of its genuineness; and that it is otherwise free from just ground of suspicion.[5] Where old deeds have been produced as evidence in cases of title, from *collections of manuscripts made for antiquarian purposes*, they have been rejected. They must be produced from the custody of persons interested in the estate.[6] Thus an ancient writing, enumerating the possessions of a monastery, produced from the Herald's office; a curious manuscript book, entitled the "Secretum Abbatis," preserved in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, containing a grant to an

[1] See Chap. II., last page.

[2] Palgrave, History of Normandy and England, vol. i., p. 118.

[3] J. Pitt Taylor, The Law of Evidence, 8d edit., 1858, p. 542.

[4] Per Chief Justice Tindal, Bingham, New Cases, vol. i., pp. 200-202.

[5] Taylor, *op. cit.*, 7th edit., p. 105. The "proper custody" means that in which the document may be reasonably expected to be found, although in strictness it ought to be in some other place. Thus a collector's book may be produced from the possession either of his executor or his successor, and a document relating to a Bishop's See from the custody either of his descendants or of his successors in the See (*Ibid.*, edit. 1858, pp. 545, 546).

[6] Phillipps, Law of Evidence, vol. ii., p. 157.

abbey; and an old grant to a priory, brought from the Cottonian MSS. in the British Museum —have in each case been held to be inadmissible.[1]

On one important point the writers of the text-books from which I have last quoted are at variance. It is urged by Mr Phillipps, that in order to render ancient documents admissible, proof, if possible, must be given of some *act done* with reference to them, and that where the nature of the case does not admit of such proof, *acts of modern enjoyment* must at least be shown.[2] This doctrine, however, in the opinion of Mr Pitt Taylor, is unsupported by the current of modern decisions; "for although it is perfectly true that the mere production of an ancient document, unless supported by some corroborative evidence of *acting under it* or of *modern possession*, would be entitled to little, if any, weight, still there appears to be no strict rule of law, which would authorise the judge in withdrawing the deed altogether from the consideration of the jury;—in other words, the absence of proof of possession affects merely the *weight*, and not the *admissibility*, of the instrument."[3]

As already observed,[4] the historian has no rules as to exclusion of evidence or incompetency of witnesses. In his court every document may be read, every statement may be heard. But in proportion as he admits all evidence indiscriminately, he must exercise discrimination in judging of its effect. Especially is this necessary in a critical survey of the "Old Charges." The evidence of some of these documents is quite irreconcilable with that of others. The truth which certainly lies between them cannot be seized by conjecture, and is only to be got at by a review of facts, and not by an attempt to reconcile conflicting statements.[5]

It being convenient at this point to introduce the promised explanation of the plates of Arms and Seals, which will carry the chapter to its allotted limits, I shall resume and conclude in Chapter XV. my examination of Seventeenth Century Freemasonry, as disclosed to us by the evidence of Ashmole, Plot, Randle Holme, and our old manuscript Constitutions, not forgetting, however, the concurrent existence in North Britain of a Masonic system akin to, if not absolutely identical with, our own, but which, for convenience sake, I have up to this period, as far as possible, treated separately and disjunctively.

Description of Plates of Arms and Seals.

Mention has already been made of the arms of the Masons' Company of London, but for convenience it may be well to repeat here a description of the arms given by Stow in the edition of the "Survey of London" 1633. In his woodcut the field is printed the proper colour, also the chevron and towers, but the compasses have been left white. The correct blazon of the arms would be: sable, on a chevron between three castles argent, a pair of

[1] Taylor, Law of Evidence, 1858, p. 544.

[2] Phillipps, Law of Evidence, vol. i., pp. 276, 278.

[3] Taylor, Law of Evidence, p. 547.

[4] Chap. I., p. 4.

[5] Commenting on the histories of the Council of Trent, by Sarpi and Pallavicini, Ranke observes: "It has been said that the truth is to be obtained from the collective results of these two works. Perhaps, as regards a very general view, this may be the case; it is certainly not so as to particulars" (History of the Popes, trans. by Mrs Austen, 1842, vol. iii., App., p. 79). This reminds me of a custom which prevailed on the Home Circuit in regard to cases referred to arbitration at the Assize time. The briefs of plaintiff and defendant were both read by the arbitrator, and an award delivered accordingly!

that the "Three Compasses" is a particularly favourite sign in all parts of the kingdom, "which may be accounted for from the circumstance that *three* compasses are a charge in the arms of the Carpenters' Company, while two are used in the arms of the Joiners' Company, and *one* in the Masons' or Freemasons' Company. Frequently the sign of the compasses contains between the legs the following good advice:—

"'Keep within compass,
And then you'll be sure
To avoid many troubles
That others endure.'"[1]

In the list of London tavern signs for the year 1864 there will be found 14 Carpenters' Arms,[2] 9 Masons' Arms, and 21 Three Compasses.[3] There are 19 Castles in the same list. This sign may have originally referred to the Masons' Arms, although, doubtless, in many instances such signs took their origin from the fact that of old the castles of the nobility were open to the weary traveller, and he was sure to obtain there food and shelter.[4]

Another sign, "The Three Old Castles," occurs at Mandeville, near Somerton.

The Axe is found combined with various other carpenters' tools, as the Axe and Saw, the Axe and Compasses, and the Axe and Cleaver.[5] Although the Axe finds no place in the arms of the English Companies, it does in those of France, and, with the other charges, naturally connects itself with the workers of wood.

One other sign must not be overlooked. The well-known engraving in Picart's "Religious Ceremonies,"[6] figures No. 129 on the screen of lodges as the "Masons Arms, Plymouth." It appears not to have been observed that the arms figured there, have dragons or griffins for the supporters, and are not the arms of the Masons. If not those of some peer, which seems most probable, the sign may be an attempt to represent the coat of the marblers.

The arms granted to the Carpenters' Company may be blazoned as follows: Argent, a chevron engrailed between three pairs of compasses extended points downwards sable. A copy of the arms and grant will be found in Jupp's "History of the Carpenters' Company," p. 10, and a facsimile of the patent, dated 1466, in the "Catalogue" of the Exhibition at Ironmongers' Hall, 1869, vol. i., p. 264. A facsimile of the arms will be given in a future plate, with the arms of the Masons' Company and others.

The coat occupying the centre of the plate is taken from Heideloff,[7] and is thus described by him: "He [Maximilian I., 1498] is said to have granted to them [the 'fraternity of Freemasons'—? the Masons] a new coat of arms, namely, on a field azure, four compasses or, arranged in square; on the helmet the Eagle of St John the Evangelist (the patron saint of the old Masons), the head surrounded by a glory (see cut adjoining, which is copied from an old drawing). The lodges had beyond this each one its special badge."

This description is not quite complete. The eagle holds in its beak the quill, referring, it

[1] See also History of Signboards, by Larwood and Hotten, 8th edit., 1875, p. 146.

[2] In the early lists of Lodges are found the "Masons Arms," the "Three Compasses," and the "Square and Compass" (see Four Old Lodges, Multa Pancis, etc.).

[3] Larwood and Hotten, History of Signboards, 8th edit., 1875, pp. 43, 44.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 487. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 346. [6] Vol. vi., 1737, p. 202.

[7] Bauhütte des Mittelalters in Deutschland, Nürnberg, 1844, pp. 23, 24.

Reference has already been made to the original act[1] in the British Museum, constituting a municipal council for the city of Cologne, dated September 14, 1396. This interesting document, which is in an admirable state of preservation, has supplied the seals next in date. After rehearsing the terms of the incorporation, the document is sealed with the large seal of the town, followed by twenty-two seals of various trades. The whole of the seals are pendent by cords of silk, neatly laced through the vellum, and the name of each trade is written above on the folded edge. The eleventh place is occupied by the "Steynmetzen" or Stonemasons, and the twenty-second by the "Vasbender"[2] or Coopers. The former bears what is evidently the arms of the Guild of Stonemasons of Cologne in fesse, two hammers crossed in saltire to dexter, and two axes crossed in saltire to sinister, and in chief three crowns: no doubt referring to the three kings of Cologne,[3] who, as already stated, were confused with the "Quatuor Coronati." The inscription round the edge is so fragmentary that it is difficult to obtain a correct reading, . . . ibr(?) . . . ſteynmetzzer | bndſr | .cz(?) . . .

The seal of the Coopers is even more broken at the edge, and only a few letters of the inscription remain: * s | der balb[ender]. . . . The centre is not occupied, like that of the Stonemasons, with a coat of arms, but has over a ground covered with vines bearing grapes, a brewer's pulley used for sliding barrels down on an incline, a goat, over which is what may be a pair of pincers, but more probably a pair of compasses. A friend, on seeing the seal, suggested to me that it was probably the origin of the sign, "Goat and compasses." This appears to be a far more probable explanation than that usually accepted, "God encompasseth us," which it would be difficult to represent upon a sign. On turning to "The History of Signboards,"[4] I find the following reference to the opinion of the late Mr P. Cuningham:

"At Cologne, in the Church of S. Maria di Capitolio, is a flat stone on the floor, professing to be the 'Grabstein der Bruder und Schwester eines Ehrbahren Wein und Fass Ampts, anno 1693.' That is, I suppose, a vault belonging to the Wine Coopers' Company. The arms exhibit a shield with a pair of compasses, an axe, and a dray or truck, with goats for supporters. In a country like England, dealing so much at one time in Rhenish wine, a more likely origin for such a sign [as the Goat and Compasses] could hardly be imagined."

The next in date, also taken from Lacroix and Seré,[5] is the seal of the Carpenters of Saint Troud, from an impression preserved among the archives of that town. The date of the seal is 1481, and it is much less ornamental than those of earlier date given above. The centre is occupied by a shield of arms bearing an axe and a pair of compasses, the latter reversed. The inscription running round the edge reads: ſiegel · der · timerlíede · dan · líntruden.

Heideloff,[6] from whom the large seal in the centre of the plate is taken, of which he gives the date 1524, thus describes the seals engraved in his work: "The Strassburg coat of arms or seal is the Mother of God, with the Child within a glory of rays, supporting a shield; this shield is gules, with the silver bend of the episcopal arms of Strassburg, of Bishop Werner of Strassburg; in the upper part of the red field is a level, in the lower a compass or; on the white bend are two masons' hammers gold."

[1] In the King's library, *ante*, Chap. III., p. 169.

[2] Now Fassbinder. [3] The arms of the city of Cologne are: Argent on a chief gules, three crowns or.

[4] By Jacob Larwood and J. Camden Hotten, 8th edit., 1875, p. 147.

[5] Le Moyen Age, etc., vol. iii., Corporations de Métiers, fol. xii.

[6] Bauhütte des Mittelalters in Deutschland, Nürnberg, 4to, 1844, pp. 22, 23.

SEALS AND TOKENS OF FRENCH & GERMAN GUILDS.

Seal of the Corporation of
CARPENTERS OF SAINT TROUD. *Belgium.*
1481.

Seal of the
MASONS OF STRASBURG.
Circa 1725

Seal of the
MASONS OF NURENBURG.
Circa 1725

Token or 'Jeton de présence'
of the Corporation of
CARPENTERS OF ANTWERP.
A.D. 1604.

Seal of the Guild of
MASONS OF COLOGNE.
Charter A.D. 1396 Brit. Mus.

Seal *of the*
MASONS OF STRASBURG.
AD 1524.

Seal of the Guild of
COOPERS OF COLOGNE.
Charter A.D. 1396. Brit. Mus.

Seal of the Corporation of
JOINERS OF BRUGES.
A.D. 1356.

Mark of
SMITHS OF MAGDEBURG.
Berlepsch

Mereau funeraire of
CARPENTERS OF MAESTRICHT.

Seal of the Corporation of
CARPENTERS OF BRUGES.
A.D. 1356

Token or
'Jeton de présence' of the Corporation of
CARPENTERS OF MAESTRICHT.
A.D. 1683.

Token of the
CARPENTERS OF MAESTRICHT.
A.D. 1677.

Seal of the
MASONS OF DRESDEN.
Circa 1725

W. H. Sparkes del.

Thomas Clerk, London & Edinburgh.

W.M. Smith Sculp.

"The Nurenberg Lodge, whose seal I have before me, possessed the same coat of arms, with this difference, that the central bend, on which are the two hammers, was red [1] instead of white, with the enclosing motto, The Craft Seal of the Stone Masons of Nüremberg."

This seal bears the inscription, STAINMETZT · HANDWERCK · ZVE · STRASBURG, and the smaller one of Nurenberg, HANDWERCKSS : D[ER] : STEINMTZEN IN NURNBERG. The smaller seal of the Steinmetzen of Strasburg, and that of the Dresden Guild, are from the work of Stieglitz.[2] The former exactly agrees in the armorial bearings with that given by Heideloff, and the inscription differs but little; it is, STEINES HANDWERCK ZV STRASBURG. The seal of the Guild of Dresden bears in the arms the usual tools of the craft, the compasses, square, and level, and is an interesting instance of the two former being placed in a position in which they are now so often represented; it is, as the inscription informs us, the seal of DAS HANDWERK DER STEINMETZEN ZV DRESDEN. Stieglitz states [3] that the Rochlitz Lodge in 1725 petitioned the Strasburg Lodge (by whose permission they had already received from that of Dresden extracts of the Strasburg Ordinances) to send them a copy of the Imperial Confirmation of 1621, and a printed brother-book.

This request was granted by the Strasburg Lodge, by a letter dated July 5, 1725, signed Johann Michael Ehrlacher, Workmaster of the High Foundation. This copy of the confirmation of Ferdinand II. is still preserved at Rochlitz, and is attested by the Notary Johann Adam Oesinger, and sealed with the Strasburg seal of red wax, in a tin box.

The copy of a confirmation by Matthias, Emperor of Germany, who died in 1619, is also still preserved, and is attested by the Notary Basilius Petri. It was sent by the Strasburg Lodge to that of Dresden, who forwarded it to the Lodge of Rochlitz, having previously attached their own seal in brown wax, also in a tin case. From this, it would appear that the small seals of the Steinmetzen of Strasburg and Dresden were in use in 1725. And the date of that of Nürnberg is in all probability of the same period.

Before describing the tokens of Maestricht and Antwerp, it will be well to give some account of the mark of the Smiths of Magdeburg, which, connected as it is with seal-marks, is of some little interest, and shows a curious custom in use in this Guild.

Berlepsch,[4] to whose work I am indebted for the drawing and account, states, on the authority of the keeper of the Magdeburg Archives, that the mark is made by the Elder of the Magdeburg Smiths in opening their meetings. Having knocked three times on the table with a hammer, he commands—"By your favour, fellow crafts, be still," etc. The proper official then brings in the chest, which is opened with proper dialogue. The Elder next places his finger and thumb on the open ends of the outside circle, in saying—"By your favour I thus draw the fellow circle—it be as round or large as it may I span it [note that it is a symbol of his presidency], I write herein all the fellows that are at work here," etc. Knocks with the hammer, "with your favour I have might and right, and close the fellow circle." He then completes the circle with chalk; the meeting being formed, they

[1] This is contrary to the laws of heraldry, colour upon colour, but other instances will be found in the arms of various *confrèries*, quoted by Lacroix, *Ibid.*, vol. iii., Corporations de Métiers, fol. xxviii.

[2] Ueber die Kirche der Heiligen Kunigunde zu Rochlitz. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

[4] Chronik der Gewerbe, vol. vii., pp. 68, 69; citing Stock, Grundzuge der Verfassung. See this reference in Chap. III., p. 167, note 1.

proceed to business. At the end of the ceremony he closed the meeting, and rubbed the chalk ring out with his hand.

The work of Lacroix and Seré[1] is the source whence have been obtained the various tokens figured on the plate. The earliest, in the possession of Professor Serrure of Ghent, is that of the Corporation of the Carpenters of Antwerp, dated 1604. In the centre in a form of cartouche are represented a number of implements belonging to the trade. There is no evidence on the token itself as to the place from whence it was issued, but we may conclude that M. Paul Lacroix or its possessor had good authority for attributing it to Antwerp.

The same remark will apply to the remaining tokens of the Corporation of Carpenters of the town of Maestricht. The earliest, dated 1677, in the collection of M. A. Perreau, bears on one side the compasses, cleaver, and another object difficult to describe, and on the reverse "Theodocus herkenrad." The next in date, 1682, bears the same form of compasses and cleaver, but in the centre is placed a skull. This was also in the collection of M. Perreau, and is called, in the work of M. Lacroix, a "Méreau funeraire," or funeral token, which is explained to be intended to prove that the members of the corporation were present at the obsequies of their confrère.

The last of the series, also in the collection of M. Perreau, who supposed that it had belonged to a Protestant Carpenter, is dated 1683. It bears on one side an axe, cleaver, and another uncertain object in the centre, while round the edge runs the following:—EERT GODT MARIA SIOS EPONSENPAT, and on the reverse the letters BOVRS H. In this instance the words have no marks of division. I have above given the inscriptions on the various seals and tokens as they are represented in the works quoted from, but am inclined to believe that the engravers who copied the original seals, have not always reproduced them with perfect exactitude. The "Méreau, or Jeton de Presence," as these tokens are called, had probably a similar use to the "Méreau funeraire," only in this instance it was to prove the attendance of the members at meetings of the corporation.

[1] Le Moyen Age, etc., vol. iii., Corporations de Métiers, fol. xii.

CHAPTER XV.

EARLY BRITISH FREEMASONRY.

ENGLAND.—IV.

THE "OLD CHARGES"—THE LEGEND OF THE CRAFT—LIGHT AND DARKNESS—GOTHIC TRADITIONS.

WITHOUT a classification of authorities, any ancient text preserved in a plurality of documents, will present the appearance of a single labyrinth, through which there is no definite guiding clue. The groups, however, into which the "Old Charges" have been arranged, will sufficiently enable us to grasp their true meaning in a collective character, and this point attained, I shall pass on to another branch of our inquiry.

Before proceeding with the evidence, it may be convenient to explain, that whilst the singularities of individual manuscripts will, in some cases, be closely examined, this, in each instance, will be subsidiary to the main design, which is, to ascertain the character of the Freemasonry into which Ashmole was received, and to trace, as far as the evidence will permit, its antiquity as a speculative science.

These "Old Charges," the title-deeds and evidences of an inherited Freemasonry, would indeed amply reward the closest and most minute examination, but their leading characteristics have been sufficiently disclosed, and in my further observations on their mutual relations, I shall leave the ground clear for a future collation of these valuable documents by some competent hand.

Whether "theories raised on *facsimiles* or printed copies are utterly valueless for any correct archæological or historical treatment of such evidences,"[1] it is not my province to determine, but it may at least be affirmed, that "the extemporaneous surmises of an ordinary untrained reader will differ widely from the range of possibilities present to the mind of a scholar, prepared both by general training in the analysis of texts, and by special study of the facts bearing on the particular case."[2]

A method of textual criticism, begun by Dr John Mill in 1707, and completed by Drs Westcott and Hort in 1881, seems to me, however, to promise such excellent results, if applied to the old records of the Craft, that I shall present its leading features, in the hope that their

[1] Woodford, The Age of Ancient Masonic Manuscripts, Masonic Magazine, Oct. 1874, p. 98.

[2] Dr Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, Introduction, 1881, p. 21.

appearance in this work, whilst throwing some additional light upon a portion of our subject which has hitherto lain much in the dark, may indicate what a promising field of inquiry still awaits the zealous student of our antiquities.

The system or method referred to, has been evolved in successive editions of the Greek Testament, commencing with that of Mill in 1707, and ending with the elaborate work of Doctors Westcott and Hort.

Mill was followed by Bentley, but the system received a great development at the hands of Bengel in 1734, whose maxim,[1] "*Proclivi scriptioni præstat ardua*," has been generally adopted. By him, in the first instance, existing documents were classified into families.

