

EMBLEMATIC
FREEMASONRY

ARTHUR EDWARD WAITE



EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

And the Evolution of its Deeper Issues

By

ARTHUR EDWARD WAITE

LONDON

WILLIAM RIDER & SON, LIMITED

8 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.4

1925

280

Printed in Great Britain by
NEILL & Co., LTD., EDINBURGH.

PREFACE

IT is the design of the following studies to present in an ordered sequence the chief aspects which have been assumed by Emblematic Freemasonry, its connections and developments in the course of their progress through the past two centuries. While the work is not historical in character, it marks epochs which belong themselves to history. Behind its purely modern subject there lie the records of the English Operative Craft, and in front there are the hopes and plans of the higher mind of Masonry for the years to come and a new world in the making. The first and last studies, which dwell upon these things, are like a prologue and epilogue to the collection at large. They are of that from which it has derived and of that into which it may evolve : between them I am concerned chiefly with deeper issues of symbolism, the sources—where traceable—of what may be termed fundamental tradition exhibited in the various Rites, and—outside these—with the relation of Rites to certain great factors of European history.

The membership of Masonic Orders is counted by millions throughout the countries of the civilised world : it is of all languages, peoples and climes. In addition to the chief Rites there is a great number of minor observances which are current at the present day, while there are extant the records of others, almost innumerable, which were once active and a few of them widely diffused in the past of the eighteenth century. There is also a large and ever-expanding literature which testifies in various ways and from many standpoints to the high import

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

of the Masonic subject in the rational understanding thereof. For those outside the circles, as well as for those who are within, it must be presented to the mind not alone as an active region which has a beginning, middle and end of purpose, but as of serious and living consequence. I have sought to offer an individual understanding of its meaning, of that which it expresses and implies in respect of spirit and object, of that to which it may lead those who can accept its message at the best and highest, and after what manner it may itself unfold from within, presenting indefectible titles to the new world which will issue from those crucibles that are melting down the old order of things.

In its root-matter Masonry is described as belonging to the realm of allegory and symbolism, from which it should follow that it has one meaning on the surface and another beneath, while in the logic of this world of images it is held that things which are within are greater than those that are without, some secret matter not to be imparted lightly or some great truth which is capable of illustration and adornment by recourse to images and types. According to a technical definition of CRAFT MASONRY the symbolical and allegorical vestures are used to veil morality, the practical lessons of which are, however, enforced openly in its THREE DEGREES. But a wider and more suggestive understanding of that which is placed in the hiddenness will open before us if we take the term cited in the sense of Louis Claude de Saint-Martin, when he describes the whole universe as a parable which will unfold ultimately into a grand morality. The absolute morality is deeper than any ethics: in creation it is the cosmic meaning, and in the soul of man it is the sense of eternal purpose. The Degrees of ENTERED APPRENTICE and FELLOW CRAFT contain ethical teaching which all who hear can grasp, and the MASTER GRADE has also its moral lesson concerning honour and good faith. But the Craft Traditional History embodies more than these: it is a morality put forth in a mystery, beyond which things there is the

PREFACE

body-general of the High Grades and there is the spirit informing these.

Among those which are entitled to count, the ORDER OF KNIGHTS TEMPLAR is no less emblematic than are the CRAFT DEGREES, and as much may be said of ROSE CROIX. They are levies on the world of images, and their external procedure is without appeal or valid significance apart from that which is implied within. There are others in the same category, subsisting under their proper veils and standing therefore for more than they express openly. To this sub-surface meaning it happens, however, that not one of them offers a key. So also, while Craft ethics are mainly confined to the lessons derived from an allegorical consideration of working tools, the import of figurative building and that which lies behind the Mystery of Raising are left for those who can find them. The Grand obediences which govern the various Rites do not adjudicate thereon, and the whole question lies open therefore to those—if any—whom it concerns, for their individual settlement. Individual schemes of interpretation have been offered there and here, from those of solar mythology to those which regard the whole alleged science, its art and craft, as a conspiracy against Church and Throne. Having observed the course of its evolution in the pages that follow, I have placed that personal construction on the undeclared purpose which is justified by the content of the Rites and can give them place and title in the age to come. Within and without the Orders there are those and many who are looking in such directions for new light on “the holy spirit of man” and the Divine Ends of being. In the future before us those Instituted Mysteries which deal with any other subject will find their claims made void.

It should be said in conclusion that many of the papers which make up the present volume were delivered originally as lectures at Masters' Lodges, Lodges of Research, Preceptories of KNIGHTS TEMPLAR and so forth. There is explained in this manner the fact that at the opening of certain studies a few

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

sentences look back upon ground which has been travelled. It would not have been difficult to reconstruct these portions, but I have let them remain as they are since there is no serious repetition, and being records and memorials of personal activities in the Masonic subject it is not without consequence to myself to preserve them, so far as possible, in their original form.

A. E. WAITE.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	PAGE V
-------------------	-----------

I

INTIMATIONS FROM THE OLD RECORDS

Grand Lodge and its Book of Constitutions—The Charges of Operative Freemasonry—Their leading Principles—Testimony of the Regius MS.—Devotion to Christ and His Church—Doctrine of the Trinity—The Old and New Constitutions—The Digest of Anderson—Imperilled Titles of the Past—Loss of the Masonic Keystone—Rise and Nature of Speculative Masonry—Development of Ritual—Contrasted Atmosphere of the Old Craft—New Spiritual Aspects—Saving Office of the High Grades	I
--	---

II

THE ACCEPTION AND ROBERT FLUDD

Obscure Origin of Speculative Masonry—Old Dreams and Modern Reveries—The Case of Elias Ashmole—Masons' Company—The Acception and its Mystery—Robert Fludd and the Rosy Cross—His Position and Influence—Possible connection with Accepted Masons—Accepted Masons as possible Hermetic Students—Fludd and Spiritual Building	21
---	----

III

ANCIENT YORK MASONRY

Whence came the Third Degree?—And whence its Traditional History?—Possibilities of Old York Masonry—York and the Building Art—A Great Masonic Centre—Claim of its Grand Lodge—York and the Royal Arch—A Fifth Degree in Freemasonry—York and Arch Origins—The Crypt of York Minster—Evidence of Godfrey Higgins—A Plea for further Research	46
---	----

IV

THE MYSTICAL QUEST IN FREEMASONRY

Fact of the Quest—The Word in the Master Grade—The Quest which follows therefrom—Circumstances of its Suspension—The Royal Arch—Its Term of Quest Attained—The Kind of Attainment—The Craft as Ethics—The Arch as Religion—Import of this Distinction	71
---	----

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

PAGE

V

MASONIC TRADITION AND THE ROYAL ARCH

- The Craft as Symbolism—The Arch and its supposed Event—
Symbolism of the Word—The Arch implies a Tradition—
Sources of the Tradition in Israel—Its Development in High
Grades 92

VI

THE SECOND BIRTH OF MASONRY IN CONTINENTAL RITES

- The Great Developments of Masonry—Secret of the Success achieved
by the First Grand Lodge—The Fact of Ritual—The Continent
and Masonry—Transformation of the Rite abroad—Genesis of
High Grades—The Strict Observance—Masonic Chivalries—
Hermetic and Rosicrucian Rites 110

VII

GRADES OF THE SECRET TRADITION

- The Word in Masonry—The Secret Tradition behind it—The
Tradition in its various Aspects—Inefficacy of the Cryptic Rite
—The Royal Arch of Enoch—A Plenary Exposition in the Grade
of Grand Elect 125

VIII

CHRISTOLOGY OF THE SECRET TRADITION

- The Old and the New Masonry—How the Word and its Secret were
transmitted to Christian Times—How its Keepers embraced the
New Covenant—Testimony of various Grades—A Hidden Rite
and its Testimony—The Transformed Strict Observance—Its
Resurrection of Hiram—The Chivalry of the Holy City 142

IX

THE CHIVALRY OF THE HOLY TEMPLE

- Speculative Masonry espoused to Christian Knighthood—The Craft
and its alleged Origin in Chivalry—The Story of Masonic
Knighthoods—Knights of the Holy Sepulchre—Templar
Masonry—The Story of its Rites and Grades 163

X

THE DEVELOPMENT OF VENGEANCE GRADES

- The Voice of Accusation—A New Spirit alleged in High Degrees—
Accusers and their Equipment—An Examination of Ritual Texts
—The Knights of Palestine—Knight of the Temple—The Early
Kadosh and its Testimony—The Witness of Memphis and
Mizraim—Pike and his Thirtieth Degree—Other Grades of the
Scottish Rite—General Conclusion 188

CONTENTS

XI

PAGE

THE ALLEGED MASONIC PERIL

- Freemasonry and the Latin Church—Papal Bulls—An Attempted Answer of Albert Pike—Anti-Masonry and its Dossier—The *Morning Post* and the Cause of World Unrest—Examination in full of the Charges—Conclusion thereupon 220

XII

THE PLACE OF MASONRY IN THE RITES OF INITIATION

- Higher Mind of Masonry—Behind and Before—The Over-Soul—Some Hostile Views—The Inward Spirit—Validity of Masonic Secret Tradition—Meaning behind Tradition—A New Way of regarding Masonic Allegories—Masonry and Mystical Experience—Profound Figurative Mystery of the Masonic Subject—A word to those who are concerned—Of Masonry as realised in Christ 253

APPENDIX

- I. William Stukeley. II. Master's Ceremony at York. III. The Second Sense of Ritual. IV. The Quest in Mysticism. V. Sacramental Masonry. VI. Concerning Unspotted Offerings in Masonry. VII. Grade of Sublime Knight. VIII. A Supreme Masonic Pontificate. IX. Secrecy and Subversion 277

- INDEX 298

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

I

INTIMATIONS FROM THE OLD RECORDS

IN the year 1717, when four Lodges of London combined to establish themselves under the denomination of a GRAND LODGE, with the laudable hope of infusing new life into apparently perishing institutions, that to which they belonged and from which they derived their being was old Operative Masonry. There are no records in evidence to let us know what they were doing during the immediately preceding years, but in respect of life and activity there happens to be a single witness who sought initiation some short time after the epoch-making event, and who affirms that there was great difficulty in collecting sufficient people to assist at the Ceremony of Admission, whatever it was.¹ Such was the position of affairs when a GRAND LODGE is supposed to have been in quarterly session, and we can imagine what went before. The ruling,

¹ This was Dr William Stukeley, who kept a DIARY, according to which he was made a Mason at the Salutation Tavern in Tavistock Street on January 6, 1721, or in the fourth year after GRAND LODGE was founded. He adds to what I have stated in the text above that immediately after "it took a run and ran itself out of breath through the folly of its members." This is the considered opinion of one who frequented Lodges after his initiation, for example, on June 24 of the same year, when the Duke of Montagu was proclaimed Grand Master, on May 25, 1722, and on the following June 25, when the Duke of Wharton was elected and when a Ceremonial was approved for Installing a Master of a Lodge. Stukeley was himself the Master of a Lodge in November of the same year. In 1726 he is said to have founded a Lodge at Grantham.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

such as it was in each of the four Lodges, was that of a Master and Wardens,¹ for corresponding Officers were at the head of the MASONS' COMPANY in common with other liveries, though it is evident that the Company had no jurisdiction over individual Lodges, was not *ipso facto* their GRAND LODGE of a kind, and was not consulted when they decided to "cement" under a Grand Master. The MASONS' COMPANY had as much and as little control over Operative Lodges as the Goldsmiths have at this day over workers in precious metals or the Vintners over taverns and wine-bars.