The same principles were further developed by Griesbach "on a double foundation of enriched resources and deeper study," and with important help from suggestions of Semler and Hug.

Lachmann inaugurated a new period in 1831, when, for the first time, a systematic attempt was made to substitute scientific method for arbitrary choice in the discrimination of various readings.

Passing over Professor Tischendorf (1841), and, for the time being, also Dr Tregelles (1854), we next come to Doctors Westcott and Hort (1881).[2]

The main points of interest and originality in the closely reasoned "introduction" of Dr Hort are the weight given to the genealogy of documents, and his searching analysis of the effects of mixture, upon the different ancient texts.

Two leading maxims are laid down, of which the first is, "THAT KNOWLEDGE OF DOCUMENTS SHOULD PRECEDE FINAL JUDGMENTS UPON READINGS,"[3]

This is to be attained, in the first place, from "The Internal Evidence of Readings," of which there are two kinds, "Intrinsic Probability," having reference to the author, and "Transcriptional Probability," having reference to the copyists. In appealing to the first, we ask what an author is likely to have written;[4] in appealing to the second, we ask what copyists are likely to have made him seem to write.[5]

[1] This great principle of distinction between various readings was then little understood, and has been practically opposed by many who have discussed such subjects in later times. On the other hand, Dr Tregelles observes, "surely in cases of equal evidence, the more difficult reading—the reading which a copyist would not be likely to introduce—stands on a higher ground, as to evidence, than one which presents something altogether easy" (The printed text of the Greek New Testament, 1854, p. 70). Also, according to Dr Hort, "it is chiefly to the earnest, if somewhat crude advocacy of Bengel, that Transcriptional Probabilities, under the name of the *harder reading*, owe their subsequent full recognition" (The New Testament in the Original Greek, Introduction by Dr Hort, p. 181).

[2] The New Testament in the Original Greek, 1881.

[3] This differs slightly, if at all, from the legal axiom—"Contemporanea expositio est optima et fortissima in lege—The best and surest mode of expounding an instrument is by referring to the time when, and circumstances under which, it was made" (2 Inst. 11; Broom, Legal Maxims, edit. 1864, p. 654).

[4] "There is much literature, ancient no less than modern, in which it is needful to remember that authors are not always grammatical, or clear, or consistent, or felicitous; so that not seldom an ordinary reader finds it easy to replace a feeble or half-appropriate word or phrase by an effective substitute; and thus the best words to express an author's meaning need not in all cases be those which he actually employed" (Hort, Introduction to New Test., p. 21).

[5] "It can hardly be too habitually remembered, in criticism, that copyists were always more accustomed to *add* than to *omit*. Of course careless transcribers may omit; but, in general, texts, like snowballs, grow in course of transmission" (Tregelles, The Greek New Testament, 1854, p. 88). Porson says: "Perhaps you think it an affected and absurd idea that a marginal note can ever creep into the text; yet I hope you are not so ignorant as not to know that this has actually happened, not merely in hundreds or thousands, but in millions of cases. From this known pro-

The limitation to Internal Evidence of Readings follows naturally from the impulse to deal conclusively at once with every variation as it comes in turn before a reader, a commentator, or an editor; but a consideration of the process of transmission shows how precarious it is to attempt to judge which of two or more readings is the most likely to be right, without examining which of the attesting documents, or combination of documents, is the most likely to convey an unadulterated transcript of the original text; or in other words, in dealing with matter purely traditional, to ignore the relative antecedent credibility of witnesses, and trust exclusively to our own inward power of singling out the true readings from among their counterfeits, wherever we see them.

Secondly, then, there here comes in the "Internal Evidence of Documents," that is, the general characteristics of the texts contained in them as learned directly from themselves by continuous study of the whole or of considerable parts.

This paves the way for the maxim to which I have already referred—that "Knowledge of Documents should precede *final* Judgment upon Readings." Wherever the better documents are ranged on different sides, the decision becomes virtually dependent on the uncertainties of isolated personal judgments; there is evidently no way through the chaos of complex attestation which thus confronts us, except by going back to its causes, that is, by inquiring what antecedent circumstances of transmission will account for such combinations of agreements and differences between the several documents as we find actually existing. In other words, we are led to the necessity of investigating not only individual documents and their characteristics, but yet more the mutual relations of several documents.

The next great step consists in ceasing to treat documents independently of each other, and examining them connectedly, as parts of a single whole, in virtue of their historical relationships. In their *primâ facie* character, documents present themselves as so many independent and rival texts of greater or less purity. But as a matter of fact, they are not independent; by the nature of the case, they are all fragments—usually casual and scattered fragments—of a genealogical tree of transmission, sometimes of vast extent and intricacy. The more exactly we are able to trace the chief ramifications of the tree, and to determine the places of the several records among the branches, the more secure will be the foundations laid for a criticism capable of distinguishing the original text from its successive corruptions.

At this point comes in the second maxim or principle, that ALL TRUSTWORTHY RESTORATION OF CORRUPTED TEXTS IS FOUNDED ON THE STUDY OF THEIR HISTORY—that is, of the relations of descent or affinity which connect the several documents.

The introduction of the factor of genealogy at once lessens the power of mere numbers. If there is sufficient evidence, external or internal, for believing that of ten MSS. the first nine were all copied, directly or indirectly, from the tenth, it will be known that all the variations from the tenth can be only corruptions, and that for documentary evidence we have only to follow the tenth.[1]

pensity of transcribers to turn everything into text which they found written on the margin of their MSS., or between the lines, so many interpolations have proceeded, that at present the surest canon of criticism is, *Preferatur lectio brevior*" (Letters to Archdeacon Travis, 1790, pp. 149, 150).

[1] "Any number of documents ascertained to be all exclusively descended from another extant document, may be put safely out of sight, and with them, of course, all readings which have no other authority" (Hort, Introduction to New Test., p. 53).

If, however, the result of the inquiry is to find that all the nine MSS. were derived, not from the tenth, but from another lost MS., the ten documents resolve themselves virtually into two witnesses: the tenth MS., which can be known directly and completely, and the lost MS., which must be restored through the readings of its nine descendants, exactly and by simple transcription where they agree, approximately and by critical processes where they disagree.

The evidence on which the genealogy of documents turns is sometimes, though rarely, external, and is chiefly gained by a study of their texts in comparison with each other. The process depends on the principle that *identity of reading implies identity of origin.* Full allowance being made for accidental coincidences, the great bulk of texts common to two or more MSS. may be taken as certain evidence of a common origin. This community of origin may be either complete, that is, due entirely to a common ancestry, or partial, that is, due to *mixture,* which is virtually the engrafting of occasional or partial community of ancestry upon predominantly independent descent.

The clearest evidence for tracing the antecedent factors of "mixture" in texts, is afforded by readings which are themselves "mixed," or, as they are sometimes called, *conflate,* that is, not simple substitutions of the reading of one document for that of another, but combinations of the readings of both documents into a composite whole, sometimes by mere addition with or without a conjunction, sometimes with more or less of fusion.

Another critical resource, which is in some sense intermediate between internal evidence of documents and genealogical evidence, in order of utility follows the latter, and may be termed its sustaining complement. This supplementary resource is internal evidence of groups, and by its very nature it enables us to deal separately with the different elements of a document of mixed ancestry. Where there has been no mixture, the transmission of a text is divergent, that is, in the course of centuries the copies have a tendency to get further and further away from the original and from each other. The result of "mixture" is to invert this process. Hence a wide distribution of readings among existing groups of documents need not point back to very ancient divergencies. They are just as likely to be the result of a late wide extension given by favourable circumstances to readings formerly very restricted in area.

In the preceding summary an outline has been given of those principles of textual criticism, which are found by experience to be of value in inquiries such as we are now pursuing.

My own method, of classifying the "Old Charges" according to their historical value, may not meet all cases, nor satisfy all readers. It possesses, however, the merit of simplicity, which is no slight one. The characteristics of each MS. are revealed at a glance, whilst in "the descriptive list," which follows a few pages later, will be found the skeleton history of every document, together with a reference to the page in Chapter II., where it is described at length.

In classifying the MSS. with a due regard to their separate *weight* as evidence, I hope in some degree to remove the confusion which has arisen from the application of the convenient term "authorities" to these documents.

The "Old Charges" may, indeed, be regarded as competent witnesses, but every care must be taken to understand their testimony, and to *weigh* it in all its particulars.

The various readings in our manuscript "Constitutions," it is not my purpose to

scrutinise very closely. In all cases[1] we rely upon transcripts very far removed from the originals. Yet, if three are put on one side—the Harleian 1942 (11), the Roberts (44), and the Krause (51)—we find substantial identity between the legend of the craft, as presented in the oldest and the youngest of these documents respectively. It is true that the number of transcriptions, and consequent opportunities of corruption, cannot be accurately measured by difference of date, for at any date a transcript might be made either from a contemporary manuscript, or from one written any number of centuries before. And, as certain MSS. are found, by a process of inductive proof, to contain an ancient text, their character as witnesses must be considered to be so established, that in other places their testimony deserves peculiar weight.[2] Still, taking the actual age of each MS. from that of No. 4 (Grand Lodge)—1583—and earlier, down to those of documents which overlap the year 1717, *e.g.*, the Gateshead (30), which will give us the relative antiquity of the *writings*, though not, of course, of the *readings*—the traditions of the craft—of which we possess any documentary evidence—are found not to have undergone any material variation[3] during the century and more which immediately preceded the era of Grand Lodges.

The "Old Charges" were tendered as evidence of the Masonic pedigree in Chapter II. Indeed, a friendly critic complains of the insertion of their general description "in the first volume as being out of sequence in the history,"[4] though, as he bases this judgment upon my having—after leaving the Culdees—"made a skip of some centuries, and landed my readers in the fifteenth century," I may be permitted to reply, that the Colidei or Célé-dé continued to exist as a distinct class at Devenish, an island on Loch Erne, until the year 1630; also that the *history* of the Culdees, and the *written traditions* of the Freemasons, possess a common feature in the grant of a charter from King Athelstan, the interest of which is enhanced by the privileges, in each case, derived under the instrument, being exercised at York.[5]

Assuming, then, that in Chapter II. the "Old Charges" *were taken as read*, I shall proceed a step further, and prove their legal admissibility as evidence.

For this purpose, and following the line of argument used at an earlier page,[6] I shall bring forward the group of documents to which I have assigned the highest place[7] under my own system of classification. Several of these, at least—and even *one* would suffice to establish my point—come from the *proper custody;* and of *acts done* with reference to them, there is ample proof, direct in some instances, and indirect in others.

Next, and *longo intervallo*, come the remaining documents, all of which fail in attaining the highest weight of authority.

[1] *I.e.*, excluding from consideration the Halliwell (1) and Cooke (2) MSS., which may be termed *evidences* of pre-existing, or, in other words, *fourteenth* century Constitutions. The *mixed* or *conflate* readings in both documents, to be presently noticed, point to the use in each case of different exemplars, one of which, at least, indicated in the Halliwell poem by the ARS QUATUOR CORONATORUM, is to be found in no other line of transmission.

[2] Thus, in the opinion of experts, the Dowland MS. (39) of the seventeenth century was transcribed from a much older document. The *reading* it contains has been assigned by Woodford the approximate date of 1500. *Cf.* Hughan, Old Charges, preface, p. xi.; and Masonic Magazine, vol. ii., pp. 81, 99.

[3] Respecting the general authenticity of manuscript copies of a single text, Sir G. Lewis observes: "Their authority is increased by their substantial agreement, *combined with disagreement in subordinate points*, inasmuch as it shows that they are not all derived from some common original of recent date" (On the Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics, vol. i., p. 209).

[4] Mr Wyatt Papworth, in the *Builder*, March 3, 1883.

[5] Chap. II., pp. 50, 52.

[6] *Ante*, pp. 195, 196.

[7] Class I., *ante*, p. 192.

Thus the relative inferiority of the manuscripts forming the second class to these comprising the first, is not continued in the same ratio. Descending a step, the deterioration of proof, though distinguishable, is not so marked. Manuscripts in roll or book form suggest wider inferences than are justified by others merely written on vellum or parchment. A clear line separates the components of the last from those of the last class but one; but in the larger number of cases the importance and value of all the documents *below* the *Lodge Records* will be found to depend upon extraneous considerations, which will be differently regarded by different persons, and cannot therefore be of service in the classification.

To use the words of Dr Maitland,[1] "*every* copy of an old writing was unique—every one stood upon its own individual character; and the correctness of a particular manuscript was no pledge for even those which were copied immediately from it." It is evident, therefore, that if undue weight is attached to the existence of mere verbal discrepancies, *each* version of the "Old Charges" might in turn become the subject of separate treatment. Subject to the qualification, that I do not concede the "correctness" of Harleian MS. 1942 (11), that is, in the sense of the "New Articles" which form its distinctive feature, being an authorised and accredited reading which has come down to us through a legitimate channel—the manuscript in question, when examined in connection with No. 44 (Roberts), fully sustains the argument of Dr Maitland.[2]

The documents last cited, if we dismiss the Krause MS. (51)[3] as being unworthy of further examination, constitute the two exceptions to the general rule, that the "legend of the craft," or, in other words, the written traditions of the Freemasons, as given in the several versions of the "Old Charges," from the sixteenth down to the eighteenth century, are in substance identical.

The characteristic features of the Harleian (11) and Roberts (44) MSS. have been given with sufficient particularity in Chapter II.,[4] where I also express my belief that the latter is a reproduction or counterpart of the former. I am of opinion that the Roberts text is the product of a revision, which was in fact a recension, and may, with fair probability, be assigned to the period when Dr Anderson, by order of the Grand Lodge, was "digesting the old Gothic Constitutions,"[5] which would exactly accord with the date of publication of the MS. Of the Roberts text, as may be said in the analogous case of the Locke manuscript,—it stands upon the faith of the compiler—and is only worthy of notice in an historical inquiry, from the fact that it was adopted, and still further *revised* by Dr Anderson,[6] whose "New Book of Constitutions" (1738), "collected and digested, by order of the Grand Lodge, from their old records, faithful traditions, and lodge-books,"[7] informs us, on the authority *of* "*a copy of the old Constitutions*," that after the restoration of Charles II., the Earl of St Albans, having become Grand Master, and appointed Sir John Denham his deputy, and Sir Christopher

[1] The Dark Ages, p. 69. [2] Chap. II., pp. 64, 75, 88. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 77; and Chap. XI., p. 494.

[4] Pp. 64, 75, 103, 104, 105. The date of publication of No. 44, given at p. 75, line 3, to read MDCCXXII.

[5] Chaps. II., p. 103; VII., p. 352, 353.

[6] Chap. II., pp. 104, 105. Sir G. Lewis observes: "The value of written historical evidence is further subject to be diminished by *intentional falsification*. Sometimes this is effected by altering the texts of extant authors, or by interpolating passages into them" (On the Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics, vol. i., p. 209).

[7] The New Book of Constitutions, 1738, title page, "We, the Grand Master, Deputy, and Wardens, do hereby recommend this our *new printed Book* as the *only Book* of CONSTITUTIONS, and we warn all the Brethren against using *any other Book* in any *Lodge* as a *Lodge-Book*" (*Ibid.*, The Sanction, preceding the title page).

Wren and Mr John Web his wardens, "held a General Assembly and Feast on St John's day 27 Dec. 1663,"[1] when the *six* regulations were made, of which the first *five* are only given in the MS. of origin (11), though all are duly shown in No. 44.[2]

These regulations, which Dr Anderson gives at length, are so plainly derived from the Roberts MS., that it would be a waste of time to proceed with their examination, the more especially as the corruptions of the Harleian text (11) which are found in the recensions of 1722 and 1738, have been already pointed out in the course of these observations.[3]

The two readings, we have last considered, may safely therefore, in accordance with the genealogical evidence,[4] be allowed to "drop out," and we are brought face to face with the original text—Harleian MS. 1942.

Having now attained a secure footing from an application of the principle laid down by Dr Hort in his second maxim, the canon of criticism previously insisted upon by the same authority may be usefully followed. Our "knowledge," however, of this document is of a very limited character; and even its date, which is the most prominent fact known about a manuscript, can neither be determined with any precision by palæographical or other indirect indications, nor from external facts or records. This is the more to be regretted, since, if we obey the paradoxical precept, "to choose the harder reading," which is the essence of textual criticism,[5] the "New Articles" given in MS. 11, open up a vista of Transcriptional and other Probabilities which we shall not find equalled by the variations of all the remaining texts or readings put together.

These constitute the *crux* of the historian. It has been well said, that "if the knot cannot be opened, let us not cut it, nor fret our tempers, nor wound our fingers by trying to undo it, but be quite content to leave it untied, and say so."[6] The "New Articles" I cannot explain, nor in my judgment is an explanation material. We are concerned with the admissibility of evidence and the validity of proofs, and to go further would be to embark upon the wide ocean of antiquarian research. The manuscript under examination, in common with the rest, is admissible, and its *weight*, as an historical record, has to be determined, but if by a careful review of facts, we find that a material portion of the text differs from that of any other independent version of the "Old Charges," whilst, as an authoritative document, it ranks far below a great number of them—unless we deliberately violate every canon of criticism—the stronger will prevail over the weaker evidence, and so much of the latter as may actually *conflict* with the former, must be totally disregarded.[7]

This will not extend, of course, to the rejection of the inferior text, where its sole defect is the absence of corroboration, as the necessity for *excluding* evidence will only arise, when the circumstances are such, as to compel us to *choose* between two discrepant and wholly inconsistent readings.[8]

[1] *Cf. ante*, p. 11; and Chap. II., p. 105.

[2] Chap. II., pp. 75, 88.

[3] If the so-called Roberts *MS.* had any better attestation, it might be worth while inquiring, why the blank between the words, "a General Assembly held at - - - - - - - - - - - - - [in all, thirteen ticks or marks], on the Eighth Day of December 1663"—was not filled up? The question of dates would also become material, since, if Mr Bond's estimate is followed, we find MS. 11—dating from the *beginning* of the century—containing *six* out of *seven* regulations which were only made in 1663! *Cf.* Chap. II., pp. 75, 88.

[4] *I.e.*, that identity of reading implies identity of origin.

[5] *Ante*, p. 204, note 1.

[6] Palgrave, History of Normandy and England, p. 121.

[7] See *ante*, p. 196.

[8] "Authorities cannot be followed mechanically, and thus, where there is a difference of reading, . . . all that we

Although, in the opinion of Mr Halliwell, "the age of a middle-age manuscript can in most cases be ascertained much more accurately than the best conjecture could determine that of a human being,"[1] the experience in courts of justice hardly justifies so complete a reliance upon experts in writing; and the date which he has himself assigned to the earliest record of the Craft (MS. 1) differs from the estimate of Mr Bond, by more years than we can conceive possible, in the parallel case of the age of a man or woman being guessed by two impartial and competent observers.

It is to be supposed that the remark of the antiquary, to whom we are indebted for bringing to light the Masonic poem, would extend beyond the manuscript literature of the Middle Ages, and though the maxim, "*cuilibet in sua arte perito est credendum*,"[2] must not be construed so liberally as to wholly exclude the right of private judgment, there is no other standard than the judgment of experts, by which we can estimate the age of an ancient writing, with the impartiality, so indispensably requisite, if it is desired that our conclusions should be adopted in good faith by readers who cannot see the proofs.

The document under examination (11), as regards form, material, and custody, comes before us under circumstances from which its use for antiquarian purposes, rather than for the requirements of a lodge, may be inferred. Externally therefore, it is destitute of Masonic value by comparison with the four sets of documents which precede it in my classification. Its internal character we must now deal with, and the first thing to do is to ascertain the date of transcription. Mr Bond's estimate is "the beginning of the seventeenth century," and by Woodford and Hughan the date has been fixed at about 1670. In my own judgment, and with great deference to Mr Bond, the evidence afforded by the manuscript itself is not conclusive as to the impossibility of its having been transcribed nearer the end of the century. This I take the opportunity of expressing, not with a view of setting up my personal opinion in a matter of ancient handwriting against that of the principal librarian of the British Museum, but because the farther the transcription of the MS. can be carried *down*, the less will be the probability of my mode of dealing with its value as an historical document being generally accepted.

I do not think, however, that by the greatest latitude of construction, the age of the MS. can be fixed any *later* than 1670, or say, sixteen years before the date of the Antiquity MS. (23), with which I shall chiefly compare it.

Leaving for the time, No. 11 (Harleian), let me ask my readers to consider the remaining MSS., except Nos. 44 (Roberts) and 51 (Krause), as formally tendered in evidence.

These will form the subject of our next inquiry, and I may observe, that although the copies which I place in the highest class, differ in slight and unimportant details, this consideration does not detract from their value as critical authorities, since they are certainly monuments of what was *read* and *used* in the time when they were written.

To the Antiquity MS. (23) I attach the highest value of all. It comes down to us with

know of the nature and origin of various readings . . . must be employed. But discrimination of this kind is only required when the witnesses differ; for otherwise, we should fall into the error of determining by conjecture what the text *ought* to be, instead of accepting it as it is" (Tregelles, The Greek New Testament, p. 186).

[1] A few Hints to Novices in Manuscript Literature, 1839, p. 11.

[2] Co. Litt. 125 *a*; Broom, Legal Maxims, 1864, p. 896.—"Credence should be given to one skilled in his peculiar profession."

every concomitant of authority that can add weight to the evidence of an ancient writing. Other versions of the "Old Charges," of greater age, still remain in the actual custody of Scottish lodges. These assist in carrying back the ancestry of the Society, but the Antiquity MS. is by far the most important connecting link between the present and the past, between Freemasonry as we now have it, and its counterpart in the seventeenth century. The lodge *from whose custody it is produced*—the oldest on the English roll—was one of the four who formed and established the Grand Lodge of England, the mother of grand lodges, under whose fostering care, Freemasonry, shaking off its operative trammels, became wholly speculative, and ceasing to be insular, became universal, diffusing over the entire globe the moral brotherhood of the Craft.

This remarkable muniment is attested "by Robert Padgett,[1] Clearke to the Worshipfull *Society* of the Free Masons of the City of London. Anno 1686."

It has been sufficiently shown that in 1682 the Masons and the Freemasons were distinct and separate sodalities, and that some of the former were *received* into the fellowship of the latter at the lodge held at Masons' Hall, in that year;[2] also, that the clerk of the Company was not "Padgett" but "Stampe."[3]

Thus in London the *Society* must have been something very different from the *Company*, though in other parts of Britain, there was virtually no distinction between the two titles. Randle Holme, it is true, *appears* to draw a distinction between the "Felloship" of the Masons and the "Society called Free-Masons," though, as he "Honor's" the former "because of its Antiquity, and the more being a Member" of the latter, it is probable that the expressions he uses—which derive their chief importance from the evidence they afford of the *operative ancestry* of a "Society" or "Lodge" of Freemasons, A.D. 1688—merely denote that there were Lodges and Lodges, or in other words, that there were then subsisting unions of practical Masons in which there was no admixture of the speculative element.

The significance of this allusion is indeed somewhat qualified by the author of the "Academie of Armory,"[4] grouping together at an earlier page, as words of indifferent application, "Fraternity, Society, Brotherhood, *or* Company"—all of which, with the exception of "Brotherhood," we meet with in the fifth of the "New Articles,"[5] where they are also given as synonymous terms.

In the minutes of the Lodge of Edinburgh, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the word "*Society*" is occasionally substituted for Lodge, and fifty years earlier the Musselburgh Lodge called itself the "*Company* of Atcheson's Haven Lodge."[6] In neither case, however, according to Lyon, was the new appellation intended to convey any idea of a change of constitution.

The Company, Fellowship, and Lodge of the Alnwick "Free Masons" has been already referred to.[7] But whatever may have been the usage in the provinces, it must be taken, I think, that in the metropolis, *Society* was used to denote the brethren of the *Lodge*, and *Company*, the brethren of the *Guild*. Indeed, on this ground only, and waiving the question of its authority, I should reject the Harleian MS. (11) as a document containing laws or con-

[1] Chaps. II., p. 68; XIV., p. 149. [2] *Ante*, p. 143, note 2. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 149.
[4] Book III., Chaps. iii., p. 61; ix., p. 393. *Cf. ante*, p. 180.
[5] Harleian MS. 1942 (11), § 30; *ante*, Chap. II., pp. 75, 88.
[6] Lyon, History of the Lodge of Edinburgh, p. 147. [7] *Ante*, p. 156; and Chap. II., p. 69.

stitutions "made and agreed upon at a General Assembly," or elsewhere, by the *London* Freemasons.[1] In the view, however, that the "New Articles" or "Additional Constitutions" *may* have been made in London, let us see how this supposition will accord with the facts which are in evidence.

We find in this code that the conditions on which a "person" can "be accepted a Free Mason" are defined with the utmost stringency. The production of a certificate is required of a joining member or visitor, and we learn, that for the future, "the sayd Society, Company, & fraternity of Free Masons, shall bee governed by one 'Master, & Assembly, & Wardens.'"[2]

Now, if there was only one "Society" or "Company" of Freemasons—the confusion hitherto existing with regard to the "Company of Masons" having been dispelled[3]—we might expect to find in the "received text" of the History and Regulations of the Craft, A.D. 1686, these very important laws, given with some fulness of detail. The absence, therefore, of any allusion to them is very remarkable, and a collation of the Harleian (11) and Antiquity (23) MSS., reveals further discrepancies which are not restricted to the mere regulations or orders. The former, strangely enough, does not mention Prince Edwin,[4] whilst the latter, as before observed, presents a reading, which differs from that of all the other texts, except the Lansdowne (3), in giving *Windsor* as the place in which "he was made a Mason."

The two documents clearly did not come from the same manufactory, and the weight of authority they respectively possess, may be determined with precision by the application of those principles of textual criticism, of which a summary has been given. To repeat somewhat, we find that the "History[5] and Charges of Masonry" are related in very much the same manner by all the prose forms of our old manuscript Constitutions, with the single exception of the Harleian (11), of which the Roberts (44) was a recension. The Krause MS. (51), it may be observed, we must consider relieved from any further criticism.

The readings that have come down to us, omitting, perhaps, those given in the Dowland (39) and York No. 4 (25) MSS.—which are in the same line of transmission with the majority, though their lost originals may be of higher antiquity—may, for the purposes of these remarks, be traced to two leading exemplars, the Lansdowne (3) and the Grand Lodge (4) versions of the "Old Charges." Thus, on the one hand, we have the Lansdowne and the Antiquity (23) readings, or rather *reading*, and on the other the versions, or version, contained in the remaining MSS., of which the earliest in point of date, if we base our conclusions on documentary evidence, is No. 4 (Grand Lodge). These two families or groups differ only in slight and unimportant particulars, as I shall proceed to show.

The Lansdowne, and I may here explain, that although the text of this MS. derives its *weight*, in the first instance, from the attestation of a Lodge Record (23), its *age*, and in a corresponding degree its *authority*,—is carried back to the earliest *use* of the same traditional history, of which there is documentary evidence. The historical relationship between Nos. 3 and 23 is happily free from doubt, and except that the older document has the words "trew

[1] *Ante*, p. 209, note 3. [2] Chap. II., p. 88. [3] *Ante*, pp. 149, 150.

[4] The Harleian MS., after mentioning the buildings constructed by King "Athelstane," proceeds—"hee loved Masons more than his Father," etc. This clearly refers to *Edwin*, and the words omitted by the scribe will be found in the parallel passages from Nos. 3 and 4, given at a later page. See also the "Buchanan" text, §§ XXII.-XXVI. (Chap. II., p. 97).

[5] *I.e.*, the *written traditions* of the Craft, within which I assume the "New Articles" to fall.

Mason,"[1] and "the charges of a Mason or Masons," whilst its descendant has "Free Mason," and the "Charges of a Free Mason or Free Masons"—variations not without their significance, but possessing no importance in the genealogical inquiry—the readings are identical.

In dealing with what has been described as "the Internal Evidence of Groups," it will only be necessary in the present case to compare the leading features of their oldest representatives, the Lansdowne (3) and the Grand Lodge (4) MSS.

These documents, and the family each represents, really differ very slightly, indeed so little, that in my judgment they might all be comprised in a single group, whilst I fail to discern any points of divergence between the several readings or versions, which cannot be explained by the doctrine of Transcriptional Probability.

The division of our old Masonic records into "families," has been advocated by the leading authorities, whose names are associated with this department of study,[2] and I have before me an analysis of the "Old Charges,"[3] wherein the differences between the families or types, of which the Lansdowne and the Grand Lodge MSS. are the exemplars, are relied upon as supporting the Masonic tradition, that, prior to 1567, the whole of England was ruled by a single Grand Master. This conclusion is based upon a statement, that with two exceptions—Nos. 3 and 23—the Grand Lodge MS. (4) "or a previous draft originated all constitutions, whether in Yorkshire, Lancashire, Scotland, or South Britain." In the sense that the readings or versions thus referred to have a common origin, the position claimed may be conceded, though without our going to the extent of admitting that the theory, which is the most comprehensive, has the greatest appearance of probability.

Let us now consider the points on which the readings of the Lansdowne and the Grand Lodge MSS. conflict.

The invocation is practically identical in both documents, and the narrative, also, down to the end of the legendary matter, which, in the Buchanan (15) copy, concludes the sixth paragraph.[4] In the next of the sections or paragraphs (VII.), into which for facility of reference I have divided No. 15, the Lansdowne and Grand Lodge readings vary. In the former, Euclid comes on the scene in direct succession to Nemroth (Nimrod), King of Babylon, whilst in the latter Abraham and Sarah separate these personages. According to the former, certain charges were delivered to the Masons by Nemroth, which, amplified, are in the latter ascribed to Euclid, as stated in paragraphs VIII.-XVI. of No. 15.

The omission of what are termed the "Euclid Charges" in the Lansdowne document, has been laid stress on, but not to say that these are virtually included, though in an abridged form, in the charges of "Nemroth"—the discrepancy between the two texts, were we discussing an actual instead of a fabulous history, might be cited as illustrating the *dictum* of Paley, that human testimony is characterised by substantial truth under circumstantial variety.[5]

The allusions in both manuscripts to David, Solomon, Naymus Grecus, St Alban, King Athelstane, and Prince Edwin, are so nearly alike, as to be almost indistinguishable, though,

[1] This term occurs in the Atcheson Haven (17) and Melrose No. 2 (19) MSS. Also in the two *English* forms to which Woodford assigns the highest antiquity, viz., the York No. 4 (25) and the Dowland (39). The Grand Lodge (4) and Kilwinning (16) versions have "free masson."

[2] Hughan, Old Charges, pp. 16, 18; and preface (Woodford), p. xi.

[3] In a letter from Mr John Yarker.

[4] See Chap. II., pp. 94, 95.

[5] Evidences of Christianity, Part III., chap. i.

in one particular, by the omission or the interpolation of *two words*, accordingly as we award the higher authority to the one document or the other, some confusion has resulted, which, by placing the passages in juxtaposition,[1] I hope to dispel.

"LANSDOWNE" MS. (3).

"Soone after the Decease of St Albones there came Diverse Warrs into England out of Diverse Nations, so that the good rule of Masons was dishired and put downe vntill the tyme of KING ADILSTON, in his tyme there was a worthy King in England that brought this Land into good rest, and he builded many great workes and buildings, therefore he loved well Masons, for he had a Sonne called EDWIN, the which Loved Masons much more then his ffather did, and he was soe practized in Geometry that he delighted much to come and talke with Masons, and to Learne of them the Craft, And after, for the love he had to Masons and to the Craft, he was made MASON [at Windsor], and he gott of the KING his ffather a Charter and Comission once every yeare to have Assembley within the Realme where they would within ENGLAND, and to correct within themselves ffaults & Trespasses that weere done as Touching the Craft, and he held them an Assembley at YORKE, and there he made MASONS and gave them Charges," etc.

"GRAND LODGE" MS. (4).

"righte sone After the decease of Saynte[2] there came diu^{rs} war^{r}es into England of dyu^{rs} nacoñs so that the good rule of massory was destroyed vntill the tyme of Knigte Athelston that was a woorthy King of England & brought all this land into rest and peace and buylded many greate workes of Abyes and Toweres and many other buyldinges And loved well massons and had a soonne that height Edwin and he loved massons muche more then his ffather did and he was a greate practyzer of Geometrey and he drewe him muche to taulke & comen wth massons to learne of them the Craft and afterwards for love that he had to Massons and to the Crafte he was made a masson [ ] and he gat of the Kyng his ffather a Charter and a Comission to houlde euy yere a sembly once a yeere where they woulde w^{t}hin thee realme of England and to Correct w^{t}hin themself faults and Trespasses that weare done w^{t}hin the Crafte And he held himselfe an assembly at Yorke & there he made massons and gaue them chargs" etc.

The crotchets or square brackets shown above do not represent *lacunæ* in the readings, but have been inserted by me to mark in the one case certain words contained in the text, which may be omitted, and in the other case, words *not* contained in the text, which may be added, without in either instance the context suffering by the alteration. The passages are so evidently taken from a common original, and the conjectural emendation under each hypothesis is of so simple a character, that in my judgment we shall do well to definitively accept or reject the words "at Windsor," *in both cases*, as forming an integral part of the text, and thus remove, as I venture to think will be the result, the only source of difficulty which we meet with in a collation of these representative MSS.

It may be observed that I am here only considering the *written traditions* of the craft, by which I mean the items of Masonic *history*, legendary or otherwise, given in the "Old Charges." Among these, the "New Articles," peculiar to No. 11 must be included, and we

[1] Transcribed from the originals. *Cf.* the Buchanan MS. (15), §§ XXII.-XXVI. (Chap. II., p. 97).

[2] The evident omission of a word here [*Albon*] weakens *pro tanto* the authority of this reading.

have next to determine whether this document possesses a weight of authority superior to that of all the others put together, as, unless we are prepared to go to this length, its further examination need not be proceeded with. I shall, therefore, content myself with saying that there are no circumstances in the case which tend to lift the Harleian MS. above the level of its surroundings in the *fifth* class of historical documents;[1] on the contrary, indeed, whatever judgment we are enabled to form of its authority as a record of the craft, bears in quite another direction, and induces the conviction that both parent and progeny stand on the same footing of unreality. The "New Articles" are entitled to no more weight than the "Additional Orders" of No. 44, or the recension of Dr Anderson. All three are unattested and unauthentic, and the value of their united testimony, which we have now traced to the fountain head, must be pronounced absolutely *nil.*

From the point of view I am regarding the "Old Charges," it is immaterial which of the Nos., 3 or 4, is the older document, nor must the superiority of the latter be assumed from the power of mere numbers. It is improbable that any care was taken to select for transcription, the exemplars having the highest claims to be regarded as authentic, whilst it is consonant with reason to suppose, that in the ordinary course of things, the most recent manuscripts would at all times be the most numerous, and therefore the most generally accessible.[2]

I have sought to show, however, that in substance the written traditions of the Freemasons from the sixteenth down to the eighteenth century were the same; and our next inquiry will be, to what extent is evidence forthcoming of the existence of these or similar traditions at an earlier period than the date of transcription of the oldest version of our manuscript Constitutions?

This brings in evidence the Halliwell and Cooke MSS., which are not "Constitutions" in the strict sense of the term, although they are generally described by that title. The testimony of the other Masonic records, which more correctly fall within the definition of "Old Charges," carries back the written traditions of the craft to a period somewhere intermediate between 1600 and 1550, or, in other words, to the last half of the sixteenth century. The two manuscripts we are about to examine now take up the chain, but the extent to which they lengthen the Masonic pedigree cannot be determined with precision. Halliwell and Cooke dated their discoveries, late fourteenth and late fifteenth century respectively,[3] but a recent estimate of Mr Bond, by pushing the former *down* and the latter *up*, has placed them virtually on an equality in the matter of antiquity.[4] This conclusion must, however, be demurred to, not, indeed, in the case of the Cooke MS. (2), respecting which the

[1] The "Legend of the craft," which forms the introduction to the Masonic poem (1), was taken by Mr Halliwell from Harl. MS. 1942 (11), which he quotes at second hand from the *Freemasons' Quarterly Review*, vol. iii., pp 288 *et seq.* This, if further proof was necessary, would amply attest the necessity of classifying the "Masonic Constitutions," with a due regard to their relative authority.

[2] "Even if multiplication of transcripts were not always advancing, there would be a slow but continual substitution of new copies for old, partly to fill up gaps made by waste and casualties, partly by a natural impulse which could be reversed only by veneration or an archaic taste, or a critical purpose" (Hort, Introduction to the New Test., p. 10).

[3] The Early History of Freemasonry in England, 1844, p. 41; The History and Articles of Masonry, 1861, preface, p. v. It should be recollected, however, that by David Casley, the Masonic poem was dated *fourteenth century* without any limitation to the latter part of it (*ante*, Chap. II., p. 60).

[4] "As you seem to desire that I should look at the MSS. again, I have done so, and my judgment upon them is that they are both of the first half of the fifteenth century" (Mr E. A. Bond to the Rev. A. F. A. Woodford, July 29, 1874; Masonic Magazine, vol. ii., pp. 77, 78).

opinion of Mr Bond is not at variance with that of any other expert in handwriting, but as regards the Masonic poem (1), the date of which, as approximately given by Mr Halliwell, himself no mean authority, has been endorsed by the late Mr Wallbran[1] and Mr Richard Sims.[2] The MSS. may safely therefore, in my judgment, be assigned—No. 1 to the close of fourteenth,[3] and No. 2 to the early part of the fifteenth, century.

The next step will be, to consider what these documents prove, though it should be premised, that even prior to their disinterment from the last resting-place of so much manuscript literature—the library of the British Museum—the texts or readings *then known* were pronounced by a competent judge to be "at least as old as the early part of the fifteenth century."[4]

The period named synchronises with that in which the Cooke MS., according to the best authorities, was compiled, and our next task will be, to examine how far the *readings* of the "Constitutions," strictly so called, are confirmed by *writings* dating from the same era as that assigned to the lost exemplars of the former.

The Halliwell and Cooke MSS. possess many common features, though one is in metrical, and the other in prose, form. In both, the history of Masonry or Geometry is interspersed with a number of quotations and allusions to other subjects, whilst each affords a few illustrations of the phenomenon of "conflation" in its simple form, as exhibited by single documents.

The Cooke MS. (2), which I shall first deal with, recounts the Legend of the Craft, very much in the same fashion as it is presented in the documents of later date.[5] Coming down to Nimrod—Abraham, Sarah, and Euclid are next severally introduced, the Children of Israel duly proceed to the "land of Bihest,"[6] and Solomon succeeds David as protector of the Masons. Naymus Grecus, indeed, is not mentioned, but we meet with Charles the Second—meaning, it is to be supposed, Charles Martel—Saints Adhabell and Alban, King Athelstan and his son, who, by the way, is not named, though it is stated that he became a Mason, "purchased a free patent of the King," and gave charges after the manner of the later Edwin. At line 642, however, there is a sudden break in the narrative, and in an abridged form we are given the story of Euclid over again, whose identity the scribe veils under the name of *Englet*, though, as he is described as the "most subtle and wise founder," who "ordained an art, and called it Masonry," besides being referred to as "having taught the children of great lords" to get an "honest living," there is no room for doubt as to the world-famous geometer[7] being the hero of the incident, the more so, since it is expressly stated that the "aforesaid art" was "begun in the land of Egypt;" whence "it went from land to land, and from kingdom to kingdom," and ultimately passed into England "in the time of King Athelstan." Englet [Euclid] and Athelstan are the only personages named in the shorter legend, in which, however, room

[1] Masonic Magazine, Sept. 1874, p. 77; Hughan, Old Charges, preface (Woodford), p. vii.