Four years after the foundation of GRAND LODGE it issued instructions—as all men know in these days—to one of its members, namely, James Anderson, to digest certain so-called GOTHIC CONSTITUTIONS "into a new and better method."² They were called otherwise CHARGES, and contained REGULATIONS, STATUTES or ARTICLES, together with legendary matter passing in the guise of history, and so forth. Nominally at least it was under these Laws that the thing called Freemasonry was abiding in the early months of the year 1717, prior to the great event of the Apple Tree Tavern, and so it continued *ex hypothesi*, otherwise more or less, until 1723, when Anderson's first printed BOOK OF CONSTITUTIONS replaced the GOTHIC MSS. It is obvious, therefore, that if we would know at first hand that which was Operative Masonry, regarded as a Guild and Fellowship, we must have recourse to these documents, which are comparable to its Articles of Association. But as it does not happen that I am writing a history of Operative Freemasonry, or am concerned with any adventure comparable thereto even in baldest summary, it must be understood that I am called to speak only of their essential and pervading spirit,

¹ At the Apple Tree Tavern in 1717 it is on record that they put the oldest Master Mason in the Chair.

² The quaint and not too clear wording of this statement is that of James Anderson in the second BOOK OF CONSTITUTIONS, 1738, or at a period when the word Gothic was almost a term of reproach. It suggested that the OLD CHARGES—to which it had never been applied previously—were antiquated, uncouth and hence in need of revision.

INTIMATIONS FROM THE OLD RECORDS

because it is this only which belongs to my subject. There are RULES which govern Masters, there are POINTS for Craftsmen and Apprentices, but I have dealt with these elsewhere.¹ There are traditional histories of the rise, progress and migrations of Masonry, stories of the children of Lamech, stories of Tubal Cain, of Abraham and Hermes, Euclid and Pythagoras, of the Crowned Masters and St Alban, of Charlemagne, Athelstan, Edwin and Henry VI, to some of which I must refer at a much later stage. My task at the moment is to exhibit the great leading principles which overshadowed all the laws and some of the fables, and thereafter to ascertain how far they were preserved or abrogated when Speculative Masonry supplanted the Operative Guild and Anderson's CONSTITUTIONS took the place of the GOTHIC MEMORIALS.

The oldest of all these documents is called the REGIUS MS., because it belongs to that important collection in the British Museum, and it is referred to the end of the fourteenth century or the earlier part of the fifteenth, with 1430 as a limit on the hither side. As the prototypes of all Masons it distinguishes the Four Crowned Masters who died at Rome for the maintenance of the Law of Christ.² The Laws which govern Masonry

¹ Both are summarised in my NEW ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF FREEMASONRY, i, 137, 138, on the basis of the typical examples found in the REGIUS MS. It is the Craftsman in particular who is commanded to "love God well and also Holy Church," the Master presumably being otherwise sufficiently instructed on this point. If it is to be assumed that the TEW MS. is not in reality later than 1534—though 1680 is now the favoured date—there are three codices of the OLD CHARGES which are earlier than the English Reformation: otherwise they are reducible to two, being the REGIUS and COOKE MSS.

² St Alban was also a patron of English Masons, for, according to a legend of the COOKE MS., it was he who first gave them a CONSTITUTION for their guidance. We hear also of St Amphibalus, a supposed master of St Alban and, I think, also of St Stephen, but not of other Martyrs and Confessors in the OLD CHARGES. St John's Day in the Winter, St John's Day in the Summer, and the Festival of St Thomas kept by Mother Kilwinning, are Masonic derivations from observances of Catholic times rather than from Masonic documents: they are like the hallowed title of Mary's Chapel at Edinburgh, signifying that this Lodge was dedicated to the Blessed Virgin. They are witnesses of Masonic lineage. Compare

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

are to be kept by Masters and Craftsmen as their prototypes kept the Divine Law, which is also put into their hands as the rule of a strict observance. The Craftsmen to this end shall love God and His Holy Church, shall invoke the aid of the Almighty that they may be faithful and true in respect of the Fellowship and its covenants, shall live chastely, shall eschew all pride and covetousness, shall lift up their hearts to Christ, shall assist at Holy Mass¹ with becoming reverence, using a particular prayer—which is given at full length—when the priest hallows the elements.² As the Masters who employ labour are exhorted to be steadfast, true and just, doing nothing

Gould's *CONCISE HISTORY*, p. 261: "In the great majority of the [Scottish] Lodges, the Festival of St John the Evangelist was kept as a day of feasting and rejoicing."

¹ See, however, my *NEW ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF FREEMASONRY*, i, 137, in which it is pointed out that the Masonic part of the *REGIUS MS.* ends with line 580, and *ibid.*, p. 139, where it is said that two independent texts have been joined together. It follows at first sight that what appears in the text above is contingent on the validity of this criticism. The evidence that may be produced against it is one of similarity in style between the doggerel verse of the earlier and later part. The religious and Christian nature of the *REGIUS MS.*, its insistence on duty towards God in heaven and His church on earth, remain in either case. An alternative view is that it is composite in character, drawing from several sources. Mr R. F. Gould cites the *LAY FOLKS MASS BOOK*, *BOOK OF CURTESYE*, *MERITA MISSÆ* and *INSTRUCTIONS FOR A PARISH PRIEST*—all well-known early English texts—as taxed for excerpts by the author of the *REGIUS POEM* in that portion which deals with "good behaviour in Church." So also the Masonic part is held by him and generally to be derived from an earlier *BOOK OF CHARGES*, to which the *COOKE MS.* owed a similar debt. Gould on his own part is indebted to Dr W. Begemann. See *CONCISE HISTORY OF FREEMASONRY*, pp. 204 *et seq.* To carry the question further would involve a critical examination of the sources cited and of their assigned or probable date, as compared with that of the *REGIUS MS.* The fact which alone concerns us is that however composite, however derived in respect of materials, and however it may have mixed matters belonging to the Craft with others which originally did not, the *REGIUS MS.* as such, and as it now stands, was produced for the use and good ruling of Masters, Craftsmen and Apprentices.

² And when the Gospel ys y-done
A₅ayn thou my₃th knele adoun :
On bothe thy knen down thou falle,
For Hys love that bou₃ght us alle ;
And when thou herest the belle ryng
To that holy sakerynge,

INTIMATIONS FROM THE OLD RECORDS

to reflect shame on the Craft, so shall those in his service strive in all manners to stand well in the Law of God. In a word, the REGIUS MS. is like the Points and Articles for the well-ruling of a Heavenly School in the guise of a trade on earth.¹

There is no other CHARGE or CONSTITUTION which corresponds to this description in its plenary sense, but the seal of religious devotion is impressed on all : (1) by the Divine Invocation which so often introduces the text ;² (2) by the

Knele 3e most, bothe 3ynge and olde,
And bothe 3or handes fayr upholde,
And say thenne yn thys manere,
Fayr and softe, withoute bere :
Jhesu Lord, welcome Thou be,
In forme of bred, as y The se.
Now Jhesu, for Thyn Holy Name,
Schelde me from synne and schame ;
Schryff and housel Thou grant me bo,
3yer that y schal hev nus go,
And very contrycyon of my synne,
That y never, Lord, dye thereynne ;
And as Thou were of a mayde y-bore,
Sofre me me never to be y-bore ;
But when y schal hev nus wende
Grant me the blysse withoute ende.
Amen, amen, so mote hyt be.
Now, swete Lady, pray for me.—Lines 633-656.

It is implied by line 644 that the day of communion in both kinds and the day of the Intincted Host had alike passed. The Mass of the REGIUS MS. might have been celebrated without wine or chalice.

¹ Compare the formula in the next earliest or COOKE MS. : " It behoveth them first principally to [love] God and His Holy Church and all Hallows, and his master and his fellows as his own brethren."

² From those which are earliest to the last in date of all the spirit is the same, and the kind of external distinction is whether it happens that worship is addressed to " God, our Glorious Father," as in the COOKE MS., or more frequently to the Holy Trinity. " Thanks be to Thee our gracious God, Father of heaven and of earth, and of all things that in them are, that He has vouchsafed to give power unto men," in a variant of the same text quoted by Halliwell, may be compared with the REGIUS : " Pray we now to God Almighty and to His Mother Mary bright," and with the BUCHANAN MS., referred to 1660-1680, and its invocation of " Three Persons in one Godhead." It is in reality idle to cite the manifold readings of later texts, as for example : (1) " Thanked be our Glorious God, Father and Former of heaven and earth . . . that He would vouchsafe of His Glorious Godhead for to make so many things of divers virtues for mankind," etc., in

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

duty of love, honour and truth in respect of God Almighty and His Holy Church which appears everywhere, in most cases at the head of all the Points ;¹ and (3) by an insistent direction to avoid heresy and error in matters of religion.² When it happens, moreover, that a Pledge or Oath is mentioned, it is imposed and taken under Divine Sanction, in the Name or Presence of God. It follows that the Fraternity of Masons from its first records at the end of the fourteenth century to the GRAND LODGE period and even thereafter, so far as Lodges continued apart from that Obedience, was a Christian and Trinitarian Institution, comparable at this day to the MILITARY AND RELIGIOUS ORDER OF THE TEMPLE, which covenants its Masonic Chivalry to maintain and defend the Holy Christian Faith against the attacks of the infidel.³

We are now in a position to understand the true status of Operative Masonry as a material craft and art which dwelt *sub specie æternitatis*, so far at least as concerned its Sacred Rule.