[2] "The text is in a hand of about the latter portion of the fourteenth century, or quite early fifteenth century" (Masonic Magazine, March 1875, p. 258).

[3] Not being an expert in manuscript literature, my personal contribution to the determination of this date consists of the remarks in Chapter VII. (The Statutes relating to the Freemasons, pp. 357-361), where I deal with the grounds on which Dr Kloss assigns a fifteenth century origin to the Halliwell poem.

[4] Sir Francis Palgrave in the *Edinburgh Review*, April 1839; *ante*, Chap. II., p. 87.

[5] The leading features of this MS. and its descendants are given with some fulness in Chap. II., pp. 83-85.

[6] *Cf.* Chap. II., p. 96, § XVIII.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 95, § VII.

is found for the tradition of Masonry having derived its name from Euclid, a fragment of Masonic history missing from the fuller narrative. These two versions of the Craft Legend were evidently transcribed from different exemplars.

The Halliwell poem has been described as "a metrical version of the rules of an ordinary mediæval Guild, or perhaps a very superior and exemplary sort of trades union, together with a number of pieces of advice for behaviour at church and at table, or in the presence of superiors, tacked on to the end."[1]

The latter I shall consider in the first instance. The Halliwell MS. (1), from line 621 to line 658, except—

> "Amen! Amen! so mot hyt be,
> Now, swete lady, pray for me,"[2]

is almost word for word the same as a portion of John Myrc's "Instructions for Parish Priests,"[3] commencing at line 268. With slight variation the two then correspond up to line 680 of the Masonic poem. Myrc was a canon regular of the Augustinian Order; and it has been conjectured that his poem, avowedly translated from a Latin work, called in the colophon "Pars Oculi," was an adaptation from a similar book by John Miræus, prior of the same monastery, entitled, "Manuale Sacerdotis."[4] The corresponding passages in the Halliwell and Myrc MSS. were printed by Woodford in 1874.[5]

The last hundred lines of the Masonic poem[6] are taken from "Urbanitatis,"[7] a poem which consists of minute directions for behaviour—in the presence of a lord, at table, and among ladies. Of these Mr Sims justly observes, "Some are curious, but some also there are which may not well be written down here;[8] and strange indeed it is to think that it should have been found necessary to give them at all, for they show a state of manners more notable, perhaps, than praiseworthy." "Perhaps, however," he continues, "the intention of the author is to leave no point unprovided for."

The Masonic portion of the Halliwell poem, which consists of the first 576 lines, appears, like the parts we have already examined, to have been derived from varied sources. This did not escape the observation of Woodford, who, in his scholarly preface to Hughan's "Old Charges," says: "The poem has been put mainly in its present shape by one who had seen *other historics* and *legends* of the Craft,

> 'By olde tyme wryten.'

And it seems to be, in truth, two legends, and not only one—the first legend appears to end

[1] Richard Sims, Comparison of MSS., Masonic Magazine, vol. ii., March 1875, p. 258. *Cf. ante*, Chap. II., pp. 79-82.

[2] Lines 655, 656. This would seem to be the extension of a quotation in Myrc, which stops short just before these lines. They also resemble the two concluding lines of the Masonic poem, which are based on the following, from "Urbanitatis:"

> "Amen, Amen, so moot hit be,
> So saye we alle for Charyte!"

[3] Cotton MS., Claudius, A. II.; Early English Text Society, vol. xxxi., 1868, edited by Mr E. Peacock, who considers that the MS. was not written out later than 1450, and perhaps rather earlier.

[4] Masonic Magazine, vol. ii., p. 260. *Cf.* Myrc, Duties of a Parish Priest (Early English Text Society, vol. xxxi.).

[5] Masonic Magazine, vol. ii., p. 130.

[6] Line 693 to line 794.

[7] Cotton MS., Caligula, A. II., *circa* A.D. 1460. The text of "Urbanitatis" has been printed by the Early English Text Society, 1868, as part of a volume on Manners and Meals in Olden Times, pp. 13-15, edited by Mr F. J. Furnivall.

[8] *I.e.*, in the descriptive account of this poem, given in the *Masonic Magazine*, vol. ii., p. 259.

at line 470, and then apparently with line 471 begins a new rythm of abbreviated use of the Masonic history. *'Alia ordinacio artis gemetriæ.'* There is not, indeed, in the MS. any change in the handwriting, but the rythm seems somewhat lengthened, and you have a sort of repletion of the history, though very much condensed."

The "ARS QUATUOR CORONATORUM" occurs in what is thus termed by Woodford "the second legend,"[1] and, apart altogether from its surroundings, which stand on an entirely different footing, and must be separately regarded, points to the existence, at the time the poem was written, of traditions which have not come down to us in any other line of transmission.[2]

The Halliwell and Cooke MSS. have been collated with some minuteness by Fort, who accepts, in each case, the date with which it was labelled by the person who made known its existence. Thus the transcription of the former is separated from that of the latter by a period of about a century, an estimate I cannot concur in, and which, as we have seen, is diametrically opposed to that of Mr Bond. This gap in the early manuscript literature of the craft, would obviously justify wider inferences being drawn from the discrepancies between the Halliwell and Cooke documents, than if their ages are brought more closely together. Thus it is observed by the talented writer to whom I have just referred: "The operative Mason of the Middle Ages in France and Germany knew nothing of a Jewish origin of his craft. In case the traditions current in the thirteenth century, or later, had pointed back to the time of Solomon, in preparing the regulations for corporate government, and in order to obtain valuable exemptions, the prestige of the Israelitish king would have by far transcended that of the holy martyrs, or Charles the Hammer-Bearer."[3] Fort then goes on to say: "It stands forth as highly significant, that Halliwell's *Codex* makes no mention of Masons during the time of Solomon, nor does that ancient document pretend to trace Masonic history prior to the time of Athelstan and Prince Edwin."[4] At a later page he adds: "Halliwell's manuscript narrates that Masonic Craft came into Europe in the time of King Athelstan, whose reign began about the year 924, and continued several years. *No other ancient document agrees with this assertion.*[5] The majority of Masonic chronicles refer the period of the appearance of Masonry into Britain to the age of Saint Alban, one of the early evangelist martyrs, many centuries prior to the time of Athelstan; *but they all agree that the craft came from abroad*, and specify Athelstan's reign as an interesting period of Masonic history. From the preceding statement it will be observed that the older craft chronicles are lacking in harmony upon vital points of tradition, and in some respects, tested by their own records, are totally antagonistic."[6]

In the opinion of the same writer, "at the close of the fourteenth century, the guild of builders in England, depending on oral transmission, suggested the origin of their Craft in Athelstan's day. Later records, or perhaps chronicles copied in remote parts of the realm, expanded the traditions of the Fraternity, and added a more distant commencement in the age of Saint Alban, introducing, moreover, the name of Prince Edwin, together with the

[1] Hughan, Old Charges, preface, p. vii.

[2] See *ante*, p. 207, note 1; and Chap. X., *passim*.

[3] Fort, The Early History and Antiquities of Freemasonry, p. 181.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] The italics are mine. It is evident that the statement in the Halliwell poem will lose its importance if the dates of the two oldest MSS. are brought into proximity.

[6] Fort, The Early History and Antiquities of Freemasonry, pp. 443, 444.

fabulous Assembly at York." "It is, perhaps, impossible," he continues, "to fix a date for the legends of Edwin and Athelstan," but strong belief is expressed that the story of Athelstane "is no earlier than the fourteenth century," also that "the tradition of Edwin is clearly an enlargement of craft chronicles of the fifteenth."[1]

The precise measure of antiquity our Masonic traditions are entitled to, over and above that which is attested by documentary evidence, is so obviously a matter of conjecture, that it would be a mere waste of time to attempt its definition. From the point reached, however, that is to say, from the elevated plane afforded by the Masonic writings (MSS. 1 and 2), which, speaking roundly, carry the Craft Legend a century and a half higher than the Lansdowne (3) and later documents, it will be possible, if we confine our speculations within reasonable limits, to establish some well-grounded conclusions. These, if they do not lead us far, will at least warrant the conviction, that though when the Halliwell poem has been produced in evidence, the genealogical proofs are exhausted, the Masonic traditions may, with fair probability, be held to antedate the period represented by the age of the MS. (1) in which we first find them, by as many years as separate the latter from the Lansdowne (3) and Grand Lodge (4) documents.

The Legend of the Craft will, in this case, be carried back to "the time of Henry III.," beyond which, in our present state of knowledge, it is impossible to penetrate, though it must not be understood that I believe the ancestry of the Society to be coeval with that reign. The tradition of the "Bulls," in my judgment, favours the supposition of its going back at least as far as the period of English history referred to, but the silence of the "Old Charges" with regard to "Papal Writings" of any kind having been received by the Masons, not to speak of this theory of Masonic origin directly conflicting with the introduction of Masonry into England in St Alban's time, appears to me to deprive the *oral* fable or tradition of any further historical weight.

In the first place, the legendary histories or traditions, given in the two oldest MSS. of the Craft, must have existed in some form prior to their finding places in these writings.

Fort is of opinion, that the Halliwell MS. has been copied from an older and more ancient parchment, or transcribed from fragmentary traditions, and he bases this judgment upon the internal evidence which certain portions of the manuscript present, having an evident reference to a remote antiquity. In illustration of this view he quotes from the "ancient charges," "that no master or fellow shall set any layer, within or without the lodge, to hew or mould stone,"[2] and cites the eleventh point (*Punctus undecimus*) in the Masonic poem,[3] as showing one of the reciprocal duties prescribed to a Mason is—

> "If he this craft well know
> That sees his fellow hew on a stone,
> And is in point to spoil that stone,

[1] Fort, The Early History and Antiquities of Freemasonry, pp. 445, 446.

[2] The Halliwell MS. is cited as the authority for this regulation, which is incorrect. See Chap. II., p. 100, Special Charges, No. 16. *Layer* in Nos. 12 (Harl. 2054), 20 (Hope), and others, gives place to *rough layer*, whilst No. 3 (Lansdowne), followed by No. 23 (Antiquity), has, "Also that a Master or ffellow make not a Moulde Stone Square nor rule to no *Lowen* nor Sett no *Lowen* worke within the Lodge nor without to no Mould Stone."

[3] The extract which follows in the text I take from Woodford's modernised version of the poem.

Amend it soon, if that thou can,
And teach him then it to amend,
That the whole work be not y-schende."[1]

He next observes, on the authority of the *Archæologia*,[2] that until the close of the twelfth century stones were hewn out with an adze. About this time the chisel was introduced, and superseded the hewing of stone. "Thus," continues Fort, "we see that the words 'hew a stone,' had descended from the twelfth century at least, to the period when the manuscript first quoted (1, was copied, and, being found in the roll before the copyist, were also transcribed."[3]

In the judgment of the same historian, the compiler of the Cooke MS. (2) had also before him an older parchment, from which was derived the following remarkable phraseology:

"And it is said, *in old books of masonry*,[4] that Solomon confirmed the charges that David, his father, had given to masons."

In the conclusion, that the anonymous writers to whom we are indebted for the manuscripts under examination, largely copied from originals which are now lost to us, I am in full agreement with Fort, though in both cases, instead of in one only, I should be inclined to rest this deduction on the simple fact, that in either document the references to *older Masonic writings* are so plain and distinct, as to be incapable of any other interpretation. Thus, under the heading of "*Hic incipiunt constituciones artis gemetriæ secundum Euclydem*," we read in the opening lines of the Halliwell poem:

"Whose wol bothe wel rede and loke,
He may fynde wryte yn olde *boke*
Of grete lordys, and eke ladyysse,
That hade mony chyldryn y-fere, y-wisse:[5]
And hade no rentys to fynde[6] hem[7] wyth,
Nowther yn towne, ny felde, ny fryth:"[8]

The "book" referred to was doubtless a prose copy of the "Old Charges," whence the anonymous author of the Masonic poem obtained the information, which greatly elaborated and embellished, it may well have been, by his own poetic taste and imagination,[9] he has passed on to later ages.

The same inconvenience from the existence of a superabundant population is related in the poem, as in the manuscripts of later date,[10] whilst in each case Euclid is applied to, and with the happiest result. The children of the "Great Lords" are taught the "craft of geometry," which receives the name of Masonry:

[1] Y-schende—*ruined, destroyed.*

[2] Vol. ix., pp. 112, 113.

[3] Fort, The Early History and Antiquities of Freemasonry, pp. 117, 118.

[4] "Olde bokys of Masonry," in original. The quotation above is from the modernised version by the late Matthew Cooke (The History and Articles of Masonry, 1861, p. 83).

[5] Y-fere, *together*; y-wisse, *certainly.*

[6] "Fynde, *to provide with food, clothing*, etc. We still use the word—a man is to have so much a week, and *find* himself" (Halliwell, The Early History of Freemasonry, 1844, p. 50).

[7] *Them.*

[8] "Fryth, *an enclosed wood*" (Halliwell, The Early History of Freemasonry).

[9] See Woolford's Introduction to Hughan's "Old Charges," p. vi.

[10] Chap. II., p. 95, § VII.

"On thys maner, thro good wytte of gemetry,
Bygan furst the craft of masonry:
The clerk Euclyde on thys wyse hyt fonde,
Thys craft of gemetry yn Egypte londe.[1]
Yn Egypte he tawghte hyt ful wyde,
Yn dyvers londe[1] on every syde:
Mony erys[2] afterwarde, y understonde
[Ere[3]] that the craft com ynto thys londe.
Thys craft com ynto Englond, as y [yow[3]] say,
Yn tyme of good kynge Adelstonus day."[4]

Leaving this early portion of the poem, I shall next invite attention to a passage commencing at line 471, where, with "a new rythm of abbreviated use," and under the title, *Alia ordinacio artis gemetriæ*, begins, what has been styled by Woodford, "the second legend," contained in this MS.:

"They ordent ther a semblé to be y-holde
Every [year], whersever they wolde,
To amende the defautes, [if] any where fonde
Amonge the craft withynne the londe;
Uche [year] or thrydde [year] hyt schuld be holde,
Yn every place whersever they wolde;
Tyme and place most be ordeynt also,
Yn what place they schul semble to.
Alle the men of craft ther they most ben,
And other grete lordes, as [ye] mowe sen,
Ther they schullen ben alle y-swore,
That longuth to thys craftes lore,
To kepe these statutes everychon,
That ben y-ordeynt by kynge Aldelston."[5]

Let us now compare the foregoing passages with the following extract from the second or shorter legend in the Cooke MS. (2), to which I have previously alluded:[6]

"In this manner was the aforesaid art begun in the land of Egypt, by the aforesaid master Englat, and so it went from land to land, and from kingdom to kingdom. After that, many years, in the time of King Athelstan [*Adhelstone*], which was some time King of England, by his councillors, and other greater lords of the land, by common assent, for great default found among masons, they ordained a certain rule amongst them: one time of the year, or in 3 years as need were to the King and great lords of the land, and all the comonalty, from province to province, and from country to country, congregations should be made, by masters, of all masters, masons, and fellows, in the aforesaid art."[7]

[1] Land. [2] Years.

[3] In the original, obsolete words, having for their initial letter the Saxon *g*—written somewhat like the ȝ of modern English manuscription—formerly used in many words which now begin with *y*.

[4] Halliwell MS., lines 53-62.

[5] *Ibid.*, lines 471-480, 483-486: ordent, ordeynt, y-ordeynt, *ordained;* y-holde, *holden;* defautes, *defects;* uche, *each;* thrydde, *third;* mowe, *may;* y-swore, *sworn;* longuth, *belongeth;* everychon, *everyone;* Aldelston, *Athelstan.* The words within crotchets are placed there for the same reason as those in the preceding extract, to which attention has already been directed.

[6] *Ante*, p. 216.

[7] Cooke, The History and Articles of Masonry, pp. 101, 103. *Cf.* Addl. MS., 23,198, British Museum, lines 687-711, where a closer resemblance to the metrical reading will appear than can be shown by our modern printing types.

Having regard to the fact, that the authors or compilers of what are known as the Halliwell and Cooke MSS. availed themselves, in a somewhat indiscriminate manner, of the manuscript literature of their respective eras, without fettering their imaginations by adhering to the strict wording of the authorities they consulted, the similarity between the *excerpta* from the two writings which I have held up for comparison must be pronounced a remarkable one. The points on which they agree are very numerous, and scarcely require to be stated, though the omission of any mention whatever, in the selected passages from either work, of the long array of celebrities who, according to the later MSS., intervene between Euclid and Athelstan, as well as their concurrent testimony in dating the introduction of Masonry into England during the reign of the latter, must be briefly noticed, as tending to prove an "identity of reading," which, as we have seen, "implies identity of origin."[1]

It will be seen that Fort has expressed too comprehensive an opinion, in withholding from the Halliwell MS. the corroboration of any other ancient document, with respect to the statement concerning Athelstan. Upon the passage in the Masonic poem where this occurs,[2] the learned editor has elsewhere observed: "This notice of the introduction of Euclid's 'Elements' into England, if correct, invalidates the claim of Adelard of Bath,[3] who has always been considered the first that brought them from abroad into this country, and who flourished full two centuries after the 'good Kyng Adlestone.' Adelard translated the 'Elements' from the Arabic into Latin; and early MSS. of the translation occur in so many libraries, that we may fairly conclude that it was in general circulation among mathematicians for a considerable time after it was written."[4]

It does not seem possible that the "Boke of Chargys," cited at lines 534 and 641 of the Cooke MS., and which I assume to have been identical with the "olde boke" named in the poem,[5] can have been the "Elements of Geometry." The junior document (2) has: "Elders that were before us, of Masons, had these Charges written to them, as we have now in our Charges of the story of Euclid, [and] as we have seen them written in Latin and in French both."[6] This points with clearness, as it seems to me, to an uninterrupted line of tradition, carrying back at least the familiar Legend of the Craft to a more remote period than is now attested by extant documents. It has been forcibly observed that, "in all the legends of Freemasonry, the line of ascent leads with unerring accuracy through Grecian corporations back to the Orient," which, though correct, if we confine our view to the legendary history given in the manuscript *Constitutions*, is not so if we enlarge our horizon, and look beyond the "records of the Craft" to the further documentary evidence, which adds to their authority by extending the antiquity of their text.

The Halliwell and Cooke MSS. contain no mention of "Naymus Grecus," though they both take us back to an earlier stage of the Craft Legend, and concur in placing the inception of

[1] *Ante*, p. 206.

[2] Halliwell MS., lines 61, 62; *ante*, p. 221.

[3] "Euclid of Alexandria lived, according to Proclus, in the time of the first Ptolemy, B.C. 323-283, and seems to have been the founder of the Alexandrian school of mathematics. His best known work is his *Elements*, which was translated from the Arabic by Adelard of Bath about 1130" (Globe Encyclopædia, s.v. Euclid).

[4] J. O. Halliwell, Rara Mathematica, 2d edition, 1841, pp. 56, 57.

[5] Line 2. It should be borne in mind that the expressions, *boke of chargys* and *olde boke*, occur in the *first* legend only of either MS.

[6] Cooke, History and Articles of Masonry, pp. 61, 63.

Masonry, as an art, in Egypt. On this point the testimony of all the early Masonic documents may be said to be in accord.

Now, without professing an extravagant love of traditions, "these unwritten voices of old time, which hang like mists in the air," I do not feel at liberty to summarily dismiss this idea as a mere visionary supposition, a thing of air and fancy.

Later, we shall approach the subject of "degrees in Masonry," when the possible influence of the ancient civilisation of Egypt, upon the ceremonial observances of all secret societies commemorated in history, cannot but suggest itself as a factor not wholly to be excluded, when considering so important a question.

It may therefore be convenient, if I here temporarily abandon my main *thesis*, and taking the land of Masonic origin, according to the Halliwell and other MSS., as the text upon which to construct a brief dissertation, pursue the inquiry it invites, to such a point, as may render unnecessary any further reference to the "great clerk Euclid," and at the same time be of service in our subsequent investigation, with regard to the origin and descent of the degrees known in Masonry.

"The irradiations of the mysteries of Egypt shine through and animate the secret doctrines of Phœnicia, Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy." [1]

In the opinion of Mr Heckethorn, "the mysteries as they have come down to us, and are still perpetuated, in a corrupted and aimless manner, in Freemasonry, have chiefly an astronomical bearing." [2] The same writer, whose freedom from any bias in favour of our Society is attested by the last sentence, goes on to say—and his remarks are of value, as well from being those of a careful and learned writer, as by showing to us the historical relationship between Freemasonry and the Secret Societies of antiquity, which is deemed to exist by a dispassionate and acute critic, who is not of ourselves.

"In all the mysteries," he observes, "we encounter a God, a superior being, or an extraordinary man suffering death, to recommence a more glorious existence; everywhere the remembrance of a grand and mournful event plunges the nations into grief and mourning, immediately followed by the most lively joy. Osiris is slain by Typhon, Uranus by Saturn, Adonis by a wild boar, Ormuzd is conquered by Ahrimanes; Atys and Mithras and Hercules kill themselves; Abel is slain by Cain, Balder by Loke,[3] Bacchus by the giants; the Assyrians mourn the death of Thammuz, the Scythians and Phœnicians that of Acmon, all nature that of the great Pan, the Freemasons that of Hiram, and so on." [4]

As it is, however, with the mysteries of Egypt that we are chiefly concerned, I shall limit my observations on the mythological systems, to that of the country which according to the traditions of the Craft was the birth-place of Masonry.

The legendary life of Isis and Osiris, as detailed by Plutarch, tells us that Osiris had two natures, being partly god and partly man. Having been entrapped by the wicked Typhon[5] into a chest, he was thrown into the Nile. His body being with difficulty recovered by Isis,

[1] Heckethorn, Secret Societies of all Ages and Countries, 1875, vol. i., p. 78. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 22.

[3] *Cf.* Fort, The Early History and Antiquities of Freemasonry, pp. 408, 410.

[4] Heckethorn, Secret Societies of all Ages and Countries, vol. i., pp. 23, 24.

[5] Heckethorn observes—"Osiris symbolises the sun. He is killed by Typhon, a serpent engendered by the mud of the Nile. But Typhon is a transposition of Python, derived from the Greek word πύθω, 'to putrefy,' and means nothing else but the noxious vapours arising from steaming mud, and thus concealing the sun" (Secret Societies of all Ages and Countries, vol, i., pp. 67, 68).

and hidden, it was again found by Typhon, and the limbs scattered to the four winds. These his wife and sister Isis collected and put together, and Osiris returned to life, but not on earth. He became judge of the dead.[1]

Osiris, who is said to have been a king of Egypt, "applied himself towards civilising his countrymen, by turning them from their former indigent and barbarous course of life; he moreover taught them how to cultivate and improve the fruits of the earth; he gave them a body of laws to regulate their conduct by, and instructed them in that reverence and worship, which they were to pay to the Gods; with the same good disposition he afterwards travelled over the rest of the world, inducing the people everywhere to submit to his discipline, not indeed compelling them by force of arms, but persuading them to yield to the strength of his reasons, which were conveyed to them, in the most agreeable manner, in hymns and songs accompanied with instruments of music."[2]

Such a god was certain to play an important part in the funereal customs of the Egyptians; and we learn from Herodotus,[3] when writing of embalming, that "certain persons are appointed by law to exercise this art as their peculiar business; and when a dead body is brought them they produce patterns of mummies in wood, imitated in painting, the most elaborate of which are said to be of him, whose name I do not think it right to mention on this occasion."

Sir Gardner Wilkinson[4] has an interesting remark on the above passage "with regard to what Herodotus says of the wooden figures kept as patterns for mummies, the most elaborate of which represented Osiris. All the Egyptians who from their virtues were admitted to the mansions of the blessed were permitted to assume the form and name of this deity.[5] It was not confined to the rich alone, who paid for the superior kind of embalming, or to those mummies which were sufficiently well made to assume the form of Osiris; and Herodotus should therefore have confined his remark to those which were of so inferior a kind as not to imitate the figure of a man. For we know that the second class of mummies were put up in the same form of Osiris."

The discloser of truth and goodness on earth was Osiris, and what better form could be taken after death than such a benefactor? It is not very clear at what period the deceased took upon himself this particular form, though it seems possible that it was immediately after death; but it may be noticed that the term Osiris or Osirian[6] is not applied in papyri or inscriptions to the deceased before the time of the XIXth dynasty, or about 1460 years B.C. With the dead was buried a papyrus or manuscript—a copy of the Ritual, or Book of the Dead, as it is called. This work, although varying in completeness at different periods and instances, was, "according to Egyptian notions, essentially an inspired work; and the term Hermetic, so often applied by profane writers to these books, in reality means inspired. It is Thoth himself who speaks and reveals the will of the gods, and the mysterious nature of divine things in man. This Hermetic character is claimed for the books in several places, where 'the hieroglyphs' or theological writings, and 'the sacred books of Thoth,' the divine

[1] Plutarchi de Iside et Osiride Liber, Samuel Squire, Cambridge, 1744, p. 15 *et seq.*

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 16, 17. [3] Herod., ii. 86.

[4] Sir J. G. Wilkinson, Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians, edit. 1878 (Dr Birch), vol. iii., p. 473.

[5] "The Mysteries of Osiris," says Heckethorn, "formed the third degree, or summit of Egyptian initiation. In these the legend of the murder of Osiris by his brother Typhon was represented, and the god was personated by the candidate" (Secret Societies of all Ages and Countries, vol. i., p. 75).

[6] Birch, Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch., vol. viii., p. 141.

scribe, are personified. Portions of them are expressly stated to have been written by the very finger of Thoth himself, and to have been the composition of a great God."[1]

Dr Birch[2] continues in the valuable introduction to his translation of this sacred book: "They were, in fact, in the highest degree mystical, and profound secrets to the uninitiated in the sacred theology, as stated in the rubrics attached to certain chapters, while their real purport was widely different." "Some of the rubrical directions apply equally to the human condition before as after death; the great facts connected with it are its trials and justification. The deceased, like Osiris, is the victim of diabolical influences, but the good soul ultimately triumphs over all its enemies by its *gnosis* or knowledge of celestial and infernal mysteries."[3] In fact, it may be said that all these dangers and trials, culminating in the Hall of the two Truths, where the deceased is brought face to face with his judge Osiris—whose representative he has been, so to speak, in his passage through the hidden world,—only "represented the idea common to the Egyptians and other philosophers, that to die was only to assume a new form; that nothing was annihilated; and that dissolution was merely the forerunner of reproduction."[4]

Space would not allow, nor is it necessary here, to enter into a discussion of the various beliefs as to night and darkness being intimately connected with the creation and re-creation of existences. The Egyptians, we learn from Damascius, asserted nothing of the first principle of things, but celebrated it as a thrice unknown *darkness* transcending all intellectual perception. Drawing a distinction between night and the primeval darkness or night, from which all created nature had its commencement, they gave to each its special deity.

Death was also represented in the Pantheon, but was distinct from Nephthys, called the sister goddess in reference to her relationship to Osiris and Isis. As Isis was the beginning, so Nephthys was the end, and thus forms one of the triad of the lower regions. All persons who died, therefore, were thought to pass through her influence into a future state, and being born again, and assuming the title of Osiris, each individual had become the son of Nut, even as the great ruler of the lower world, Osiris, to whose name he was entitled when admitted to the mansions of the blessed. The worship of Death and Darkness, as intermediate to another form, seems to have been universal. Erebos, although personified, which in itself signifies darkness, was therefore applied to the dark and gloomy space under the earth, through which the shades were supposed to pass into Hades; indeed, all such ideas must have played an important part in the symbolical representations of the ancient mysteries.[5] Among the Jews darkness was applied to night, the grave, and oblivion alike, and we find the use of the well-known expression,—darkness and the shadow of death.[6]

The idea of death as a means of reproduction is beautifully expressed in the text:[7] "Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die it beareth

[1] Bunsen, Egypt's Place in Universal History, vol. v., 1867 (Birch), p. 134. [2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 136. [4] Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, vol. iii., p. 468.

[5] "In the mysteries all was astronomical, but a deeper meaning lay hid under the astronomical symbols. While bewailing the loss of the sun, the epopts were in reality mourning the loss of that light whose influence is life. . . . The passing of the sun through the signs of the Zodiac gave rise to the myths of the incantations of Vishnu, the labours of Hercules, etc., his apparent loss of power during the winter season, and the restoration thereof at the winter solstice, to the story of the death, descent into hell, and resurrection of Osiris and of Mithras" (Heckethorn, Secret Societies of all Ages and Countries, vol. i., pp. 19, 20).

[6] Job x. 21; xxviii. 3, etc. St John xii. 24.

much fruit." Baptism and reception into the Church by washing away, and entire change of condition, is, in fact, a form of death and new birth.

As bearing on this point, a carefully written article[1] by the late Rev. Wharton B. Marriott will well repay perusal. When explaining one of the terms used to designate baptism, he observes: *Terms of Initiation or Illumination.* "The idea of baptism being an initiation (*μύησις μυσταγωγία τελετὴ*) into Christian mysteries, an enlightenment (*φωτισμὸς, illuminatio, illustratio*) of the darkened understanding, belonged naturally to the primitive ages of the Church, when Christian doctrine was still taught under great reserve to all but the baptized, and when adult baptism, requiring previous instruction, was still of prevailing usage. Most of the Fathers interpreted the *φωτισθέντες*, 'once enlightened,' of Heb. vi. 4, as referring to baptism. In the middle of the second century (Justin M., *Apol.* II.) we find proof that 'illumination' was already a received designation of baptism. And at a later time (S. Cyril Hieros, *Catech. passim*) *οἱ φωτιζόμενοι* (illuminandi) occurs as a technical term for those under preparation for baptism, *οἱ φωτισθέντες* of those already baptized. So *οἱ ἀμύητοι* and *οἱ μεμυημένοι*, the uninitiated and the initiated, are contrasted by Sozomen, *H. E.*, lib. i., c. 3."

Much curious information will be found in the quotations from the *Catecheses* of St Cyril of Jerusalem,[2] with reference to the ritual of that city, A.D. 347. Those to be baptized assembled on Easter eve[3] in the outer chamber of the baptistry, and, facing towards the west, as being the place of darkness, and of the powers thereof, with outstretched hand, made open renunciation of Satan; then turning themselves about, and with face towards the east, "the place of Light," they declared their belief in the Trinity, baptism, and repentance. This said they went forward into the inner chamber of the baptistry.

The figurative language of St Cyril, we are told, makes evident allusions to the accompanying ceremonial of the Easter rite. This was celebrated, as is well known, on the eve and during the night preceding Easter Day. "The use of artificial light, thus rendered necessary, was singularly in harmony with the occasion, and with some of the thoughts most prominently associated with it."

This being a most important Catholic ceremony, it will not be uninteresting to give a short account of it from another source.

Dr England, in his description of the ceremonies of the Holy Week, in the chapels of the Vatican, observes: "On these days [Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of the holy week] the church rejects from her office all that has been introduced to express joy. The first invocations are omitted, no invitatory is made, no hymn is sung, the nocturn commences by the antiphon of the first psalm; the versicle and responsory end the choral chaunt, for no absolution is said; the lessons are also said without blessing asked or received; no chapter at Lauds, but the *Miserere* follows the canticle, and precedes the prayer, which is said without any salutation of the people by the *Dominus vobiscum*, even without the usual notice of *Oremus*. The celebrant also lowers his voice towards the termination of the petition itself; thus the *Amen* is not said by the people, as on other occasions, nor is the doxology found in any part of the service.

"This office is called the *tenebrae* or darkness. Authors are not agreed as to the reason. Some inform us that the appellation was given, because formerly it was celebrated in the

[1] Smith, Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, *art.* Baptism, p. 155.

[2] *Ibid.*, p 157.

[3] Easter Eve was the chief time for the baptism of catechumens.

darkness of midnight; others say that the name is derived from the obscurity in which the church is left at the conclusion of the office, when the lights are extinguished. The only doubt which suggests itself regarding the correctness of this latter derivation, arises from the fact, that Theodore, the Archdeacon of the holy Roman church informed Amalarius, who wrote about the year 840, that the lights were not extinguished in his time in the church of St John of Lateran on holy Thursday; but the context does not make it so clear that the answer regarded this office of mattins and lauds, or if it did, the church of St John then followed a different practice from that used by most others, and by Rome itself for many ages since."

"The office of Wednesday evening, then, is the mattins and lauds of thursday morning in their most simple and ancient style, stripped of every circumstance which could excite to joy, or draw the mind from contemplating the grief of the man of sorrows. At the epistle side of the sanctuary, however, an unusual object presents itself to our view: it is a large candlestick, upon whose summit a triangle is placed; on the sides ascending to the apex of this figure, are fourteen yellow candles, and one on the point itself. Before giving the explanation generally received respecting the object of it's present introduction, we shall mention what has been said by some others. These lights, and those upon the altar, are extinguished during the office. All are agreed that one great object of this extinction is to testify grief and mourning. Some writers, who seem desirous of making all our ceremonial find its origin in mere natural causes, tell us that it is but the preservation of the old-fashioned light which was used in former times when this office was celebrated at night, and that the present gradual extinction of its candles, one after the other, is also derived from the original habit of putting out the lights successively, as the morning began to grow more clear, until the brightness of full day enabled the readers to dispense altogether with any artificial aid. These gentlemen, however, have been rather unfortunate in generally causing all this to occur in the catacombs, into which the rays of the eastern sun could not easily find their way, at least with such power as to supersede the use of lights. They give us no explanation of the difference of colour in the candles which existed, and still exists in many places, the upper one being white and the others yellow, nor of the form of this triangle. Besides, in some churches all the candles were extinguished at once, in several by a hand made of wax, to represent that of Judas; in others, they were all quenched by a moist sponge passed over them, to shew the death of Christ, and on the next day fire was struck from a flint, by which they were again kindled to shew his resurrection. . . .

"The number of lights was by no means, everywhere the same; . . . and in some churches they were extinguished at once, in others at two, three, or more intervals. . . . In the Sixtine chapel there are also six upon the balustrade, which, however, are extinguished by a beadle, at the same time that those upon the altar are put out by the master of ceremonies; nor is the candle upon the point of the triangle, in this chapel, of a different colour from the others."

The explanation adopted by Dr England is that which informs us that the candles arranged along the sides of the triangle represent the patriarchs and prophets. John the Baptist being the last of the prophetic band, but his light was more resplendent than that of the others. The ceremony is based on the Redemption, and, preparatory to the closing scene, the last "remaining candle is concealed under the altar, the prayer is in silence, and a sudden

noise[1] reminds us of the convulsions of nature at the Saviour's death. But the light has not been extinguished, it has been only covered for a time; it will be produced still burning, and shedding its light around."[2]

As mentioned above, the ceremony of baptism was preceded by a formula of renunciation, pronounced by the catechumen. He was at that time divested of his upper garment, standing barefoot and in his *chiton* (shirt) only, being required to make three separate renunciations in answer to questions put to him whilst facing the west, and before he was turned towards the east.[3] The renunciation of something gone before was followed by a formal ceremony of admission; and this appears to have been the universal rule, as such admission necessarily indicated a change. Persons applying for admission to the Order were to stay at the gate many days, be taught prayers and psalms, and were then put to the trial of fitness in renunciation of the world, and other ascetical pre-requisites.[4]

Although monasticism, or the renunciation of the world, was widely established in Southern and Western Europe, it was the Rule founded by Saint Benedict, born A.D. 480, who died probably about 542, that gave *stability* to what had hitherto been fluctuating and incoherent. According to his system, the vow of self-addiction to the monastery became more stringent, and its obligation more lasting. The vow was to be made with all possible solemnity, in the chapel, before the relics in the shrine, with the abbot and all the brethren standing by; and once made, it was to be irrevocable—"Vestigia nulla retrorsum."[5]

"But the great distinction of Benedict's Rule was the substitution of study for the comparative uselessness of mere manual labour. Not that his monks were to be less laborious; rather they were to spend more time in work; but their work was to be less servile, of the head as well as of the hand, beneficial to future ages, not merely furnishing sustenance for the bodily wants of the community or for almsgiving."[6]

The Rule of St Benedict for some time reigned alone in Europe, and very many were the magnificent buildings raised by the care and energy of the members of the Order; it would be endless to enumerate the celebrated men the Order has produced.

As the first, and perhaps the greatest of all the religious Orders, and the one which, as before mentioned, fixed in a definite manner the *regulæ* or rules of such brotherhoods, it will not be out of place to give a short account of the formal ceremony of reception into the Order; the more particularly as it bears on the subject upon which I have lightly touched in the last few pages, viz., Darkness, as connected with death and initiation. I am indebted to Mr William Simpson, who himself witnessed the ceremony, for the following account:—

"St Paul's without the walls [of Rome] is a basilica church, and in the apse behind the high altar an altar had been fitted up. The head of the Benedictines is a mitred abbot. On this morning, the 1st Jan. 1870, the abbot was sitting as I entered the church, with mitre on head and crosier in hand. Soon after our entrance a young man was led up to the abbot, who placed a black cowl on his head. The young man then descended the steps, went on his knees, put his hands as in the act of prayer, when each of the monks present came up, and,

[1] Made by striking books together.

[2] Dr J. England, Bishop of Charleston, Explanation of the Ceremonies of the Holy Week in the Chapels of the Vatican, etc., Rome, 1833, p. 48 *et seq.*

[3] Smith, Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, p. 160.

[4] Fosbroke, British Monachism, 1843, p. 14.

[5] Smith, Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, *art.* Benedictine Rule, p. 187.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 189.