WATSON MS. ; and (2) the valediction of the FOXCROFT MS. of 1699, which prays that the Almighty God of Jacob "have you and me in His keeping" and "bless us now and for ever."

¹ Compare the REGIUS First Point for Craftsmen, each of whom "must love well God and Holy Church, and his master and fellows," with YORK No. 4 of 1693, which covenants the Apprentice "that he shall be true to God and the Holy Church, the prince, his master and dame whom he shall serve."

² The BUCHANAN MS. reads : "That you use no heresy nor errors in your understanding to distract men's teachings," for which rather doubtful sentence the THOMAS N. EMBLETON MS., of *circa* 1680, substitutes : "That you use no heresy nor error by your understanding or by the teaching of discreet men," which does not help matters ; but the WAISTELL MS. of 1693 tries to cut the knot of the difficulty by saying simply : "That you use no heresy nor error to your understanding," though perfect sense is still wanting to the charge. It is interesting to note the recurring covenant, to maintain orthodox doctrine, in post-Reformation texts.

³ The REGIUS MS. recites the fact of the Oath only, saying that all shall swear it, "ben they luf, ben they loght." The formula in MELROSE MS. of 1674 is : "We do swear, so God us help and holy dome, and by the contents of this book." Compare BUCHANAN : "These charges that you have received you shall well and truly keep, not disclosing the secrecy of our Lodge to man, woman, nor child, stick nor stone, thing movable nor immovable, so God you help and His Holy dome."

INTIMATIONS FROM THE OLD RECORDS

It inculcated brotherly love,¹ relief of brethren, but first and over and above all its great irremovable landmark was truth, which truth was interpreted as fidelity to God and His Holy Christian Church. From the fourteenth to the eighteenth century it never moved from this consecrated ground. It follows that, alike as to basis and superstructure, its living stones were laid and built up in Christ. We have now to pass from this golden age of Masonry when the great stone-poems of Gothic architecture were raised to the glory of God, and when the Charges which I have cited were the sole Law of Lodges, subject to an Annual Assembly about which no one knows definitely,² and return to the GRAND LODGE epoch, with its commission to James Anderson. The fact that the new Institution had issued such directions transpired in other quarters, and as if it were foreseen that there would be tampering of a serious kind with the old CONSTITUTIONS, it came about that some among those³ who prized the immemorial landmarks decided that they would be beforehand with Anderson, and

¹ That is, the love of Masters and Fellows, even as blood brothers: it runs through all the MSS. (1) "Ye shall be true one to another . . ., every Master and Fellow . . ., and do unto them as ye would they should do unto you"; (2) "You shall call Masons your Fellows, or your Brethren"; (3) "None shall slander another behind his back"; (4) "You shall duly reverence your Fellows, that the Bond of Charity and Mutual Love may continue stedfast and stable among you"; (5) "Every Master and Fellow shall cherish strange Masons and Fellows, when they come over the country, and set them in work. . . . And if he have none he shall refresh with money unto the next Lodge." To quote further would be only ringing the changes.

² An annual or triennial Congregation of Masters and Fellows is mentioned in the earliest MSS., as ordained in the days of Athelstan. It is affirmed, moreover, that such a Congregation was held at that period in York. The Charge was "that every Mason and Fellow shall come to the Assembly if it be within five miles of him"—or according to many later codices, within fifty miles—"and if he have any warning." The wording is practically identical in all versions, late and early, one variant making the limit of distance seven miles and no place being mentioned, within my recollection, except in the case stated. According to the REGIUS MS., the Assembly of Masons was to be held "in every place wheresoever they would."

³ It is just to say that this is a matter of inference, but it seems to me irresistible. To suppose that a text of OLD CONSTITUTIONS appeared on the eve of Anderson's work merely as a publisher's venture is not less than incredible.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

prior to his famous BOOK OF CONSTITUTIONS they produced a text on their own part, entitled THE OLD CONSTITUTIONS ; it happens to be the first Masonic document that was ever printed.¹ At the head of it they established their religious principles by placing the following

Prayer

The Almighty Father of Heaven, with the wisdom of the Glorious Son, through the goodness of the Holy Ghost, Three Persons in One Godhead, be with our beginning, and give us His grace so to govern our lives that we may come to His bliss, that never shall have end. Amen.²

If this had been intended as a counterblast beforehand to the Clause on God and Religion in the GRAND LODGE CONSTITUTIONS of the following year, we may question whether its silent protest by an appeal to the records of the past could have been exchanged more profitably for forms of denunciation or forms of critical debate. And the Trinitarian Prayer was followed by the old, old definition of the prime Masonic duty concerning God and His Church, concerning orthodoxy in religious belief, however it happens to have been understood amidst the flux and scattermeal of post-Reformation times. The CONSTITUTION itself and the family to which it belongs have been subjects of special study and are not of my concern

¹ THE OLD CONSTITUTIONS *belonging to the Ancient and Honourable Society of Free and Accepted Masons, taken from a Manuscript wrote above Five Hundred Years since.* London: Printed and sold by J. Roberts, in Warwick Lane, MDCCXXII. (*Price Sixpence.*)

² It corresponds closely and in almost every respect to HARLEIAN 1942, referred to the beginning of the seventeenth century, reciting the Seven Liberal Sciences as comprehending the Craft of Masonry, and affirming that no person shall be accepted hereafter, until he shall have taken the Oath of Secrecy, which is given in full. It is taken "in the presence of God Almighty," and it is to be observed that there is no penal clause.

INTIMATIONS FROM THE OLD RECORDS

here. Nor do I need to dwell upon the famous Clause of Anderson, which in throwing over the Christian qualification of Masons and setting aside the Church of Christ displaced also Almighty God, owing to the confusion of its verbiage : I have dealt sufficiently with this part of the subject in another place.¹ Here it is needful only to realise under what auspices the thing denominated Freemasonry began its new career *post* 1717—so far as its Articles of Association go, as nearly as possible without God in the world. Here is the kind of digestion which the GOTHIC CONSTITUTIONS suffered in the alembic of a Presbyterian mind, possibly with something to be said for the influence and immediate presence of a French Huguenot. It may well seem that of the old honourable Institution there remained a name only.

This is how the subject stands at its lowest and irreducible minimum, but the issue is not so simple as it may seem when expressed only in these unadorned and naked terms. In sifting the mentality at the back of any given movement we have to take into consideration the measure and quality of intention, while it happens often enough that in so doing we are brought up against a considerable complex. There are no records before us to shew that in 1721 the GRAND LODGE instructed its scribe Anderson to remove the Christian landmarks of Operative Masonry and open the doors to all who could and would subscribe to certain ethical principles over which all men are agreed.² There is nothing to shew that this brilliant notion was conceived otherwise than in the mind of Anderson, like the supreme unreason of its wording. We know merely, and

¹ See NEW ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF FREEMASONRY, i, 176-180, on Anderson's definition of "the religion in which all men agree" as that of being "good men and true."

² The Minutes of GRAND LODGE do not begin till June 24, 1723, and as regards the years intervening between that date and the "revival" of 1717 we are dependent—for better, for worse—on particulars furnished by Anderson in his second BOOK OF CONSTITUTIONS, published in 1738. Whether he proceeded on the basis of records kept by himself or in the recesses of his memory we do not know, but of his manifold inaccuracies there is, I believe, no question.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

then on the sole authority of its own writer, that the Clause on God and Religion was examined and approved, in common with the rest of the work, by fourteen GRAND LODGE Masons whom he describes as learned, for our further confusion. The question is therefore what actuated Anderson: what was the kind of mentality which characterised that individual who undertook to “digest the old GOTHIC CONSTITUTIONS in a new and better method”?

There were probably but a few available to his research at the moment, for other unnamed Lodges had burnt their records, the only assignable reason being to prevent them falling into the hands of the new and distrusted obedience.¹ There were, however, some records of the past before him, and more than one patient worker has identified them, at least up to a certain point.² They do not concern us specially in this place: it is more important to remember once more that Anderson represented the set of principles and beliefs which was characteristic of the Kirk of Scotland in the first quarter of the eighteenth century. Now what would signify to him that ever-recurring covenant of fidelity to the Holy Church which we have found in the OLD CHARGES? And supposing

¹ The destroyed MSS. are said on Anderson's authority to have been those of Nicholas Stone, a Master of the Masons' Company. Cf. p. 50.

² It follows from the evidence of Stukeley that Anderson was or could have been acquainted with the COOKE MS., which was exhibited at a Meeting of the London GRAND LODGE in 1721, and it is equally obvious that he would know the ROBERTS printed copy of OLD CHARGES which appeared in 1722 and which has been cited in my text above. As a fact, he used it to such purpose that Gould speaks of the ROBERTS text having been “revised by Anderson.” He worked therefore on the principle of “that is best which lies the nearest,” and may have been actuated, moreover, by a feeling that the further he departed from the text of the first printed CONSTITUTION—and one also which was claimed to be five hundred years old—the more he would lay open his digest to attack on the score of invention, because the body-general of OLD CHARGES was known to few. Gould is one of the experts to whom I have alluded in the text, and though much work has been done since on the documents and many new variants have been discovered, his accounts of them in the large HISTORY, i, 57–106, and ii, 203–248, are still worth careful reading, their prolixity notwithstanding. They may be compared also with a summary account in Gould's CONCISE HISTORY.

INTIMATIONS FROM THE OLD RECORDS

for a mere moment that he had inspected the REGIUS MS., what effect upon him would be produced by its appeal to "Mother Mary bright," its allusion to the use of holy water, its instruction for assisting at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and its Prayer at the Consecration of Elements? Most certainly he would digest them into a new and better method by making a clean sweep of the whole Popish Rag Fair.¹ Before he received his commission from GRAND LODGE it may well be that the only one of those OLD CHARGES which he had ever seen or heard was that recited in his presence when he was made a Mason, where and whensoever it was. Whatever he may have thought in his heart of the Nicene *Credo in unam sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam*, he saw to it that there was no Holy Church in the kind of Masonry which he proposed to bring into being, Grand Lodge helping, as a successor to that which he had sworn to maintain.²

It is obvious that Anderson did not realise all that was implied or could follow from the fact of his digest, just as he and those who approved his performance failed to discern that

¹ The clearance was so complete that, apart from all intention, the necessity for a Mason to believe in God went over among the rubbish. I have dealt with this subject at length in A NEW ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF FREEMASONRY, i, 176-180, and with the position taken up by the GRAND ORIENT of France in 1918 respecting the Anderson Clause on God and Religion, *ibid.*, ii, 4-7. There is a considerable likeness of analogy between Dr Anderson, author of the stultifying Clause, and that "Protestant minister of the Gospel" who recommended removing the Name of God from the Constitution of the GRAND ORIENT of France.