THE PROFESSION OF A BENEDICTINE MONK.



enigmatical phrases, the use of signs and symbols of recognition, may probably be ascribed to the period when the whole system was united to the worship of the Deities of Vengeance, and when the sentence was pronounced by the Doomsmen, assembled, like the Asi of old, before the altars of Thor or Woden. Of this connection with ancient pagan policy, so clearly to be traced in the Icelandic courts, the English territorial jurisdictions offer some very faint vestiges;[1] but the mystery had long been dispersed, and the whole system passed into the ordinary machinery of the law."[2]

Charlemagne, according to the traditions of Westphalia, was the founder of the Vehmic Tribunal; and it was supposed that he instituted the court for the purpose of coercing the Saxons, ever ready to relapse into the idolatry from which they had been reclaimed, not by persuasion, but by the sword.[3] This opinion, however, in the judgment of Sir F. Palgrave, is not confirmed either by documentary evidence or by contemporary historians, and he adds, "if we examine the proceedings of the Vehmic Tribunal, we shall see that, in principle, it differs in no essential character from the summary jurisdiction exercised in the townships and hundreds of Anglo-Saxon England."[4]

The supreme government of the Vehmic Tribunals was vested in the great or general Chapter, before which all the members were liable to account for their acts.[5] No rank of life excluded a person from the right of being initiated, and in a Vehmic code discovered at Dortmund, the perusal of which was forbidden to the profane under pain of death, three degrees are mentioned.[6] The procedure at the secret meetings is somewhat obscure. A Friegraff presided, while the court itself was composed of Freischöffen, also termed Scabini or Echevins. The members were of two classes, the uninitiated and initiated (*Wissenden* or *wise men*), the latter only, who were admitted under a strict and singular bond of secrecy, being privileged to attend the "Heimliche Acht," or secret tribunal.[7]

At initiation the candidate took a solemn oath to support with his whole powers the Holy Vehme, to conceal its proceedings "from wife and child, father and mother, sister and brother, fire and wind, from all that the sun shines on and the rain wets, and from every being between heaven and earth," and to bring before the tribunal everything within his knowledge that fell under its jurisdiction. He was then initiated into the signs by which the members recognised each other, and was presented with a rope and a knife, upon which were engraved the mystic letters S. S. G. G.,[8] whose signification is still involved in doubt, but which are supposed to mean *strick, stein, gras, grein*.[9]

The ceremonies of the court were of a symbolic character; before the Friegraff stood a

[1] *E.g.*, the strange ceremony of the "Gathering of the Ward Staff" in Ongar Hundred, possesses a similarity to the style of the Free Field Court of Corbey. See Palgrave, *op. cit.*, pp. cxliv., clviii.

[2] Palgrave, The Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth, 1832, Part II., p. clvi.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. clv. [4] Palgrave, *loc. cit.* *Ibid.*, p. cli.

[5] Heckethorn, Secret Societies of all Ages and Countries, vol. i., p. 200.

[6] Palgrave, *op. cit.*, pp. cxlix., cli.

[7] Heckethorn states that the initials S. S. S. G. G. have been found in Vehmic writings preserved in the archives of Hertfort, in Westphalia, and by some are explained as meaning *stock, stein, strick, gras, grein*, stick, stone, cord, grass, woe (Secret Societies of all Ages and Countries, vol. i., p. 201).

[8] Encyclopædia Britannica, 9th edit. For the preliminary procedure at the reception of a candidate, see Chap. V., p. 250.

table, on which were placed a naked sword and a cord of withe [or *willow twigs*].[1] There was no mystery in the assembly of the Heimliche Acht. Under the oak or under the lime-tree the judges assembled, in broad daylight and before the eye of heaven.[2]

"In England," observes Sir F. Palgrave, "the ancient mode of assembling the suitors of the Hundred 'beneath the sky,' continued to be retained with very remarkable steadiness. Within memory, at least within the memory of those who flourished when English topography began to be studied, the primeval custom still flourished throughout the realm." "It is remarkable," he continues, "that on the Continent there appears to be very few subsisting traces of popular courts held in the open air, except in Scandinavia and its dependencies, where the authority of Charlemagne did not extend; in Westphalia, where the Vehmic Tribunals retained, as I have supposed, their pristine Saxon law; and in 'Free Freisland,' the last stronghold of Teutonic liberty."[3]

During the proceedings of the Heimliche Acht all had their heads and hands uncovered, and wore neither arms nor weapons, that no one might feel fear, and to indicate that they were under the peace of the empire.[4] At meals the members are said to have recognised each other by turning the points of their knives towards the edge, and the points of their forks towards the centre of the table.[5]

Although the Vehmgerichte or secret criminal courts of Westphalia existed, at least in name, until as late as the middle of the eighteenth century,[6] the history of the Association or Society is still enveloped in the utmost obscurity. Like many other subjects, however, upon which the light of modern research has but faintly beamed, its consideration was essential in this history, though for any success which may attend the method of treatment which has been adopted, I am chiefly indebted to a long-forgotten article on "Ancient and Modern Freemasonry," from the pen of the late Dr Armstrong, Bishop of Grahamstown—an extract from which will conclude this dissertation.

According to the Bishop all the views formed of the Masonic body, stand, like Chinese women, on small feet, on the slender foundation of a few facts. The views, however, of the principal writers on the subject, he considers may be ranged into two classes,—the one maintaining that the fraternity was originally a corporation of Architects and Masons, employed solely on ecclesiastical works, composed of persons of all ranks and countries, and moving from place to place during the great church-building periods; the other asserting that it was a

[1] Mackey, Encyclopædia of Freemasonry, p. 878.

[2] Palgrave, *op. cit.*, p. cliv. The form of opening the court was probably by a dialogue between the Freigraff and an Echevin, as in the analogous procedure of the Free Field Court of Corbey (*Ibid.*, p. cxlv.). *Cf.* Fort, The Early History and Antiquities of Freemasonry, chap. xxv., *passim*.

[3] Palgrave, The Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth, Part II., p. clviii. *Cf. ante*, p. 229.

[4] Mackey, *loc. cit.*

[5] Heckethorn, Secret Societies of all Ages and Countries, vol. i., p. 201. Sir Walter Scott, in his novel "Anne of Geierstein," in which he unfolds to us somewhat of the mysterious history of the Holy Vehme, makes use of a judicial dialogue, the rhymes of which, by a perhaps excusable poetic licence, he has transferred from the Free Field Court of Corbey to the Free Vehmic Tribunal.

[6] Palgrave, Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth, Part II., p. clvii. According to Heckethorn it was not till French legislation, in 1811, abolished the last free court in the county of Münster, that they may be said to have ceased to exist; and not very many years ago, certain citizens in that locality assembled secretly every year, boasting of their descent from the ancient free judges (Secret Societies of all Ages and Countries, vol. i., p. 205).

secret society connected with the Templars, and merely using the terms and implements of the Mason's craft as a medium of secret symbolical communication.

Dr Armstrong endeavours to soothe these opposing writers by the assurance that there may be truth in both opinions; on which assumption, and having in a manner associated the Vehmic Tribunals and the Knights Templars, as we have already seen, by means of his classification of the metaphors and symbols used by the Freemasons, and by an allusion to the date of extinction of the latter as an Order, coinciding with that in which the fortunes of the former reached their culminating point,[1] observes: "We have now done our best for the two theories which we find floating about the world. Supposing that there is truth in both, it does not seem improbable to suppose that, at the time of the suppression of the Templars, a new secret society was then formed, which adopted the title of 'The Freemasons,' to escape suspicion; or that the Freemasons—which, as a working practical body, was on the point of dying away—was changed into a secret society; or perhaps the higher degrees, the inner circle, the *imperium in imperio*, merged themselves into a secret society."[2]

It has been already shown, that under the cloak of symbols, borrowed from the Egyptians, pagan philosophy crept into the Jewish schools, where it afterwards served as the foundation upon which the Cabbalists formed their mystical system.[3] The influence of the Cabbala upon successive schools of human thought, with direct reference to the possibility of the old world doctrines, having been passed on whole and entire to the Freemasons, has also been examined.[4] Still, it is necessary, or at least desirable, to add some final remarks to those which appear in Chapter XIII., for whilst, on the one hand, it is essential that old and obsolete theories should be decently interred and put out of sight, on the other hand we must be especially careful, lest in our haste some of the ancient beliefs are buried alive.[5] At the outset of this history, the use of metaphorical analogies, from the contrasts of outward nature, such as the opposition of light to darkness, warmth to cold, life to death, was pointed out as a necessary characteristic of all secret fraternities, who are obliged to express in symbolical language that relation of contrast to the uninitiated on which their constitution depends.[6] It is important, however, to recollect that in Freemasonry, we have literate, symbolical, and oral traditions, or in other words, our comprehension of the history and *arcana* of the Craft is assisted by letters, by symbols, and by memory. The comparative trustworthiness of the three sets of traditions becomes very material. Where their testimonies conflict, all cannot be believed, and yet to which of the three shall we award the palm? The point we have now reached is an appropriate one from which to consider the varied forms in which our Masonic traditions are presented to us.

Documentary evidence, craft symbolism, and oral relations, alike take us back to Egypt and the East.

In his "Contribution to the History of the Lost Word," Dr Garrison observes,—"The

[1] *Ante*, p. 229. In the *Monthly Review*, vol. xxv., 1798, p. 501, it is stated, on the authority of Paciandi (Antiquitates Christianæ, Romæ, 1755), that certain churches of the Templars in Lombardy bore the epithet "*de la mason*."

[2] The Christian Remembrancer, vol. xiv., 1847, pp. 5, 17, 18. In the opinion of Dr Armstrong, the Freemasons 'possess the relics and cast-off clothes of some deceased Fraternity." He says, "They did not invent all the symbolism they possess. It came from others. They themselves have equipped themselves in the ancient garb as they best could, but with evident ignorance of the original mode of investiture, and we cannot but smile at the many labyrinthine folds in which they have entangled themselves. They suggest to us the perplexity into which some simple Hottentot would fall, if the full-dress regimentals and equipments of the 10th Hussars were laid at his feet, and he were to induct himself, without instruction, into the mystic and confusing habiliments" (*Ibid.*, p. 12).

[3] *Ante*, p. 63. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 71 *et seq.* [5] *Cf.* Chap. I., p. 10. [6] *Ibid.*, pp. 11, 12.

tenets of the Essenes, and the doctrines of Pythagoras and the Cabbala are especially suggestive. Studied, as they all should be, in their relations to the Bible as the written Word of God, and the traditions and teachings of the lodge, they will, I am sure, furnish matter of continually increasing interest and instruction to every thoughtful student of the Fraternity, who may really desire more light."[1]

This view is supported by the authority of many writers of reputation, to whose works I have incidentally alluded in the course of this history, and it may be remarked that the vitality of Masonic theories is dependent not altogether upon books, but derives much of its force from the opinions expressed by eminent members of the Fraternity. Now, one of the most learned of English Masons, in recent times, according to popular repute, was the late Dr Leeson, who, in a lecture delivered at Portsmouth on July 25, 1862, states that Egypt was the cradle of Masonry. The mystic knowledge became known to the Essenes, hence arose the Jewish Cabbala, and in due process of transmission, Masonry became the inheritance of those philosophers of the Middle Ages who were known as Rosicrucians.[2] So far back as 1794, Mr Clinch remarked, "it is now grown into a popular demonstration in controversy, to show a thing derived from heathenism."[3] It would be difficult, even in these days, to point out a single ancient custom for which a pagan origin could not at least be plausibly assigned. The Egyptians were the first to establish a civilised society, and all the sciences must necessarily have been derived from this source.

According to Jewish tradition, the Cabbala passed from Adam over to Noah, and then to Abraham, the friend of God, who emigrated with it to Egypt, where the patriarch allowed a portion of this mysterious doctrine to ooze out.[4] It was in this way that the Egyptians obtained some knowledge of it, which has probably served as the foundation of authority upon which the passage in the "Old Charges," relating to Abraham, was originally inserted.[5] The mystical philosophy of the Jews is thus referred to in an essay bound up with, and forming part of, the "Book of Constitutions," 1738: "The CABALISTS, another *Sect*, dealt in hidden and mysterious Ceremonies. The Jews had a great Regard for this Science, and thought they made uncommon Discoveries by means of it. They divided their Knowledge into *Speculative* and *Operative*. DAVID and SOLOMON, they say, were exquisitely skill'd in it; and no body at

[1] Fort, The Early History and Antiquities of Freemasonry, appendix A., p. 474.

[2] Lecture delivered by Dr Leeson, Most Puissant Sov. Gr. Com. 33°, before the Royal Naval Chapter of Sovereign Princes of Rose Croix (Freemasons' Magazine, Aug. 2, 1862). Besides the statements in the text, the Doctor told his hearers a great many things which should have severely tested their credulity; *inter alia*, that under the Grand Lodge of 1722 it was decreed and enacted, that all craft lodges were to receive every 30° Mason with the highest honours, and in the words of the report, "he concluded a *very learned* and elaborate address, by stating that from the facts he had told them, every one would see that the 18th or Rose Croix degree had been practised so far back as the year A.D. 1400"! (*Ibid.*).

[3] Anthologia Hibernica, vol. iii., 1794, p. 423. "I shall show that the terms of Egyptian mystery have not merely been adopted in latter times, that they are coeval with Christianity, as their ceremonies have been imitated in all nations" (*Ibid.*, p. 424).

[4] Dr Ginsburg, The Kabbalah, 1865, p. 84; *ante*, p. 64.

[5] "Moreover, when Abraham and Sara his wife went into Egypt and there taught the vij Sciences unto the Egyptians, and he had a woorthy scholler, that height Ewcled, and he learned right well, and was a Mr. of all the vij Sciences" (No. 4—Grand Lodge MS.).

first presumed to commit it to *Writing*: But (what seems most to the present Purpose) the perfection of their Skill consisted in what the *Dissector*[1] calls *Lettering of it*,[2] or by ordering the Letters of a Word in a particular Manner."[3]

In order to estimate the comparative trustworthiness of literate, symbolical, and oral traditions, when in either case their aid is sought in lifting the veil of darkness which obscures the remote past of our Society, it will be necessary to pass in review the opinions of some writers, by whom the inferences deducible from symbols are held to outnumber and outweigh those handed down by letters or by memory. Thus, in the judgment of the historian, from whose interesting and instructive work on the "Secret Societies of All Ages and Countries" I have already quoted: "From the first appearance of man on the earth, there was a highly favoured and civilised race, possessing a full knowledge of the laws and properties of nature, and which knowledge was embodied in mystical figures and schemes, such as were deemed appropriate emblems for its preservation and propagation. These figures and schemes are preserved in Masonry, though their meaning is no longer understood by the fraternity. The aim of all secret societies, except of those which were purely political, was to preserve such knowledge as still survived, or to recover what had been lost. Freemasonry, being the *resumé* of the teachings of all these societies, possesses dogmas in accordance with some which were taught in the Ancient Mysteries and other associations, though it is impossible to attribute its origin to any specific society preceding it." Finally, according to this writer, Freemasonry is—or rather ought to be—the compendium of all primitive and accumulated human knowledge.[4]

From this flattering description I turn to one from the competent hand of the author of "The Early History and Antiquities of Freemasonry,"[5] but shall first of all seize the opportunity of saying a few prefatory words explanatory of the estimation in which I regard both the work referred to, and also its talented author. To slightly paraphrase the words of Sir F. Palgrave:[6] Whoever now composes the early history of Freemasonry has to contend against great disadvantages. All the freshness of the subject is lost, whilst many of the perplexities remain to be solved. Upon first consideration, it seems almost superfluous to multiply details of things popularly or vulgarly known, and equally objectionable to pass them over. Yet the historian will often find himself compelled to abridge what

[1] *I.e.*, Samuel Prichard. *Cf. ante*, pp. 9, 47.

[2] The Cabbala is divided into two kinds, the *Practical* and the *Theoretical*. The latter is again divided into the Dogmatic and the Literal. The Literal Cabbala teaches a mystical mode of explaining sacred things by a peculiar use of the letters of words, and a reference to their value. This is further subdivided into three species, Gematria—evidently a rabbinical corruption of the Greek γεω-μετρια—Notaricon, and Temura (Ginsburg, The Kabbalah).

[3] Constitutions, 1738, appendix, p. 221. Although the subject is headed "A Defence of Masonry, publish'd A.D. 1730. Occasion'd by a Pamphlet call'd Masonry Dissected" (*Ibid.*, p. 216). I am aware of no copy of earlier date than 1738. Dr Anderson is said to have been the author, but, besides being unlike any piece of composition *known* to be his, the thanks which are offered him at p. 226 of the Constitutions "for *printing* the Clever Defence," by a member of his own lodge—the "Horn," now Royal Somerset House and Inverness No. 4—who signs himself "Euclid," militate strongly against such a conclusion.

[4] Heckethorn, *op. cit.*, vol. i., pp. 248, 249.

[5] By G. F. Fort, 4th edit., Philadelphia (Bradley & Co.), 1881.

[6] History of Normandy and of England, vol. i., p. 94.

others have considered leading passages of history, and at the same time to invest with apparently disproportionate importance the topics which his predecessors have disregarded. If an edifice has one principal façade, the views taken by different artists will be pretty nearly the same; but this is not the case where there are diversified and irregular portions, presenting many fronts, each claiming attention for their use, ornament, singularity, or grandeur. The aspect selected in one picture will be seen only in rapid perspective in another, and in a third quite cast into the shade.

The artist cannot change his position whilst he is working, or represent the same thing under two aspects at a time. No persons can see the same object in the same way.

Therefore, instead of quarrelling with a writer because his mode of treating history differs from that which we should have preferred, we should rather thank him for affording us the opportunity of contemplating the Masonic Edifice from a position which we cannot reach, or in which we should not like to place ourselves. *Historians can never supersede each other.* No one historian can give all we wish, or teach all we ought to learn; neither can comparisons fairly be instituted between them, for no two are identical in their views, no two possess the same idiosyncrasies, the same opportunities, the same opinions, the same intentions, the same mind. History cannot be read off-hand; it must be studied—studied by investigation and comparison—otherwise it profits no more, perhaps less, than Palmerin of England or Amadis of Gaul.

Fort has succeeded, where all his predecessors have failed—that is in rendering the study of our antiquities an attractive task. This, of itself, is no slight merit, but the value of his work is by no means confined to its literary execution. The old-world libraries appear to have been ransacked to some purpose by the author, during his occasional visits to Europe, and we are the more disposed to admire the lucidity of the text, from the copious extracts and references to authorities, which, in the notes, attest, so to speak, the prodigality of his research. In chapter xxv. of his history, the symbolical traditions, which have come down to us, are closely examined, and compared with the cognate symbolism, and the metaphorical analogies of Gothic origin.

Thus he demonstrates beyond the shadow of a doubt, that many usages *now* in vogue among Masons had their counterparts, if not their originals, in the Middle Ages, but in two respects, as it appears to me, the analogy requires fortifying, if it is to sustain the natural inference which will be drawn from it by the generality of readers. Fort's "History" is one of those captivating works which are read by many who, though well informed on other subjects, are wholly unacquainted with the "Antiquities of Freemasonry," and are not really studying, or particularly curious, with respect to them. They do, however, almost unconsciously, or at least unintentionally, form an opinion respecting that subject "from broad general statements and little detached facts," one being very commonly given as if it were a sufficient voucher for the other, and both coming in quite incidentally as matters perfectly notorious—as matters so far from wanting proof themselves, that they are only brought in to prove other things.[1]

Now I am far from suggesting that at any portion of his history, Fort has withheld

[1] *Cf.* Dr Maitland's Observations on Dr Warton's History of English Poetry (The Dark Ages, 2d edit., note B.).

information from his readers, that in his judgment might have modified the conclusions at which they are asked to arrive on the authority of his personal statement. On the contrary, the positions advanced by this writer are frequently so fortified by references as to be conclusive beyond what the mind altogether wishes, but in the present instance, and in the exercise of an undoubted discretion—to which I have previously alluded, as the special province of the historian—having clearly established in his own mind certain *facts*, these appeared so incontrovertible as to justify the exclusion of the details by which they were supported. But no one, I am sure, would more heartily concur in the golden rule of criticism, that TRUTH is the great object to be sought, and not the maintenance of an opinion, because it was once expressed. *Evidence* must always modify critical opinions, when that evidence affects the data on which such opinions were formed; it must be so at least on the part of those who really desire to be guided on any definite principles.[1]

The parallelism which has been drawn between the symbolism of Freemasonry and that of institutions which flourished in the Middle Ages, is wanting in completeness. In the first place, and if we begin with the proceedings or usages of the latter upon which the analogy has been built up, I see no reason why any pause should be made in our inquiry when we reach the Middle Ages. That era, no doubt, as well as the societies or associations coeval with it, is interesting to the archæologist, if it fixes either a date or a channel, calculated to elucidate the transmission of Masonic science from the more remote past. Yet as the greater number, not to go further, of the analogies or similarities, which are so much dwelt upon, have their exemplars in the Mysteries—to the extent that they are identical—we might with as much justice claim Egypt as the land of Masonic origin,[2] as limit our pretensions to a derivation from the Vehmic Tribunals of Westphalia. In the Mysteries we meet with dialogue, ritual, darkness, light, death, and reproduction,[3] all of which reappear in the Benedictine ceremony of which a description has been given. It admits of no doubt that the rites and theological expressions of the Egyptians were of universal acceptation. Indeed, we are expressly told by Warburton—after remarking that the Fathers of the Church bore a secret grudge to the Mysteries for their injudicious treatment of Christianity on its first appearance in the world:—"But here comes in the surprising part of the story—that, after this, they should so studiously and affectedly transfer the *Terms, Phrases, Rites, Ceremonies*, and *Discipline* of these *odious Mysteries* into our holy Religion; and thereby, very early viciate and deprave, what a Pagan Writer (Marcellinus) could see and acknowledge, was ABSOLUTA & SIMPLEX, [perfect and pure] as it came out of the Hands of its divine Author."[4]

The objection I have hitherto raised to the theory which has been based upon the symbolical traditions of the Freemasons, is one rather of form than of substance, but the ground on which I shall next venture to impeach its value, goes to the root of the whole matter, and, unless my judgment is wholly at fault, clearly proves that the parallel sought

[1] *Cf.* Tregelles, The Greek New Testament, p. 43.