² It follows from some of the CHARGES and is recognised by Masonic criticism that when Masons were made, in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, as also previously, the so-called CONSTITUTIONS were read over as things to which they agreed and by which they were bound. It is supposed that, *e.g.*, Ashmole was pledged in this manner, as well as by the Oath—if any—contained in the particular document which the Lodge happened to possess. We do not know where Anderson was received, and what is said in the text above implies that if it were in Scotland the custom which prevailed in England obtained there also. This was apparently the case in 1670, for according to the Laws of the Lodge of Aberdeen, formulated at that date, the "Masons' Charter" was to be read to every Entered Apprentice. There is evidence that the custom obtained from old time, from the beginning of the English records, for according to the COOKE MS. the CHARGES were read to "new men."

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

the Clause on God and Religion conveyed in all probability the reverse of what was in their minds. Moreover, when Anderson cast out the Trinitarian Doctrine of the OLD CHARGES the fact does not signify that he was himself a mere Deist.¹ He spoke of that on which all men are agreed as if it were matter of ethic only, but almost the last accusation which could be brought against him would be that he, a minister of religion, did not believe in a God. As further evidence of exceedingly loose intention, we have also to remember that when GRAND LODGE Masonry entered into its Emblematic period and began to develop primitive Ritual, some time after the first BOOK OF CONSTITUTIONS, it seems certain that there were Christian elements present in the workings, and these presumably became more pronounced as the system of LECTURES was elaborated. There was in fine, at a much later period, that for which the movement of the Ancients stood ; but about this I need say only that the HOLY ROYAL ARCH, howsoever edited in late interests, remains now that which it was from the beginning, militantly Trinitarian in doctrine. We know in addition to this, and shall see later on in a plenary sense, that when Masonry crossed the English Channel, either it carried no vestiges of "pure and ancient" Deism, or if it did they were purged out in French, German, Russian, Danish and Swedish alembics, in all of which countries the Order developed

¹ On August 1, 1720, he preached in Goodman's Fields to a Religious Society described as maintaining "an Evening Lecture on the Lord's Day, at the Rev. Mr Samuel Harris's Meeting-House," there situated. It was printed in the same year for R. Ford at the Angel in the Poultry under the title *CONTEND EARNESTLY FOR THE FAITH*. The address to Anderson's "catechumens" affirms that he prays constantly "to the God of all Grace, that as ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord, ye may walk in Him, rooted and built up in Him, and stablished in the Faith," being that "once delivered to the saints," which is the chief subject of the discourse itself. Among the "grounds or fundamentals of a Christian's hope" there is included the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity in these terms: "That there is but one only, the living and true God, the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit, the Three that bear record in Heaven, and these Three one. One Eternal God, the same in substance and equal in power and glory, in Whose Name we are baptized and blessed."

INTIMATIONS FROM THE OLD RECORDS

its implicits as a great symbolical experiment pursued in Christ. They knew of no Bible but that which contained the Gospels, and often enough no other but that bearing the title of TESTAMENTUM NOVUM.¹ In Catholic lands, and in lands no longer Catholic but with a better Catholic Tradition than remained in England of the early eighteenth century, the memorials belonging to the Old Alliance were mainly magnificent archives, having little part in life except for their intimations concerning Christ and His everlasting mission.

Emblematic Freemasonry under a GRAND LODGE, as the newest thing on earth, having defaced its titles and imperilled in this manner the validity of its appeal on the past, had to earn new warrants as it best could ; and as there is no question that it set out towards this end and hoped somehow to reach it by

¹ The French Candidate was pledged on the NEW TESTAMENT not alone in the Master Grade of the Craft Rite, more especially when this Rite introduced a High Grade system, but generally in the later developments. In the Grade of ENTERED APPRENTICE, according to one of the MSS., he was asked for his "Baptismal Name," as well as that of his family, and the obligation was taken with the right hand laid on the Gospel, the same and no other volume of the Sacred Law being used in the MASTER GRADE. In that of INTIMATE SECRETARY the Bible is specified, signifying both Testaments, and it is explained that the triangle, otherwise the Jewel of the Grade, represents the three theological virtues—Faith, Hope and Charity. The Gospel is required for the Grade of ELECT OF NINE, and in SUBLIME ELECT OF TWELVE the Candidate is pledged to defend the Christian Religion, to the last drop of his blood. We may compare the solemn undertaking in the SUPREME GRADE OF GRAND ELECT, taken also on the "Holy Gospel," to keep faith with the Eternal and with the "Holy Religion" professed by him who is advanced. The recitation might continue indefinitely, without departing from one only of the French Masonic collections. In another—of not less rare Rituals in MS.—a FIRST GRADE OF ELECT MASONS follows the THIRD DEGREE, and in connection with the Penal Clause of his Obligation the Candidate prays for the help of God and His Holy Gospel. In the GRAND ÉCOSSAIS GRADE, belonging to the same series, St John Baptist appears in the Tracing Board baptizing on the banks of Jordan. See my NEW ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF FREEMASONRY, i, 322, 323, where the anachronism of such an introduction in an episode belonging to the period of the First Temple is characterised in legitimate terms. It illustrates, however, the inability of the French Masonic mind to regard anything connected with the Old Alliance except in the light of the New. As a further example, the twelve oxen which supported the Sea of Solomon are said not only to signify the twelve tribes of Israel but the twelve pillars of the Christian religion, namely, the Apostles of Christ.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

the help of "noble" Grand Masters—figure-heads of title and fashion—so there is none that its efficient coadjutors throughout the second half of the eighteenth century were High Grades, chiefly of continental origin.¹ When Christ is sent forth by the front door it may happen that He returns at the back, and when there is no room for Him in the inn He comes to birth in the stable. He is native to temple and palace, but the hut of the charcoal-burner will serve as His hearth at need. What happened, however, when the Rummer and Grapes had a mind to replace Him by "that in which all men agree" was that He went abroad in the world, and under the name of Masonry they created for Him Preceptories, Chapters, Halls of Sovereign Princes and a new Mountain of Transfiguration under the name of Heredom.²

There is one thing more on this part of the subject, and I do not bring it forward with the view to save a situation: there is none indeed to save, for the fact must remain always that the Operative Guild was emptied of its peculiar odour of sanctity. I offer it on account of truth, to which my life of letters has been dedicated in the heart of hearts, as it was at the beginning and continues when the end draws on and that night cometh, at the further side of which—as my prayer goes up—is the work of the world to come. The later Masons of the eighteenth

¹ The full consideration of this important subject is reserved for a later study. I may refer also to *THE SECRET TRADITION IN FREEMASONRY*, 1911, 2 vols., in which the interconnection between the Craft and the High Grades is considered under all its aspects, through Rites and Degrees which are well known and in activity at this day as well as those which, owing to adventitious circumstances, are remembered only by students who search in archives. The work to which I refer has been long out of print, but a new and revised edition is in the forefront of my literary schemes.

² I have shewn elsewhere that the fabled Mountain which passes under this name is a great mystical portent. See *NEW ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF FREEMASONRY*, i, 347-349. We shall meet with it again in connection with the German poet Werner and his *SONS OF THE VALLÉY*. We may compare intimations in a certain *ADEPT GRADE*, under the denomination of *ROSY CROSS*, concerning a Symbolic Mountain of God which is said to be the Mountain of Initiation, encompassed by darkness and silence but crowned with ineffable light. It is protected by a wall of secrecy, but there is one Gate of Entrance between the Pillars of Hermes.

INTIMATIONS FROM THE OLD RECORDS

century could not have seen beyond the Western Isles their Spiritual Mountain, which is Heredom ; they could not have dreamed their chivalry of the Spiritual City and all the spires thereof ; they could not have been present when the Book of the Seven Seals was opened in their Craft-born Sanctuary by the Apocalyptic Lamb ; they could not have brought forth from their RITE OF THE STRICT OBSERVANCE another and yet higher Observance, which was born in God, if the Emblematic Craft—as it came to them—had itself no seals of holiness. As the Rituals developed ¹ it was built up surely into a Spiritual House and as such on the side of God. But Anderson, Desaguliers, Anthony Sayer *et hoc genus omne*, the “learned” Brothers and the rank and file who suffered it, had allowed the keystone which is Christ to be “heaved over among the rubbish.” It remained for those “skilful craftsmen” who created the High Degrees in France and Germany and elsewhere ; it remained for those Unknown Superiors on whom there fell the spark from holy heaven, after the formula of exile to discover that of return—the exile and return of Christ—in ROSE CROIX MASONRY, in sacro-saintly observances of KNIGHTS TEMPLAR and in the loyalty of the ROYAL ORDER, which is marked Faithful and True over all its pageant. The EIGHTEENTH DEGREE at large is a memorial of the loss and recovery. When Emblematic Freemasonry was created, with Anderson for the first scribe, it was the hour when the veil of the Temple was rent in twain, when the true light departed and the Altar was cast down. But when the Banner of the Rosy Cross was raised over the roof of Masonry, then was the Altar set up and light was restored

¹ The course of this development was a curiously secret thing, alike by design and accident. As there was that on the one hand which those who were concerned elected apparently to hide, so on the other it was never betrayed by an unguarded word. We can understand well enough that there are and could be no emblematic traces in the CONSTITUTIONS of 1723, though the reference to Hiram or Hiram on p. 11 as “the most accomplished Mason on earth,” and to the “inspired” Master of work on p. 14, indicates that something was brewing ; but it is absent also from Anderson’s later work, of 1738, when the fact that there was a Figurative Mystery had gone abroad in the world.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

to the eyes. The Clause on God and Religion in the first BOOK OF CONSTITUTIONS is symbolised by the Loss of the Word, and the Risen Christ in the Holy House of St Andrew, in the House of Heredom and Perfection, and in the Knighthood of the Holy Sepulchre is the Word restored. The loss is in Emblematic Freemasonry and the finding is in the High Degrees.

As an introduction to succeeding studies, it is necessary to establish at this point the precise measures and meaning of the term Emblematic applied to Masonry and also that of Allegory, which is used in the same connection. I have shewn elsewhere¹ that prior to the GRAND LODGE period there is no trace whatever of any figurative sense attached to the Masonic subject: having dealt sufficiently with this question there is little call to recur, more especially as the OLD CHARGES bear their own witness about it on every line and page. From the first even to the last they comprise three main elements, and these indeed account for their entire content: (1) Religious, concerning the duty to God in Heaven and His Holy Church on earth;² (2) Governmental, comprising the Rules imposed on Masters, Craftsmen and Apprentices belonging to the Building Guild or Fellowship; (3) pseudo-Historical, being Craft Legends designed to exhibit the time immemorial antiquity of architecture and the Operative Craft but utterly ridiculous from any standpoint of fact:³ they will call for mention from another standpoint

¹ ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF FREEMASONRY, i, 80, 147, 148, 327, 354; ii, 211-213, and generally throughout the two volumes.

² It is love which is enjoined in both cases by the REGIUS MS., being the earliest of all the texts, the presumable reason being that God is our Father and Holy Church is Mother. A noticeable point is that the duty of being true to Holy Church is inculcated equally in the latest as in the oldest Charges: e.g. in the STANLEY MS. of 1677; SHROPSHIRE MS., 1694; WAISTELL, 1693; FOXCROFT, 1699; CLAPHAM MS., referred to 1700-1720; and HUGHAN MS., of uncertain date but late seventeenth or early eighteenth century.

³ This question will arise also for consideration towards the end of our research: meanwhile it is sufficient to indicate that a good test of general validity is offered by the affirmation that Abraham taught geometry to Euclid in Egypt: it recurs in the OLD CHARGES, though not—as it happens—in the REGIUS MS., which is content with ascribing his own discoveries to the immortal Greek.

INTIMATIONS FROM THE OLD RECORDS

at a later stage. Through all the century of documents there is not one reference to a spiritual aspect of building, and there is not only no moralisation upon tools used in the trade but to the best of my recollection such implements are never mentioned.

When the development of Ritual began—as it is believed, *post* 1723—a system of “figuration” was introduced, and it is important to ascertain its limits; but in our present and possibly permanent ignorance as to the growth of the system and as to the original Ritual forms no one can say what objects were first made subject to moral explanation or what were otherwise symbolised. Under all needful reservations we can glance at them only as they are marshalled now before us. At one stage or another the term Lights was applied emblematically to certain implements, and also to a third object which is not *per se* Masonic and which I do not propose to specify. There was an external position assumed by members to typify an inward attitude: the positions indeed were several and were significant of that or this. It was explained to the Entered Apprentice that he himself was comparable to a certain stone in any and every building. There was lastly a collection of implements offered to his inspection, and he was taught a very crude moral and semi-religious sense in which they must be regarded. It should be added that as time went on the symbolism of the Lodge, its form, elevation and furniture became important points of instruction, a particular import being attached to certain Pillars, our Masonic Knowledge of which is derived from the Secret Tradition in Israel, otherwise the Jewish KABALAH. At a later stage the Craftsman was made acquainted with the moral lessons attached to several further implements, and he heard more also concerning the Pillars of the Temple, by derivation from the same source. In the THIRD DEGREE he was taught the inner emblematical meaning of procedure within the Lodge, and was placed in a pregnant figurative relation with the Master Builder, whose traditional

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

history is thus the point within the circle of Craft procedure. The meaning of yet other implements was also explained.

While it follows that anything in CRAFT MASONRY is broadly speaking Emblematic, the typology can be classified into three chief groups : (1) the significance of Signs and other Tokens, that is to say of technical or official secrets, words always excepted, as these belong to etymology—whether true or false, as it happens ; (2) the significance of working implements ; and (3) the spiritual import of the building structure itself, represented (*a*) in the person of the Candidate and (*b*) in the catholic idea of the Lodge.

(1) The Signs, like the Tokens, are simple, and as some of them are found on figured monuments of past ages it has been customary to affirm that they are exceedingly old, but this is to be understood solely in the sense that they are liable to occur casually and apart from their Masonic import. (2) The meanings attached to Implements are conventional, and as there is no trace of them in the records of the past¹ it is to be concluded that they arose within the four figurative walls of the LONDON GRAND LODGE. They are characteristic of their artificial period, are good enough in their way and do not rank seriously, being without life and its unction. (3) The spiritual significance of building as represented in the person of the Candidate is a light of symbolism peculiar to Masonry,² is very eloquent and suggestive, like the threshold of a great symbolism ; but that which is unfolded in the FIRST DEGREE is stultified in the SECOND³ and then passes out of

¹ There is of course a sense in which implements of many kinds have been subjects of rough-and-ready moralisations both in daily life and in the literature of all ages ; but it does not happen to prove that Emblematic Freemasonry is old as the civilised world.

² It is to be distinguished as such from the "lively stones" of St Paul and also from the mystical developments of the Scriptural intimation by Robert Fludd, as we shall meet with them in the next study.

³ I can say only that the quality of symbolism is changed over and represents no longer the building up of the Candidate as into a perfect spiritual or moral edifice : it has become a question of hypothetical progress in Masonic knowledge. Those who are Masons shall remember the situations

INTIMATIONS FROM THE OLD RECORDS

sight. That of the Lodge itself is peculiar in the mode of its presentation, but the root of all is in Scripture.

As regards the Allegory in which Masonry is said to veil its moral teaching, the term in its proper sense is applicable only to the Craft Traditional History, but some explanations of symbols are of an allegorical character.

I have now presented at reasonably sufficient length and under several aspects the moral and spiritual atmosphere of the old Operative Craft. Herein are the best and highest of Speculative Masonic antecedents, according to the claim which Emblematic Freemasonry makes upon its own antiquities. It is that which can be affirmed concerning its alleged genealogy. The irresistible conclusion is that the GRAND LODGE foundation of 1717, by altering its CONSTITUTIONS very nearly renounced its heritage and therefore imperilled its claim upon the Operative past, to which it held every title in virtue of descent and origin. In so far as it was saved for the time being the escape came about because its Ritual developments of *post* 1723, more especially in the MASTER GRADE, on the evidence of witnesses like Andrew Michael Ramsay and Martin Clare, maintained the Christian tradition. When this was abandoned finally, about the period of the Union or a little later, the vestiges remained, as we shall see, more especially in the ROYAL ARCH, for the tradition of Christian doctrine went down into its marrow and essence and could not be taken away. Whether the situation can be regarded as saved by such "golden remains" is a question left over for debate and I do not propose to discuss it, seeing that for my own concerns Craft Masonry and its supplement in the HOLY ORDER are saved after another manner—that is to say, as prolegomena to certain High Degrees, for example, ROSE CROIX MASONRY, the CHRISTIAN CHIVALRY OF THE TEMPLE and the KNIGHTS BENEFICENT OF THE HOLY CITY. When taken in conjunction with these it can be said that Craft

allocated to the Candidate in the one and the other case, when they should be able to check my statement.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

Masonry conforms in a plenary sense to the old ordinance that Masons shall not only love God, in the sense of "the Holy Blessed and Glorious Trinity," but also the Christian Church.

In conclusion, Emblematic Freemasonry in its valid and highest understanding is spiritual architecture, and we shall find in the next study that some speaking aspects of this mystical art were unfolded by an English theosophical writer of the early seventeenth century. Amidst the welter of uncertainty as to whence came the emblematic elements of modern Freemasonry, we shall consider also, as a purely speculative possibility, whether and in what manner it may have derived something from this unexpected source.

We have made acquaintance meanwhile with the kind of past which lies behind the Masonic subject and with the cloud which fell upon its Sanctuary when that which was Operative in the old order of things became Figurative in the new. But we have not found that the old consecrations were taken entirely away, and at a later stage we shall see how the Hallows were restored.

II

THE ACCEPTION AND ROBERT FLUDD

THE tentative consideration of this study must open with a statement which will appear drastic to those who are unprepared, but it represents my conclusions at their value on the subject of Masonic Research, as it has been pursued on my own part through many years of literary life and thought. After more than one generation of earnest and highly qualified investigation, preceded by a much longer period of reverie and invention, we are still in the dark upon those precise circumstances under which Speculative Masonry originated as a system of morality presented in the form of Ritual, protected by covenants of silence, making claims upon a remote past and veiling its instructions by recourse to allegory and symbolism. We know only too well about the old dreams which every man of sense, within and without the Order, has set aside long since and the recitation of which at this day can only sound ridiculous. It may well seem incredible that people posing as serious should have ever affirmed, which they did, that Masonry was older than the world, because the Great Architect of the Universe, by virtue of His work in the cosmos, was unquestionably the first Freemason; that alternatively it began with Adam in Paradise, though he does not seem to have made even his own "coats of skin" or to have "clothed" himself; and so forward through a heavy cloud of false and dull imaginings.¹

¹ "Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skin, and clothed them."—GENESIS iii, 21. This is the AUTHORIZED VERSION, which agrees word for word with the VULGATE: *Fecit quoque Dominus Deus Adæ et uxori ejus tunicas pelliceas, et induit eos.*

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

These phantasmata have some time since melted. We have emerged also from other hosts of nightmare, a typical example of which proposed that the Tower of Babel was the work of Speculative Craftsmen,¹ whose hands are to be traced also in the Pyramids of Egypt, in the Temple of Solomon and Zerubbabel, and—broadly speaking—in all ancient monuments of the Building Art. The hypothesis was that the old architects, stonemasons, wallers, paviours and plasterers were all in some mysterious and undemonstrable manner not only material and operative artists, but moralists, ritualists and makers of mystery-symbolism.

The *a priori* argument in exposition of this view is obviously that the Speculative Art is—as we have seen—an Art of Building spiritualised, or more accurately is that Art figuratively and morally transformed and applied, from which it might seem to follow that it arose among building craftsmen. The valid condemnation, however, arises from the fact—already established—that there is no particle of evidence anywhere in the world of the past to indicate that the old architects and builders had any notions of moralities veiled in allegory or illustrated by symbols.

The records of this view are prolonged through several generations of Masonic *literati*: it has even come down to us and is with us, at least implicitly, in much of the sound and sometimes admirable work of modern research. To throw a little new light on architectural history, on building guilds, is

¹ According to the Secret Tradition in Israel, as represented by SEPHER HA ZOHAR, Part i, fol. 75*b et seq.*, the Tower was built, not as a place of safety in the event of a second Deluge, as the common explanation goes, but in order to reach up to God and make war upon Him, being the assumed implicit of GENESIS xi, 4: "Let us build us a city and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven." But the expounded reason in the sacred text was in order "to make us a name," the AUTHORISED VERSION adding: "lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth." More logically the VULGATE substitutes *antequam* in place of "lest." The Masonry was speculative enough in either case, but not in the sense of Masonic *literati*. It may be added that Babel is heard of in the OLD CHARGES, usually under the corrupt form of Babylon.