[2] This was, in effect, maintained by Mr Clinch, whose comparison of the ceremonies of the Pythagoreans and the Freemasons, where he instances no less than fifteen points of similarity, is prefaced by the words—"*The Pythagoreans introduced their mystic rites from Egypt*" (Anthologia Hibernica, vol. iii., 1794, pp. 183, 184; *ante*, Chap. I., p. 8).

[3] Chap. I., pp. 12, 15, 19.

[4] Divine Legation, vol. i., 1738, p. 172. *Cf. ante*, Chap. I., p. 16.

to be established, is unsupported by the only evidence which could invest it with authority.

If, indeed, many of the rites, symbols, and beliefs, *now* prevalent among Masons, correspond with, or are analogous to, those supposed to have been common to the members of earlier and distinct societies,[1] to what extent is this material in our consideration of the Freemasonry of Ashmole's time, and the Masonic "customs" referred to by Dr Plot?

De Quincey, in the volume of his general works, to which I have so frequently referred, very justly observes—"We must not forget that the Rosicrucian and Masonic orders were not originally at all points what they now are: they have passed through many changes, and no inconsiderable part of their symbols, etc., has been the product of successive generations."[2]

Without further referring to the Rosicrucian fraternity, than to direct attention[3] to where the Brethren of the Rosy Cross are stated to have been one of the intermediaries in passing on the mysterious learning of Egypt to our present-day Freemasons, it may be remarked, that the position taken by De Quincey is a sound one, and commends itself to our common sense.

On this principle, therefore, we might expect to find the speculative Masonry of our own time characterised by many features which were wholly absent from the earlier system. Yet if we accept the conclusions of writers who have carefully studied the comparative symbolism of past ages, it is clear, either that Masonry in its later growth, instead of changing in some degree its original character, has, on the contrary, gone back pretty nearly to the same point from which it is said to have first started, or that our speculative science was transformed into what it now is by the antiquaries and philosophers who were affiliated to the craft in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[4]

A passage from the "Defence of Masonry," first printed in 1730, and so highly esteemed by the compiler of the official "Book of Constitutions," as to have been incorporated by him in the second edition of that work, will be of service at this portion of our inquiry. The author of the *brochure* referred to, after stating that Freemasonry had been represented as being "an unintelligible Heap of Stuff and Jargon, without common Sense or Connection," thus proceeds: "I confess I am of another Opinion; tho' the *Scheme* of *Masonry*, as reveal'd by the *Dissector*,[5] seems liable to Exceptions: Nor is it so clear to me as to be fully understood at first View, by attending only to the *literal* Construction of the Words: And for aught I know, the *System*, as taught in the regular *Lodges*, may have some Redundancies or Defects, occasion'd by the Ignorance or Indolence of the old Members. And indeed, considering through what Obscurity and Darkness the *Mystery* has been deliver'd down; the many Centuries it has survived; the many Countries and Languages, and *Sects* and *Parties* it has run through; we are rather to wonder it ever arriv'd to the present Age, without more Imperfection. In short, I am apt to think that MASONRY (as it is now explain'd) has in some

[1] *Ante*, pp. 61, 62.

[2] Vol. xvi. (Suspiria de Profundis), p. 366.

[3] Chaps. I., p. 25; XIII., *passim*.

[4] Chaps. I., p. 13; XII., p. 19; XIII., pp. 60, 111, 114-116, 136-138; XVI., *sub anno* 1717.

[5] *I.e.*, Samuel Prichard.

Circumstances declined from its *original Purity!* It has run long in muddy Streams, and as it were, under Ground: But notwithstanding the great Rust it may have contracted, and the forbidding Light it is placed in by the *Dissector*, there is (if I judge right) much of the *old Fabrick* still remaining; the essential Pillars of the Building may be discover'd through the Rubbish, tho' the Superstructure be over-run with Moss and Ivy, and the Stones, by Length of Time, be disjointed. And therefore, as the BUST of an *old* HERO is of great Value among the Curious, tho' it has lost an Eye, the Nose, or the Right Hand; so MASONRY with all its Blemishes and Misfortunes, instead of appearing ridiculous, ought (in my humble Opinion) to be receiv'd with some Candour and Esteem, from a Veneration to its *Antiquity*."[1]

The preceding extract lends no colour to the supposition, that the Masonry known to the founders of the Grand Lodge of England retained what they believed to have been its pristine excellences. On the contrary, indeed, it is evident that in their opinion the ancient "Fabrick" had sustained such ravages at the hands of time and neglect, as to raise doubts as to *how much of it* was "still remaining."

The character of the Freemasonry, which existed after the era of Grand Lodges, will be examined in the next chapter, but the reference which I have just made to it will be sufficient for my present purpose, which is, to show the futility of all speculations with regard to a direct Masonic ancestry or descent, which attempt to link together two sets of circumstances peculiar to distinct bodies and eras, without some definite guiding clue which leads directly *upwards* or *backwards*, the one from the other.

It is perfectly clear, that how much soever we may rely upon what is termed "a chain of evidence," everything will depend upon the connection and quality of its links, and if, so to speak, several of the latter are missing, our chain will be, after all, only an imaginary one, whilst the parts can only be separately used, and to the extent that the links are united.

Whatever conformity of usage, therefore, may be found in the proceedings of Lodges and of the old Gothic tribunals, it will be expedient to test the weight of the analogy by considering how far the former may be held to represent the Masonic customs of times remote from our own.

Among the ancient customs so graphically depicted by Fort, and which he compares with those of the Freemasons, there are three to which I shall briefly allude. These are—the formal opening of a court of justice with a colloquy;[2] the Frisian oath—"I swear the secrets to conceal (*helen*), hold, and not reveal;"[3] and the "gait" or procession about their realms made by the Northern Kings at their accession, imitated in the Scandinavian laws, under which, at the sale of land, the transfer of possession was incomplete until a circuit had been made around the property.[4]

[1] Dr Anderson, The New Book of Constitutions, 1738, p. 219.

[2] Fort, The Early History and Antiquities of Freemasonry, p. 268.

[3] "Schwur das heilige geheimniss zu helen, hüten u. verwahren, vor mann, vor weib, vor dorf, vor trael, vor stok, vor stein, vor grasz, vor klein, auch vor queck" (*Ibid.*, p. 318, citing Grimm, Deutsche Rechts Alterthümer, pp. 52, 53). "Whoever will collate the foregoing triplets with the oath administered in the Entered Apprentice's Degree, cannot fail to avow that both have emanated from a high antiquity, if not from an identical source" (Fort, *loc. cit.*).

[4] Fort, *op. cit.*, p. 321.

To take the last custom first, Fort, after citing it, institutes the following parallel:

"During the installation ceremonies of the Master of a Masonic lodge, a procession of all the craftsmen march around the room before the Master, to whom an appropriate salute is tendered. This circuit is designed to signify that the new incumbent reduces the lodge to his possession in this symbolic manner."[1]

In all these ceremonies vestiges appear of the rite of circumambulation, or worship of the sun, to which I briefly alluded in my concluding observations on the Companionage.[2] It prevailed extensively in Britain. The old Welsh names for the cardinal points of the sky—the north being the left hand and the south the right—are signs of an ancient practice of turning to the rising sun.[3] When Martin visited the Hebrides, he saw the islanders marching in procession three times from east to west round their crops and their cattle. If a boat put out to sea, it began the voyage by making these three turns. If a welcome stranger visited one of the islands, the inhabitants passed three times round their guest. A flaming brand was carried three times round the child daily until it was christened.[4] It will be seen that, for the existence of a custom upon which a portion of the installation ceremony may have been *modelled*, we need not look beyond the British Isles, where the usage may be traced back to very ancient times. Indeed, an accurate writer observes: "The survival in remote districts of the habit of moving 'sun-wise' from east to west, may indicate the nature of the processions in which the British women walked, 'with their bodies stained by woad to an Ethiopian colour.'"[5]

But after all, this adoration of the sun which is unconsciously imitated by the Freemasons in their lodges, establishes an historical conclusion which is more curious than important. There is no evidence to show that the *degree* of Installed Master was invented before the second half of the eighteenth century, and at this day the Masters of Scottish Lodges are under no obligation to receive it.[6]

The remaining points of resemblance which await examination, between the proceedings of lodges and those of the old Gothic Tribunals, are the formal opening of both with a colloquy, and the oath or obligation administered by their authority.

To what extent, these, or any other portions of the existing lodge ceremonial, are *survivals* of more ancient customs, cannot be very accurately determined, but the evidence, such as it is, will

[1] Fort, *op. cit.*, p. 321.

[2] Chap. V., p. 250.

[3] J. Rhys, Lectures on Welsh Philology, 1877, p. 10; Revue Celtique, vol. ii., p. 103.

[4] M. Martin, Account of the Western Islands of Scotland, 1716, pp. 113, 116, 140, 241, 277; Elton, Origins of English History, 1882, p. 293.

[5] Elton, *loc. cit.*, quoting Pliny, Hist. Nat., xxii. 2.

[6] Laws and Constitutions of the Grand Lodge of Scotland, 1879, pp. 2, 3. In the edition of these Constitutions in vogue in 1852, it is laid down—"The Installation of the whole of the office-bearers of a Lodge, including the Master, shall be held in a just and perfect lodge, *opened in the Apprentice Degree*, whereat, at least, three Masters, two Fellow-crafts, and two Apprentices must be present; or failing Craftsmen and Apprentices, the same number of Masters, who, for the time being, shall be held of the inferior degree" (Chap. xxi., Rule XXI.).

The postscript to the general Regulations in Dr Anderson's "Book of Constitutions," 1723, alludes to the Master of a new lodge being taken from among the *Fellow-crafts*, and installed by "certain significant Ceremonies and ancient Usages;" after which he installs his wardens. This is very vague, but as it bears in the direction of the *third* or Master Mason's degree, having been conferred on the actual Master of Lodges, I give it a place in this note. The point will again come before us.

by no means justify the belief, that the derivation of any part is to be found in the sources which are thus pointed out to us.

The mode of opening the proceedings of a court, or society, by a dialogue between the officials, may be traced back to a very remote era; but it will be sufficient for my purpose to remark, that as the Vehmic ceremonies, of which this was one, were of "Old Saxon" derivation,[1] they must have been known in Anglo-Saxon England long before the time of Charlemagne. Vestiges of their former existence were recorded, as we have seen, by Sir F. Palgrave, as existing so late as 1832.[2]

The Frisian Oath, with which Fort has compared the obligation of the Apprentice in Freemasonry, may be further contrasted with the last clause or article of Sloane MS. 3848 (13), of which the concluding words are:

"These Charges that we have rehearsed & all other y^{t} belongeth to Masonrie you shall keepe; to y^{e} vttermost of yo^{r} knowledge; Soe helpe you god & by the Contents of this booke."[3]

That the extract just given, places before us the precise words to which Ashmole signified his assent, on being made a Free Mason at Warrington on October 16, 1646, cannot of course be positively affirmed, but it is fairly inferential that it does. The copy of the "Old Charges," from which it is taken, was transcribed *on the same day*—presumably for use—by Edward Sankey, the son, it is to be supposed, of Richard Sankey, one of the Freemasons present in the lodge.[4] But without going this length, we may assume with confidence, that the final clause of the Sloane MS. (13) gives the *form of oath*, which, at the date of its transcription, was ordinarily administered to the candidates for Freemasonry. This, indeed, derives confirmation from the collective testimony of the other versions of our manuscript "Constitutions," to which, and in connection with the same subject—the admission of Ashmole—I shall again refer.

Fort has carefully reviewed the circumstances which led, in his judgment, to "the perpetuation of Pagan formularies used in the Gothic courts, and the continuation of mythological rites and ceremonies in mediæval guilds;" and these, he considers, have "conjointly furnished to Freemasonry the skeleton of Norse customs, upon which Judaistic ritualism was strung."[5]

The passages in which his arguments are given are too long for quotation, and would lose much of their force by being summarised. I shall therefore content myself with presenting the following short extract from his work, in which will be found the general conclusions at which he has arrived:

[1] *Ante*, p. 229 *et seq.*

[2] Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth, Part II., p. clvi.; *ante*, p. 230.

[3] See, however, the forms of oath given in Chaps. II., p. 100; VIII., p. 423; XIV., p. 183; and Hughan's "Old Charges" (11), p. 57. "Bode, a learned German, maintains that it [Freemasonry] is of English origin. He proves this from the form of oath in which the perjured are threatened with the punishment determined by the English laws for those guilty of High Treason—that of having their entrails torn out and burnt; and in which it is said besides, that he shall be thrown into the sea, a cable's length, where the tide ebbs and flows twice in twenty-four hours" (J. J. Mounier, On the Influence attributed to the Philosophers, the Freemasons, and the Illuminati upon the French Revolution, translated by J. Walker, 1801, p. 133).

[4] Chap. XIV., p. 142.

[5] Fort, The Early History and Antiquities of Freemasonry, p. 388.

"Old Teutonic courts were a counterpart of such heathen symbols and ceremonies as the priesthood manipulated in the celebration of religious services.[1] When, therefore, the junction occurred which united the Gothic and Jewish elements of Freemasonry, by the merging of the Byzantine art corporations into the Germanic guilds in Italy, the Norsemen contributed the name and orientation, oaths, dedication of the lodge, opening and closing colloquies, Master's mallet and columns, and the lights and installation ceremonies. On the other hand, Judaistic admixture is equally well defined. From this source Masonry received the omnific word, or the faculty of Abrac[2] and ritualism, including the Hiramic legend."[3]

The legend of Hiram, which has crept into our oral traditions, will demand very careful consideration, but it is first necessary that we should resume our examination of the "Old Charges." I shall therefore bring this dissertation to a close by presenting a final quotation from the essay of Dr Armstrong, which, while somewhat humorously enlarging upon a portion of the traditionary history of the Craft, open to deserved censure from the uncritical treatment it had met with up to the date of the Bishop's observations, will, so to speak, take us back to the "Legend of Masonry," at the exact point where our study of it must recommence.

The Doctor observes: "There are minds which seem to rejoice in the misty regions of doubt, which see best in the dark, which have a sensation of being handcuffed when they are tied to proofs and documents; they despise those stubborn facts, the mules of history, on which safe historians are content to ride down the crags and precipices of olden times, 'Inveniam viam, aut faciam;' I will find my facts, or make them; so say the masonic writers. They have the same contempt for plain plodding historians which we can conceive a stoker of the Great Western dashing out of Paddington would feel for an ancient couple, could such be seen jogging leisurely out of town in pillion-fashion on their old sober mare, with the prospect of a week's journey to Bath. They drive the 'Express trains' of history. While we are groping and floundering amid the fens and bogs of the seventh, and eighth, and ninth centuries, they look upon such times as the mere suburbs of the present age—'the easy distance from town.' They dash past centuries, as railroad trains whisk by milestones. For ourselves we see nothing of Freemasons before the seventh century; we cannot even scent the breath of a reasonable rumour. But if we put ourselves under the charge of the most sober and matter-of-fact of Masonic historians, away we are skurried from the seventh century to the sixth, from the sixth to the fifth, from the fifth to the fourth, to the third, to the second, till with dizzy heads, and our breath gone, we find ourselves put down by the Temple of Solomon."[4]

The preceding remarks having taken us back to one of the leading features of the legendary as well as of the traditional history of the Craft, the thread of our main inquiry may be here resumed.

According to the evidence of the "Old Charges," King Solomon was a great protector of

[1] See pp. 226-229, 236. A colloquy ensued, at the "Profession" of a Benedictine, between the abbot and the candidate (Fosbroke, British Monachism, 1843, p. 179).

[2] According to the same authority, "the Wey of Wynnynge the Facultye of Abrac," when properly understood, "signifies the means by which the lost word may be recovered, or, at least, substituted." See chapter xxxvi. of the work quoted from above, *passim*; Gould, The Four Old Lodges, p. 42, note 3; and *ante*, Chap. XI., p. 488.

[3] Fort, The Early History and Antiquities of Freemasonry, p. 406.

[4] Ancient and Modern Freemasonry, Christian Remembrancer, vol. xiv., 1847, pp. 18, 19.

the Masons, and from this monarch it was that Naymus Grecus—whose protracted and adventurous career might have suggested the fable of the Wandering Jew—acquired the knowledge of Masonry, which, some eighteen centuries later, he successfully passed on to Charles Martel.

In a work of great pretension, and which I am informed still retains its hold of the popular judgment, it is laid down—"After the union of speculative and operative Masonry and when the Temple of Solomon was completed, a legend of sublime and symbolical meaning was introduced into the system, which is still retained, and consequently known to all Master Masons."[1]

At a later portion of his life, however, Oliver seems to have shaken off a good deal of the learned credulity which deforms his earlier writings, as will appear from the following extracts, which I take from his "Freemason's Treasury"[2]:—"Freemasonry is confessedly an allegory, and as an allegory it must be supported, for its tradition at history admits of no palliation."

"One unexplained tradition is the origin of Masonic degrees, which is placed at a thousand years before the Christian era, viz., at the building of King Solomon's Temple, and that they were brought into existence by three distinguished individuals."[3]

The Doctor then states at some length his reasons for considering that the Third is a modern degree. If found to be puerile or erroneous, he asks that they may be rejected; but if sound, as he believes them to be, they may tend, he thinks, "to restore the primitive dignity of Masonry, at the risk of dissipating many a pleasing illusion—as the child who is in the seventh heaven of delight at reading an interesting fairy tale, becomes vexed and annoyed when he discovers that it is only a senseless fable."[4]

The *title* of Master Mason, which may or may not, at its original establishment, have been dignified with the rank of a separate degree, in the opinion of the Doctor—and his conclusions are corroborated by the "Ancient Charges"—"was strictly confined to a Master in the chair."[5] "It was known only as the *Master's Part*, and comprised within such narrow limits," that he is disposed to think "the ceremony and legend together would not be of five minutes' duration."[6] His final judgment is, that "our present Third Degree is not architectural, but traditionary, historical, and legendary; its traditions being unfortunately hyperbolical, its history apocryphal, and its legends fabulous."[7]

Dr Oliver next informs us that "the name of the individual who attached the aphorism of H. A. B. to Freemasonry has never been clearly ascertained; although it may be fairly presumed that Brothers Desaguliers and Anderson were prominent parties to it, as the legend was evidently borrowed from certain idle tales taken out of the Jewish Targums, which were published in London A.D. 1715, from a manuscript in the University Library at Cambridge; and these two Brothers were publicly accused by their seceding contemporaries of manufacturing the degree, *which they never denied.*"[8]

The italics are those of Dr Oliver, but it may be observed, that as both Anderson and Desaguliers had been many years in their graves, when the earliest publication of the seceding

[1] Dr G. Oliver, The Historical Landmarks of Freemasonry, 1846, vol. ii., p. 169.