THE ACCEPTION AND ROBERT FLUDD

still expected in some vague and undeclared manner to promote the knowledge of a purely emblematic subject. The research has produced occasional results of value within its own measures, but nothing in respect of our concern. There are still studious and greatly serious people—among whom I must count that most suggestive Masonic essayist and my good friend, Dr Fort Newton¹—who think that Leader Scott—otherwise Mrs Baxter—made a substantial contribution to the antiquities of Speculative Freemasonry in her work on *THE CATHEDRAL BUILDERS*. She made no contribution to anything except the story of Architecture, and this was considerable enough to be sufficient for a single volume, while her feeling towards the emblematic aspects and her titles of knowledge concerning them are summed up almost casually by herself in a few sentences.² There are others whose eyes have turned—as my own turned once eagerly, and not so very far in the past—towards those *OLD CHARGES* and *CONSTITUTIONS* with which I have just dealt from another standpoint. But a century and more of these notable documents have not—as we have seen—given us one line of help, from the *REGIUS MS.* onward to the first decades of the eighteenth century.

This is how the case stands in respect of recent authentic and systematic research. As might have been expected, the fantasiasts are still among us, making great claims and clothed in all the vestures of dogmatic certitude. Their appeal is to Egypt, Babylon, India, Mexico, Peru, wherever the building

¹ See *THE BUILDERS: A Story and Study of Masonry*, 1915, pp. 87 *et seq.*

² See *THE CATHEDRAL BUILDERS*, 1899, pp. 16–19. Her knowledge is derived from an anonymous Italian book of 1788, on the Institutions, Rites and Ceremonies of the Freemasons, presumably a hostile work as it refers what she terms the “second revival” to Oliver Cromwell. The Rites and Ceremonies described in the Italian text are said to be “the greatest tissue of mediæval superstition, child’s play, blood-curdling oaths and mysterious secrecy . . . that can be imagined.” The inelegantly worded paragraph goes on to affirm that “every moral thing masquerades under an architectural aspect,” but “all the signs of Masonry” are without a figment of reality” in “that ‘Temple made without hands’ which is figured by a Freemasons’ Lodge in these days.” This “pseudo-Freemasonry,” with its “entirely spiritual significance,” is referred, however, to the Comacines.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

monuments of ancient civilisation remain to testify, wheresoever there are figured monuments and records of primeval inscription. The recurrence of certain simple signs-manual, of certain peculiar attitudes and a few conventional symbols, recalling those of and belonging to Masonry, or thereunto attributed by popular voice and rumour, are no evidence of a moral and spiritual art of building in such ages and places. If it could be shewn conclusively that some secret society flourishing B.C. 5000 communicated between its members by means of undeniable Craft Signs, the fact would be a memorable and curious point of interest, but it would prove nothing. To affirm Speculative Masonry—*e.g.* in Egypt—is to affirm our specific and conventional system of morality, illustrated by building symbols and a building myth. Still less does it enforce any thesis of antiquity to cite the existence from presumable time immemorial and the almost universal prevalence of the triangle, square, pentagram and other geometrical figures. The antecedent facts of their recurrence, whether or not as symbols, are of no evidential value apart from their particular application, as this prevails among us. Assuredly these points of simple and unchallengeable criticism must have been advanced by others before me : they may be common-places of the subject at large, but their repetition is imposed—if so—because we have by no means emerged from the extravagance of Masonic assumptions.

It follows that there are many answers—each excluding the others—to the oft-repeated question : When, where, and how did Symbolical Masonry arise? An hundred and more voices have intervened in as many ways, but scarcely one of them has any cards of evidence to lay upon the table in support of any thesis. In such cases it means most commonly that a given subject has been begotten ready made and vested, like Minerva, out of the brain of some creative Jupiter, whether an individual or a company. If this is the solution of the present problem there may not be so far to look on the hither side of 1717 : it

THE ACCEPTION AND ROBERT FLUDD

is perhaps in the direction of Desaguliers as a shaper of CRAFT DEGREES into something approaching broadly or at least in direct relation to that form in which we have them now. But in this event it does not follow that he made up out of his own head the entire Emblematic Aspects of Masonry as well as the Ritual Aspects. The matter of my immediate concern is whether something of this kind may have come into his—or at need another's—hands and whether we can indicate, however tentatively, a possible source in the past, seeing that all the known avenues have failed us in the course of our research.

There is one which I have not mentioned and which has stood so far in no better position than the rest. When German Rosicrucians of the late eighteenth century adopted a Masonic aspect, communicating their Mysteries to applicants in the guise of an elaborate Rite, they defined their Masonic position by an allegation that the Speculative Brotherhood owed its existence to themselves. It was a dogmatic claim, delivered from a Darien peak of Mastery, and to be taken or left as one chose, seeing that the problematical Order was not in the habit of citing evidence in support of its statements, at least on the historical side.¹ I do not find that the affirmation produced a marked effect or carried any consequence, direct or otherwise, so far as Freemasonry was concerned: on the Continent at least that orphan Daughter of the Mysteries was in the midst of many competitors pretending to the same position of fatherhood. But at the beginning of the nineteenth century the Rosicrucian origin of the Craft was advanced seriously and debated also seriously in several quarters of Germany, though there was exhibited no first-hand acquaintance with the Rite to which I have referred.² The hypothesis passed over to

¹ In respect of the claim at large, I refer to my immediately preceding work, *THE BROTHERHOOD OF THE ROSY CROSS*, c. xvi and especially pp. 442-446.

² They created a considerable impression in several quarters, but it was during the infancy of Masonic research, and they have passed long since into the limbus of forgotten things.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

France, where it found a champion in Reghellini,¹ speaking in terms of certitude, whereas German writers, and J. G. Böhle² among them, argued a thesis and sought to produce their reasons. About 1850 J. M. Ragon went much further and presented the CRAFT GRADES as manufactured by an English Rosicrucian in the middle of the seventeenth century, some seventy and five years before they came into being in assignable Ritual form.³ There is familiar acquaintance among us with some of these speculations, because Thomas de Quincey dressed up one of the German expositions and presented it in a series of papers which belong to literature. It became the fashion of a period with several later dreamers, and there is no question that it captivated the alert and discriminating mind of Robert Freke Gould, though he saw plainly enough that Böhle, Nicolai, von Murr, Ragon and a dozen who followed their lead did not prove their case.

¹ LA MAÇONNERIE CONSIDÉRÉE COMME LE RÉSULTAT DES RELIGIONS JUIVE ET CHRÉTIENNE. I have used the edition of Paris, 1833, but it was published originally at Brussels in 1829, 3 vols. in each case, *plus* an album of plates. But it is exceedingly difficult to disentangle Reghellini's confusions of thought and wording. He represents the Rosicrucians as parting with Freemasons and going their own way in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as a protest against religious mania and abuse of absolute power. The reformers in Germany were Rosen-Cruz, an entirely mythical character, and J. V. Andreæ, who does not happen to have been born till the close of the sixteenth century. In England they included Francis Bacon, *ob.* 1626, and Ashmole, who began his literary career in 1650. See ii, p. 98. But on p. 110 of the same volume Reghellini represents Ashmole, after he was made a Mason in 1646, combining with other Brethren and establishing a Society of Rosicrucians in London. He rectified the Rosicrucian formulæ of initiation, basing them almost entirely on the ancient Egyptian and Greek Mysteries. The new procedure seems to have been preserved in Masonic receptions, but the innovations thus introduced assisted in producing the schism which reached its term only in 1813. There is no evidence for these reveries.

² UEBER DEN URSPRUNG . . . DER ROSENKREUZER UND FREYMAUER, 1804.

³ See A NEW ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF FREEMASONRY, i, 357, for a summary account of the thesis, the original of which will be found in ORTHODOXIE MAÇONNIQUE and elsewhere in the writings of Ragon. The English Rosicrucian so called was Elias Ashmole. It would appear that Ragon may have drawn something from Nicolai, who affirms that Ashmole was received in 1646, not into a Masonic Lodge but into the Rosicrucian Brotherhood. I would that he had proved his point.

THE ACCEPTION AND ROBERT FLUDD

Gould was tentative enough and far away from anything that can be called belief in the subject, but he was manifestly drawn and impressed,¹ while that which impressed and drew him was the suggestive and—it might be—pregnant fact that at Warrington in 1646 Elias Ashmole, supposed Rosicrucian and known Alchemist and Hermetist, was made a Mason and thought enough of the matter to attend a second meeting, which was held in London, some thirty-six years later. Nor this only, for he had planned and collected certain materials towards a History of Masonry, by which, however, must be understood the Building Art and not a Figurative Mystery that teaches how to be good by means of symbols and an allegorical myth.

What kind of Lodge it was that met at Warrington we are never likely to know,² except that it admitted to membership persons who were not Operative Masons and was ruled apparently by a Warden.³ It is moderately certain by the

¹ See THE CONCISE HISTORY OF FREEMASONRY, c. i, s.v. THE ROSICRUCIANS, pp. 61-94, and c. iv, pp. 186, 190.

² Gould affirms that it was the first evidence of what he terms "*living* Freemasonry," and that "it was an out-growth of something essentially distinct from the Scotch Masonry of that period."—THE HISTORY OF FREEMASONRY, ii, p. 300. Regarding the earlier citation I do not know what significance is to be attached to the word which Gould italicises, but the sense of the second is explained presumably on p. 301, when it is suggested or rather assumed that *circa* 1700 there was "a marked difference between the ceremonial observances" of Scottish Lodges and those of England, especially "the Southern metropolis." It seems to me that in this case Gould, who is utterly clear as a rule, is at once confused and confusing. As regards the Lodge at Warrington, it lies in the night of our ignorance; but he offers much argument—ii, 141 to 143—in favour of the rather obvious hypothesis that its history goes back behind the date of Ashmole's initiation, though "how far is indeterminable." He adds also that it is immaterial, with which no one will agree, and it is probable that in a more recollected mood he might have revised the statement. It may be added that his mammoth volumes are beyond all words for value as a collection of materials—like the ANACALYPSIS of Godfrey Higgins—but he is perpetually lost among them—also like Higgins.

³ This is the result of patient and fortunately successful research on the part of Mr W. H. Rylands. See THE MASONIC MAGAZINE, December 1881. According to the DIARY Col. Henry Mainwaring, of Kardicham in Cheshire, was made a Mason with Ashmole, the Masons present being eight only in number; their names are given and their status has been determined in every case.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

evidence of Ashmole's DIARY that he never revisited the city and, according to the printed versions,¹ that he did not attend any other Lodge till the year 1682, when he was summoned to a meeting at Masons' Hall, as already intimated. He went there as a Fellow and, moreover, as the oldest present Brother of that rank. It seems to follow that if there were two Degrees in his day he received them on the same night, or otherwise by the effluxion of time, and alternatively—if there were one only—that he became a Fellow by the fact of his initiation.² In this connection we may remember that the conventional title of ENTERED APPRENTICE seems to have been brought by Desaguliers from Scotland, though the Old English Charges recognise APPRENTICES and FELLOWS. There is another point of consequence which arises out of the DIARY: the fact that he had been admitted at Warrington entitled Ashmole to attend a Lodge held in the Hall of the MASONS' COMPANY. Was it an ordinary Lodge, meeting within the walls of the Company and itself practising evidently, like Warrington, the admission of non-operative members? The answer is that it was presumably that body, on which so much may depend, about which we know so little and are likely to learn no more—I mean the ACCEPTION.³ The COMPANY has no records prior to the Fire

¹ The printed work was edited from a transcript in the writing of Robert Plot, not from the original MS., ASHMOLEAN, No. 1136, though it claims to have been compared therewith. According to the late edition of Mackey's ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF FREEMASONRY, i, 81, he has a record of his attendance at a Masonic Meeting between the two dates mentioned above. The reference given is DIARY, p. 362, which may signify the ASHMOLEAN MS., as there is no such page in either edition of the printed text, and as there is no account of the entry it is probably cited at second hand. A careful study of the DIARY in ARS QUATUOR CORONATORUM, vol. xi, knows of two entries only.

² Compare the Minutes of Mary's Chapel for August 25, 1721, and the record that a Lord Provost of Edinburgh and other "honourable persons" were "admitted and received Entered Apprentices and Fellowcrafts."—See D. Murray Lyon: HISTORY OF THE LODGE OF EDINBURGH.

³ The authority throughout is Mr Edward Conder, in his important work on the MASONS' COMPANY, concerning which there may be noted the following summary points: (1) That it consisted of a Master, Wardens, Court of Assistants, Livery and a Body of Freemen. (2) That the regular

THE ACCEPTION AND ROBERT FLUDD

of London—in which its archives were destroyed, except an Account Book, to which we owe our knowledge of the bare facts (1) that there was an Acception, (2) that it held Meetings distinct from those of the Company, and (3) that one might be Master of the Masons' Company but would be still ineligible as such to attend ACCEPTION gatherings without passing through the Ceremony of Acceptance, whatever it was. Now, we have no reason to suppose that any Lodge other than the Acception had its quarters at Masons' Hall, and it seems inevitable therefore that Ashmole attended a Meeting of this body, the records of which begin in 1620–21.¹ It would follow that his initiation at Warrington made him eligible not only to attend but to be summoned to the Lodge of the ACCEPTION, which was therefore a twin-sister of his Mother Lodge. It opened doors to him, though it was closed against ordinary members, liverymen and Masters of the Masons' Company. He responded in due course to the call, was present at the initiation of five members of the Company, and of at least two

system of joining was by what is termed "servitude," or being bound as Apprentice for seven years, after which period members were entitled to take up the freedom, and this led to the livery. (3) That the Court of Assistants and other Officers were chosen from the last rank. (4) That outside the regular mode of joining there were those of "patrimony and redemption." (5) That in 1620, and presumably still earlier, there were members of the Company "who were in no way whatever connected with the building trade." (6) That in addition to other records of the Company, its Constitutions also were destroyed in the Fire of London. (7) That as regards the ACCEPTION its second record in the Account Book belongs to 1638–39. (8) That the frequency or otherwise of its meetings is not to be gauged by the paucity of such entries. (9) That there is no mention of that which was attended by Ashmole. (10) That the Accepted Masons do not figure in the Accounts after 1677, though according to Ashmole it was still at work in 1682. (11) That, as proved by the silence of Anderson, it had ceased to exist before 1717. (12) That it was entirely distinct from the Company regarded as "a Guild for the protection of trade."

¹ I am contrasting both sides of things which on the surface may appear equally possible in hypothesis. But such is not the case. I have said that the Meeting at Masons' Hall was attended by Ashmole in the capacity of Fellow, which was an Operative Lodge title; but if it is agreed that the Acception was not an Ordinary Lodge it would seem to follow that the denomination in question would not be current therein.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

non-Operatives like himself, and dined subsequently with the Lodge at the Half-Moon Tavern in Cheapside. All that emerges from this story as it stands is that Elias Ashmole, a "Geomatic" Mason, visited a London Lodge, where it happened, as his Diary shews, that he was in a position of seniority as regards the rest of the Fellows. In this light it does not seem to justify my title of a mysterious body, but I shall recur to the ACCEPTATION and its problem at a later stage.

Such being the position of the Ashmole case in respect of his initiation, it remains to say that it offers *per se* no colourable ground for a Rosicrucian hypothesis concerning the origin of Speculative Masonry, because there is no shred of evidence that the Oxford antiquary ever belonged to any Rosicrucian School or Order.¹ He had thought in Alchemy till he spoke in its own tongue, and we have his own evidence—under circumstances which are beyond challenge—that he had been made acquainted, *ex hypothesi* at least, with the root-matter of its physical mystery.² But all Rosicrucians were not alchemists, while very few known alchemists indeed were connected with the Rosy Cross.³ There is in fact only one great name in the country of its origin, that, namely, of Michael Maier, and he belongs to the literature of the subject rather than to its art or science. To this extent the Ashmole case must be called a manifest delusion, and it is difficult to see how it captivated anyone, except indeed that for people like Gould it connoted

¹ The alleged Rosicrucian connections of Elias Ashmole are examined and dismissed in my immediately preceding work: *THE BROTHERHOOD OF THE ROSY CROSS*, 1924, c. xiii.

² Seeing that the *DIARY* contains such intimate particulars of communication on what has been held always as the most secret of secret arts, I must dissuade my readers from supposing that Ashmole omitted from his record all reference to Rosicrucian Meetings. It is impossible to discuss matters which are not excluded utterly from the likelihood of things but for which there is no evidence. Supposing for a moment that the Acceptation had Hermetic and Rosicrucian aspects, as I am about to suggest tentatively, it would follow that Ashmole attended such a gathering at Masons' Hall in 1682.

³ Robert Fludd was the first spiritual alchemist in England, and is perhaps comparable as such to Jacob Böhme in Germany.

THE ACCEPTION AND ROBERT FLUDD

the School of Hermetic thought in England, with dreams about Francis Bacon, the Pillars of Hermes, the NEW ATLANTIS and the beginnings of the Royal Society, in which the Hermetic School played a not inconsiderable part.

It happens, however, that the speculative possibility of Hermetic and even Rosicrucian influence on the rise of Emblematic Freemasonry by no means stands or falls with Elias Ashmole. Let us take the fact of the ACCEPTION—more mysterious, if possible, than that of the Rosy Cross—some twenty-six years behind the Warrington episode, or to the date under which it is mentioned first in the Account Book of the Masons' Company, namely, 1620–21.¹ The Manifestoes of the Rosy Cross had appeared in Germany onward from the year 1614. In 1616 and 1617, when a great debate on the subject was proceeding at full course in that country, there had appeared at Leyden a Latin defence of the Order, under the name of Robertus de Fluctibus. It came out in two divisions, the preface to the text as APOLOGIA COMPENDIARIA, a minute pamphlet, and then the work itself, or TRACTATUS APOLOGETICUS, with the preface thereto reprinted.² The author was Robert Fludd, whose ancestral home was in a beautiful manorial house at Bearstead, Kent, a few miles from Maidstone. He had also a residence in London, in contiguity to the headquarters of the Masons' Company, otherwise in Coleman Street. Fludd was born in 1576 and died on September 8, 1637. I do not propose to speak of his external life, which is well enough known to those concerned therein; but it may be noted, and I have shewn otherwise and recently, that he was in Germany and elsewhere on the Continent for several years prior to 1605, when he graduated in medicine at Oxford.³

It is not unreasonable to suppose that much of his

¹ See Edward Conder : RECORDS OF THE HOLE CRAFT . . . OF MASONS, 1894, and the same writer in ARS QUATUOR CORONATORUM, vol. ix.

² For a bibliographical and analytical account of these tracts see THE BROTHERHOOD OF THE ROSY CROSS, already cited, c. xiii, pp. 280 *et seq.*

³ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 279, 280.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

theosophical, metaphysical and occult knowledge was acquired abroad; but I mention this in passing only, as I do not intend to contribute a further *dossier* to the archives of invention concerning the Rosy Cross.¹ It calls to be understood that the present study is undertaken as a speculative excursion only, the consideration of a possible case, which is unlikely ever to emerge in the realm of certitude. It offers a possible link in the chain of connection between Operative and Emblematic Masonry, at a link's value, when it is uncertain whether it can withstand a strain.

Whatever Fludd gained abroad was supplemented by further study in the pleasant solitude of Bearstead and amidst his medical practice in London. He was forty years old in 1616 and had matured his views. His Apology for the Rosy Cross, being his first appearance in print, is typical in every way of his mental outlook, his curious learning and the extravagance by which he was characterised.² It may have brought him to

¹ See also *ibid.*, pp. 364, 365, and especially my reference to the closing of a certain "house of call," which is cited at this point in view of what follows in the text of the present study. My allusion in the story of the BROTHERHOOD is to those who might treat the field of speculation which I am now about to enter as if it were one of evidential history.

² Taking the two tracts as forming a single work, I would dissuade my readers from supposing that it is to be judged by that which is of least account therein. God is described as *ens entium*, eternal form, inviolable, purely igneous and without any material intermixture. The created world was produced from the four putative elements and from ether, which in its purest form is composed as to three parts of a luminous substance and as to one part of water. The tract is divided into three parts, the first dealing with the several branches of magical knowledge, Kabalism, the Books of God—both visible and invisible—the secret characters of Nature and the value of astrological portents. The second considers the impediments and degeneracy of existing arts and sciences, above all of Natural Philosophy, Medicine and Alchemy, a reformation being needed in all. The third part treats of the Mysteries of Light, which is the cause of all energies. The later writings of Fludd are a development from this ground, so that it may be said of him that he never changed his views, while in respect of extravagance there are things in PHILOSOPHIA MOSAICA, published posthumously, which are comparable to TRACTATUS APOLOGETICUS on "the admirable knowledge of light and its virtues," which knowledge enabled ancient Magi to make everburning lamps, kindle tapers from the rays of stars and render men invisible by means of *lux invisibilis*.