[2] 1863, p. 290. [3] Oliver, Freemason's Treasury, 1863, p. 217. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 220.

[5] "In ancient times no Brother, however skilled in the Craft, was called a Master Mason until he had been elected into the chair of a Lodge" (Ancient Charges, Book of Constitutions, London, 1873, pp. 7, 8).

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 288. [7] *Ibid.*, pp. 222, 223. [8] *Ibid.*, p. 288.

or "Atholl" Masons saw the light, their silence, even under the severe strictures passed by Laurence Dermott in the successive editions of his work, upon all who took part in the early proceedings of the first Grand Lodge of England, is not to be wondered at. This statement of Oliver's has been, however, so frequently copied in later Masonic works, that it requires to be noticed, though I shall only add to the remarks already made, that the entire story is unattested, and therefore unworthy of any further consideration.

The point, indeed, as to *when* the Hiramic Legend was introduced into Freemasonry is a material one, and its determination must rest largely upon conjecture, though I shall do my best to narrow the debatable period within which it became an integral part of our oral traditions.

In the first place, the story or legend derives little, if any confirmation from the language of the "Old Charges," and here the comparative trustworthiness of the traditions preserved by letters and by memory becomes a consideration of great importance. Our written traditions remain what they were[1] rather more than three centuries ago, but the same cannot be positively affirmed with regard to our oral traditions. Putting aside, however, the operation of natural causes, upon which alone the relative infidelity of the latter might be allowed to rest, let us see if there is distinct evidence that will strengthen this conclusion.

As a preliminary, it will be desirable to ascertain what the manuscript Constitutions actually say with regard to Hiram and the legend of the Temple.

The judgment I have myself formed of the community of tradition which we find in the legendary histories of Freemasonry and the Companionage, I shall at once express, though, for obvious reasons, the grounds upon which it is based will be more conveniently stated, when in the next chapter I deal with the system of Masonry dating from 1717.

Shortly stated, then, I am of opinion that, whatever difficulties may appear to exist in tracing the Hiramic Legend in the Companionage to an earlier date than 1717, the inference that it can be so carried back, problematical as it may be, affords perhaps the only—and certainly the best—justification for the belief, that in Freemasonry, the legend of Hiram the builder, ante-dates the era of Grand Lodges.

Hiram is not mentioned in either the Halliwell (1) or the Cooke (2) MSS., though he is doubtless alluded to in the latter, where the "King's son, of Tyre," is said to have been Solomon's "Master masen." The Lansdowne MS. (3) has the following, in which the remaining *Constitutions* for the most part substantially agree: "And he [Iram] had a Sonne that was called *Aman*, that was Master of Geometry, and was chiefe Master of all his Masonrie, & of all his Graving, Carving, and all other Masonry that belonged to the Temple."

The name, however, appears in varied forms and spellings, *e.g.*: Amon, Aymon, Anon, Aynone, Ajuon, Dyan, and Benaim. Generally, the Book of Kings is cited as the source of authority whence the information is derived; but in none of the documents is there any special prominence given to the personage thus described. The fullest account is contained in the Inigo Jones MS. (8), which runs:

[1] It has, however, been maintained by Laplace, that the diminution in the value of testimony, which is produced by oral repetition through a series of persons, extends to the tradition of written testimony, through a series of generations (Essai Philosophique sur les Probabilités, 5me édit., p. 15). See, however, the counter remarks of Dunnou, Cours d'Etudes Historiques, tom. i., pp. 20-26; and of Sir P. Lewis, On the Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics, vol. i., p. 199.

"And HIRAM, King of Tyre, sent his servants unto SOLOMON, for he was ever a Lover of King *David;* and he sent *Solomon* Timber and workmen to help forward the Building of the *Temple;* And he sent one that was Named HIRAM * ABIF, a widow's Son, of the Line of *Nephtali;* He was a Master of *Geometry,* and was [the head] of all his Masons, Carvers, Ingravers, and workmen, and Casters of Brass and all other Metalls that were used about the Temple."

* First of Kings, vii., xiv.

With this single exception, the "Old Charges" do not make any approach towards a full quotation from the Scriptural account of Hiram, nor, if their orthography can be relied upon as a criterion, could the various scribes, in the generality of instances, have been aware of the identity of the "Master of Geometry" whose personality they veiled under such uncouth titles, with the widow's son of Tyre.

The silence of the old records of the Craft, with respect to Hiram having figured as a prominent actor in proceedings which were thought worthy of commemoration in the Masonic ceremonial, will suffice to show that at the time they were originally compiled, the legend or fable with which his name has now become associated, was unknown.

There are circumstances, however, apart from the testimony of the "Old Charges," which will enable us to form, in some measure, an independent judgment with regard to the antiquity of this tradition.

First of all, there is the opinion of Sir William Dugdale, and the statement in the "Antiquities of Berkshire"[1] that the Society took its origin in the reign of Henry III., which must at least record a popular Masonic belief. Next, it will be convenient, if we consider the character of the Freemasonry into which Ashmole and Randle Holme were admitted, as, should the result of the inquiry show us what it really *was*, we at the same time may learn what it could *not* have been.

In so doing, however, I shall limit our investigation to an examination of the facts which are already in evidence. A faint outline of the Freemasonry of the seventeenth century is all that I shall attempt to draw.

It is quite possible that between the era of the Chester Lodge (1665), of which Randle Holme was a member, and that of the formation of the Grand Lodge of England, many evolutionary changes may have occurred. The proceedings, however, of the few lodges that can be traced between the date of Dr Plot's remarks on the Freemasons of Staffordshire[2] (1686) and the establishment of a governing body of the Craft in 1717, do not come within the purview of the current chapter, and will be hereafter examined with some detail. A comparison of the Masonry of Scotland with that of England will in like manner be postponed until a later stage of this history.

The method of treating the general subject which I am about to adopt, will, I trust, meet with approval. The characteristic features of the systems of Freemasonry which are found to have prevailed in the two kingdoms are slightly dissimilar; and though I entertain no doubt whatever as to their both having a common origin, this fact, if it be one, will find readier acceptation by my presenting the Scottish and the English evidence in separate divisions, prior to combining the entire body of facts as a whole, and judging of their mutual relations.

[1] *Ante*, pp. 6, 17.

[2] *Ante*, p. 168.

In England none of the speculative or non-operative members of the Craft, of whose admission in the seventeenth century there is any evidence, were received as apprentices. All appear, at least so far as an opinion can be formed, to have been simply *made* Masons or Freemasons. The question, therefore, of grades or degrees in rank does not crop up; though it may be incidentally mentioned that, in the Halliwell MS. (1), it is required of the apprentice that—

> "The prevystye of the chamber telle he no mon,
> Ny yn the logge whatsever they done:
> Whatsever thou heryst, or syste hem do,
> Telle hyt no mon, whersever thou go."[1]

And in the same poem it is distinctly laid down that at the Assembly—

> "And *alle schul swere the same ogth*
> Of the masonus, ben they luf, ben they loght,
> To alle these poyntes hyr byfore
> That hath ben ordeynt by ful good lore."[2]

In Scotland the practice, though not of a uniform character, was slightly different, as I have in part shown, and shall more fully explain in the next chapter.

Ashmole, it may be confidently assumed, was *made a Mason* in the form prescribed by the "Old Charges," a roll or scroll, containing the Legend of the Craft, or, as I have suggested, the copy made by Edward Sankey (13) must have been read over to him,[3] and his assent to the "Charges of a Freemason" were doubtless signified in the customary manner.

Up to this point there is no difficulty, but the question next arises, what *secrets* were communicated to him? On this point I shall again quote from Dr Oliver, but rather from the singularity of his having cited the Sloane MS. (13) in connection with some remarks on Ashmole's initiation, than for any actual value which the allusion possesses. To a certain extent, however, it corroborates the view I have expressed with regard to the comparative silence of the "Old Charges" respecting Hiram. After misquoting the diary of the antiquary, and making the members of the Warrington Lodge "FELLOW-CRAFTS," he argues that "there could not have been a Master's degree in existence," and adds, "this truth is fully corroborated in a MS. dated 1646, in the British Museum,[4] which, though expressing to explain *the entire Masonic ritual*,[5] does not contain a single word about the legend of Hiram or the Master's degree."[6]

The evidence from which we can alone form an estimate, of the secrets communicated to Masonic initiates in the seventeenth century, is of a very meagre character. For the time being,

[1] Halliwell MS., lines 279-282. Prevystye, *privities*; logge, *lodge*; heryst, *hearest*; syste, *seest*.

[2] *Ibid.*, lines 437-440. Schul, *shall*; oght, *oath*; luf, *willing*; loght, *loath*.

[3] "*These* be all the Charges and Covenants that ought to be had read at the makeing of a Mason or Masons." "The Almighty God who have you and me in his keeping, Amen" (Lansdowne MS., No. 3, *conclusion*). *Cf. ante*, pp. 239, 240, and Chap. II., Nos. 18, 30, and pp. 92, 98.

[4] Identified by the Doctor as Sloane MS. 3848 (13).

[5] It is almost unnecessary to say, that it does no such thing, but the Doctor is rarely so imprudent as to name the "old manuscripts" he quotes from.

[6] The Freemason's Treasury, p. 284.

and for the reasons already stated, I exclude from consideration the history of the Scottish Craft. As regards the Freemasonry of South Britain, the only founts from which we can draw, are Plot's "Natural History of Staffordshire,"[1] Aubrey's "Natural History of Wiltshire,"[2] and Harleian MS. 2054 (12).[3] These concur in the statement that the Freemasons made use of "*signs*," and from the two last named we learn that the signs were accompanied by words.

Here I pass for the present from the question of degrees, a subject I cannot further discuss without transgressing the limits I have prescribed to myself, and which will be treated with some fulness hereafter. For the same reasons, and until the same occasion, my observations on the inferences to be drawn from the similarities between our Masonic customs and those peculiar to the Steinmetzen and the Companionage, will also be postponed.

Some other features, however, of our own Masonic records still await examination.

In his notes on MS. 2, the late Mr Cooke observes, with regard to lines 621-624, "This is to the free and accepted, or speculative, Mason, the most important testimony. It asserts that the youngest son of King Athelstan learned practical Masonry in *addition* to speculative Masonry, for of that he was a master. No book or writing so early as the present has yet been discovered in which speculative Masonry is mentioned, and certainly none has gone so far as to acknowledge a master of such Craft. If it is only for these lines, the value of this little book to Freemasons is incalculable."[4]

Upon this, it has been forcibly remarked, "The context explains the word 'speculative.'—And after that was a worthy king in England that was called Athlestan, and his youngest son loved well *the science of geometry*, and he wist well that hand-craft had the science of geometry so well as masons, wherefore he drew him to council and learned [the] practice of that science to his speculative, for of speculative he was a master." "The practice of that science," says the commentator, whose words I reproduce, "what science? clearly, geometry? This 'speculative' was a knowledge of geometry, and the word '*no*' should be inserted to make sense before hand-craft. 'He wist well that [*no*] hand-craft had the practice of the science of geometry so well as masons. It also appears that the writer of the book [*i.e.*, Addl. MS. 23,198] did not consider *speculative* knowledge as making the possessor a Mason, for he writes, 'and became a Mason himself,' *i.e.*, when he had added the *practice* of that science to his speculative. He was, clearly, not a Mason when only in possession of the speculative science."[5] The conclusion arrived at by this writer is, that "Masonry was an *art* and *science*, and, like all other working bodies, had its apprentices and free members, and also its peculiar regulations; that speculative Masonry implied merely an acquaintance with the science; that circumstances rendered it a convenient excuse for secret meetings; and that its professors have availed themselves of every source to throw a mystery around their ritual, and to make it of as much importance as they can."[6]

As bearing upon the use of the word "Speculative," an expression, the import of which has been but imperfectly grasped by members of the Craft, the following quotations may not be uninteresting. Lord Bacon observes:

[1] *Ante*, p. 163. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 6. [3] *Ante*, p. 183; Chap. II., p. 64.
[4] History and Articles of Masonry, p. 151, note *k*.
[5] Freemasons' Magazine, Jan. 31, 1863, p. 84.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 85.

"These be the two parts of natural philosophy—the Inquisition of Causes, and the production of Effects; Speculative, and Operative; Natural Science, and Natural Prudence. ∴ ∴ Both these knowledges, Speculative and Operative, have a great connexion between themselves."[1]

Worsop, speaking of M[aster] Thomas Digges, says—"All Surveiors are greatly beholding unto him, because he is a lanthorne unto them, aswel in the speculation, as the practise."

And of another—"He understandeth Arithmetike, Geometrie, and perspectiue, both speculatiuely and practically singularly wel."[2]

John Dee in his "Mathematical Preface to Billingsley's Elements of Geometry," writes: "A Mechanicien, or a Mechanicall workman is he, whose skill is, without knowledge of Mathematicall demonstration, perfectly to work and finishe any sensible worke, by the Mathematicien principall or deriuatiue, demonstrated or demonstrable. Full well I know, that he which inuenteth, or maketh these demonstrations, is generally called *A Speculatiue Mechanicien:* which differreth nothyng from a *Mechanicall Mathematicien.*"[3]

In the "Lexicon Technicorum" of John Harris, we find—"Geometry is usually divided into *Speculative* and *Practical;* the former of which contemplates and treats of the Properties of continued Quantity abstractedly; and the latter applies these Speculations and Theorems to Use and Practice, and to the Benefit and Advantage of Mankind."[4]

The early Masons possessed the *science*, and practised the *art* of building. The traditionary or mythical Edwin "lernyd" *practical* Masonry, in addition to *speculative* Masonry, of which he was already a Master. By this we must understand that he had studied geometry, and comprehended the *theory*, so far as his mathematical knowledge could lead him—but wished to add the practice of the art to the knowledge of its principles.

The "Edwin" tradition has been rationalised by Woodford, who believes that "it points to Edwin, or Edivin, King of Northumbria, whose rendezvous once was at Auldby, near York, and who in 627 aided in the building of a stone church at York after his baptism there, with the Roman workmen."[5] The clue to this solution, is indeed to be found, as Woodford states, in the famous "speech" delivered by the historian of York on December 27, 1726, wherein he says, "yet you know we can boast that the first Grand Lodge ever held in *England* was held in this city, where *Edwin*, the first Christian King of the *Northumbers*, about the Six Hundredth year after *Christ*, and who laid the Foundation of our Cathedral, sat as Grand Master."[6] The preceding statements have been closely examined by Fort, who is of opinion that from the evidence, but one conclusion can be drawn, namely, "that in the year 627 King Edwin could not have been Grand Master of a body of skilled Craftsmen, because there

[1] The Works of Francis Bacon, edited by James Spedding, 1857, vol. iii., p. 351.

[2] A Discoverie of sundrie errours and faults daily committed by Lande Meaters. Lond., 1582, fol. K.

[3] London, 1570, a. iii. *verso.*

[4] Second edit., MDCCIV., *s.v.* Geometry. See further Jacques Aleaume, La perspective speculative et Pratique, Paris, 1643; T. Bradwardinus, Geometria Speculativa, Parisiis, 1530; J. de Muris, Arithmeticæ Speculativæ, Moguntiæ, 1538; E. Phillips, The New World of English Words, 1658; Batty Langley, The Builders' Compleat Assistant, 1738; John Nisbet, System of Heraldry, Speculative and Practical; and *ante*, Chap. II., No. 50.

[5] Preface to the "Old Charges," p. xiv. "Tradition sometimes gets confused after the lapse of time, but I believe the tradition is in itself true, which links Masonry to the Church building at York by the Operative Brotherhood under Edwin in 627, and to a guild charter under Athelstan in 927" (*Ibid.*).

[6] Speech delivered at a Grand Lodge in the City of York, Dec. 27, 1726, by the Junior Grand Warden [Francis Drake]. This oration has been reprinted by Hughan in his "History of Freemasonry at York," Appendix C.

was at that time no such assembly around the walls of his rude edifice of stone and mortar at York; and for the additional reason that an uncivilised ruler had no recognition as the head of artificers whose science represented centuries of exalted periods of civilisation."[1]

Not, however, to pursue to any greater length the purely architectural portion of this tradition, which, so carefully scrutinised by Fort, has been further dealt with by Rylands[2] in a series of articles to which it will be sufficient to refer, I may shortly state, that I cannot agree with the former as regards the period of origin which he assigns to the legend.[3]

Before terminating this chapter, it may not be out of place if I mention that heraldry has its myths as well as Masonry, and in the opinion of its earlier votaries, has been presumed to exist, not merely in the first ages of the world, but at a period—

> "Ere Nature was, or Adam's dust
> Was fashioned to a man!"

We are gravely assured by a writer of the fifteenth century, that "heraldic ensigns were primarily borne by the hierarchy of the skies."[4]

The gentility of the great ancestor of our race is stoutly maintained, and by an enthusiastic armorist of the seventeenth century, two *coats of arms* were assigned to him. One as borne in Eden, and another suitable to his condition after the fall.[5]

This antediluvian heraldry is expatiated upon by Sir John Ferne, in a manner far too prolix for us to follow him through all his grave statements and learned proofs. I shall therefore only observe *en passant*, that arms are assigned to the following personages, all of whom we meet with in the legend of the Craft, viz., Jabal, the inventor of tents, *vert, a tent argent* (a white tent in a green field); Jubal, the primeval musician, *azure, a harp, or, on a chief argent three rests gules;* Tubal-Cain, *sable,* a *hammer argent, crowned or;* and Naamah, his sister, the inventress of weaving, *In a lozenge gules, a carding-comb argent.*[6]

"A knight was made before any cote armour, whereof *Olibion* was the first that ever was. *Asteriall* his Father, came of the line of that woorthie gentleman *Iapheth*, and sawe the people multiplie hauing no gouernor, and that the cursed people of *Sem* warred against them. *Olibion* being a mightie man and strong, the people cryed on him to be their gouernor. A thousand men were then mustered of *Iaphetes* line. *Asteriall* made to his Sonne a garland of nine diuerse precious stones in token of Cheualrie, to bee the Gouernor of a thousand men. *Olibion* kneeled to *Asteriall* his Father, and asked his blessing: *Asteriall* tooke *Iaphetes* Fauchen [Falchion] that *Tubal* made before the fludde, and smote flatling nine times upon the right shoulder of *Olibion*, in token of the nine vertues of the foresaid precious stones, with a charge to keepe the nine Vertues of Cheualrie."[7]

[1] Fort, The Early History and Antiquities of Freemasonry, p. 443.

[2] The Legend of the Introduction of Masons into England (Masonic Magazine, April 1882; Masonic Monthly, August, November, and December 1882).

[3] *Ante*, p. 219. *Cf.* Chap. XII., pp. 57, 59; and Woodford, The connection of York with the History of Freemasonry in England (Hughan, Masonic Sketches and Reprints, Part ii., Appendix A).

[4] Cited by M. A. Lower, The Curiosities of Heraldry, 1845, p. 2.

[5] *Ibid.*, citing Morgan, Adam's Shield, p. 99.

Ferne, Blason of Gentrie, 1586.

[7] Gerard Leigh, Accedence of Armorie, 1597, pp. 23, 24.