THE ACCEPTION AND ROBERT FLUDD

the notice of like-minded people abroad and surely to a few at home. It was the beginning of a literary life which was devoted throughout to the advancement of what may be denominated in a broad sense the principles and *theosophia* connoted by the term Rosicrucian.¹ The cosmos and microcosmos were treated in his folios from the standpoint of Kabbalism, the Higher Magic, Alchemy and Hermetic Medicine. There is no opportunity to speak of them at length here and no need arises. He is ridiculous enough in too many of his reveries and his credulity knew no bounds; but he had read widely within the limits of his dedications and he had thought at first hand upon them, so that he is in no sense a man who merely reflected others or who produced works of compilation. His books were published on the Continent, and there is no doubt that they were known and read: indeed the best evidence that they were things which mattered at their period, in the opinion of their period, is that men like Kepler, Mersennus and Gassendus wrote volumes in reply to his own. For the rest, his writings exhibit him as a person of intellectual tenacity and force of character who would count among those about him and might have to be reckoned with at need. He seems likely to have drawn round him a certain circle in days like those of King James I, more especially as he was known at court, was one of the court physicians and—as he testifies on his own part—was favoured by that monarch.

Such being the case as regards Robert Fludd, let us now recur to the ACCEPTION. Checked by the statements and inferences of Mr E. Conder, my hypothesis concerning it is (1) that this was “an Inner Fraternity, consisting largely of so-called Speculative Masons, or people who did not follow the arts and crafts of building”; (2) that in Conder’s words it had “much the same relation to the COMPANY as a ROYAL ARCH Chapter has to the Lodge from which it may derive and to which it is attached”; (3) that it “made Masons,” who were

¹ Compare THE BROTHERHOOD OF THE ROSY CROSS, p. 293.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

by the fact of their making or who otherwise became Fellows ; (4) that to this extent it was in the likeness of the Warrington Lodge ; (5) that to be thus made " was something beyond " being a member of the COMPANY ; (6) that the Acception so far favoured Masons belonging to the Company that it received them on a smaller scale of fees than other Candidates, as shewn by the Book of Accounts ; (7) that it accepted many in this manner ;¹ (8) that as members of the COMPANY they were obviously Masons already after their own manner ; (9) that the kind of making practised by the ACCEPTION must have differed from that of the Company and perhaps *in toto* ; (10) that the COMPANY² was " small and comparatively poor " and that the inducements for persons outside the building trade to join it were few or none, unless they were drawn by the Acception, which appears to have been the case occasionally ; (11) that the Acception was about some other business than that of the Livery ; (12) that its nature does not emerge, unless it was in the likeness of the Warrington Lodge, the business of which does not emerge either ; (13) that if there is anything in the notion of a Speculative Masonry in vestiges prior to 1717, it may have had its beginning within the Lodge of ACCEPTION ; (14) that it may or may not have followed the procedure in " making " of OLD CHARGES ; but (15) that it was about some other business, and that a key to its nature may be indicated by Robert Fludd when in a manifest Rosicrucian connection he speaks of a House Mystic built up of living stones, of ascending a *Mons Rationabilis*, which Mountain was a Way

¹ There is a record of fees charged at the making of Masons to the number of seven, all of whom were members of the COMPANY. See on this subject Mr Edward Conder : THE HOLE CRAFT AND FELLOWSHIP OF MASONS : " It is found that members of the COMPANY paid 20s. for coming on the Acception, and strangers 40s."

² It is stated by Conder, on the basis of the evidence, (a) that some persons came on the Livery and were admitted " upon acceptance of Masonry," apparently at the same time ; (b) that a non-Operative who had joined the ACCEPTION " may have been considered more eligible for membership of the COMPANY by redemption " ; (c) that in 1650 the ACCEPTION may have become a preliminary qualification for membership of the COMPANY itself.

THE ACCEPTION AND ROBERT FLUDD

to Christ, while Christ was the corner-stone of the spiritual building represented by the other symbolism.¹ The ACCEPTION, in a word, may have been tolerably like a certain Secret Order which met continually at Mark Masons' Hall for a period of about twenty years, ending in 1914, and accepted Masons among many others as Members, which worked in Ritual and was to this extent in the Masonic likeness, but had otherwise no connection therewith. There is very full material at need for the history of this Association : were it otherwise, in a century to come, so far as MARK MASONRY is concerned, it might be known only by an Account Book, a bare record in ledgers concerning rentals paid, under a certain heading, for a considerable period. It happens, to complete my case, if not to institute a strict line parallel, that the body in question was Hermetic and Rosicrucian in character.

¹ Compare St Paul in 2 CORINTHIANS v, 1, concerning a building which is of God, "an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens"; 1 St Peter ii, 5: "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house"; St John xiv, 2, concerning the "house of many mansions"; St Paul's "Church of the firstborn"; and the House Mystic of the green olive-tree in Ps. lii, 8. Compare also the Honourable and Christian Degree of MARK MASONRY and its pregnant allusions to 1 St Peter ii, 7, concerning "the stone which the builders disallowed" but which "is made head of the corner." Compare in fine the figurative Christology of Robert Fludd, e.g. (1) CLAVIS PHILOSOPHIÆ ET ALCHYMIÆ FLUDDANÆ, 1633, p. 78: *Christus spiritualis est verus Lapis Angularis, super quem quasi fundamentum omnia ædificantur et existunt*; (2) SUMMUM BONUM, 1629, p. 22: *Omnes Christiani Lapides vivi dici possunt*; (3) *Ibid.*, p. 40, concerning *Mons rationalis*. The House of Wisdom is thereon, otherwise *palatium seu cœnobium F. R. C.*. The foundation of this Mountain is *Lapis angularis, qui de monte abscissus sine manibus—teste Propheta. Est Mons magnus implens totam terram, hoc est . . . Mons ille verus Horeb, seu ille Spiritualis Sion, toties in pagina sacra repetita. Atque hic lapis est eadem petra, illa vera domus de qua intendit Evangelista afferens quod sapiens ædificaverit domum et foderit in altum et posuerit fundamentum ejusdem supra petram, etc. At petra illa est Christus, super quem Domus Spiritualis Sion et Sacerdotium Sanctum, etc.* Here is emblematic or figurative building conceived and expressed at the highest, and had the working tools of Masonry been put into the hands of Robert Fludd for an explanation of their spiritual aspects we can dream of what he would have said, speaking from the same foundation, and how it would have contrasted with the high conventions of the eighteenth century. For the spiritual building of Fludd and the Rosy Cross was not emblematic in a merely moral sense: it belonged to God's work in the soul.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

Now, knowing as I do in a reasonably intimate manner the record of Robert Fludd, my suggestion is that in the year 1620—or even earlier—we may not have to look much further than the Kentish theosophist in Coleman Street to explain how the ACCEPTION may have been occupied and that for which it stood. I have intimated that Fludd was not the kind of man who was likely to store his lights under figurative bushels, and through all his life he was about the business of his particular dedications and interests. There are two points of view possible as regards his connection with the Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross, being (1) that at some unassignable date after the publication of his APOLOGIA he was made a member, which would—as it seems to me—have come about probably by emissaries of the Order visiting England for the purpose of his reception, or (2) that he constituted himself its dogmatic interpreter on the faith of its published documents.

In the first case his initiation would not be referable to Michael Maier, about whose connection with Fludd several scandalous inventions have been put forward, though it could serve little purpose to expose them in this place.¹ Maier was a notable German alchemist of the early seventeenth century, but apparently—as I have suggested already—of the literary rather than of the practical kind. It seems to me, I mean, that he produced his theories of the work in obscure parables and allegories, but they belong to the study rather than to the laboratory. It is certain in any case that he was over in England antecedently to the year 1616, and it is quite possible that he met Fludd, but this would be prior to the APOLOGIA, when Fludd was utterly unknown, while Maier himself was scarcely a name in the world, for he was at the beginning of his brief though exceedingly productive career in Hermetic literature. On the best of all evidence, being that of his own statements, he knew nothing of the Order during his sojourn in England

¹ I have examined them at sufficient length in *THE BROTHERHOOD OF THE ROSY CROSS*, c. x.

THE ACCEPTION AND ROBERT FLUDD

and he never returned thereto. On the other hand, Fludd may have made a second continental journey, and there are rumours to that effect which I have not been able to verify. His initiation, if any, may have taken place then, or otherwise and more probably in England itself. We cannot tell. As regards the second or alternative case which I have named above, it is discounted by his later writings, the testimony of which is in my opinion stronger than if he had made an overt claim. Nor would it seem that we have to look far for the source of his direct knowledge: it may be even the concealed author of *SUMMUM BONUM*, under the name of Joachim Fritz, written in defence of his principles, more especially so far as they were concerned with expositions of the Rosy Cross. By his own statement it was the work of an intimate and valued friend who had written otherwise on the subject and who may have known both Fludd and the Order for many years prior to 1629, when *SUMMUM BONUM* was published.¹

Supposing in any case, and under circumstances about which we must be content to speculate in the dark, that Fludd was integrated in the Rosy Cross, I register my conviction, on the basis of his record at large, that he would have been no inactive member. He was ever in the arena of book production, armed at all points, to uphold and defend the Order, and that

¹ As an addendum to all that is advanced in *loc. cit.* on the authorship of this famous tract there may be mentioned that in *CLAVIS PHILOSOPHIÆ ET ALCHYMIÆ FLUDDANÆ*, 1633, p. 41, Fludd says about *SUMMUM BONUM*: (1) *cujus medulla a me non est fabricata*; but (2) *partem illius majorem ex lingua Scotica in Latinam transtulerim*. It follows that he had been accused of writing a defence of his own position as a Rosicrucian apologist under another name, a peculiarly gratuitous slander in view of his eagerness to enter the lists at all times on all his subjects of debate. The quotation is otherwise important, as it accounts naturally for people like J. G. Böhle maintaining that Joachim Fritz could be no other than Robert Fludd because they were exactly in each other's likeness as to ideas and style. We see that the Kentish philosopher put the bulk of *SUMMUM BONUM* into Latin, while the intimate and valued friend who wrote in *lingua Scotica* was responsible only for the marrow of the work. That this marrow corresponded in every respect to the views and feelings of Fludd there is no need to say, and it follows that though the work is of dual authorship it can be treated as if it had been written by a single hand.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

which he did with the pen he is certain to have done also by word of mouth and by his personal influence among those about him. He would have had therefore his circle. Now, a time came in his writings when he, who in the VALEDICTION attached to his APOLOGIA had pleaded for consideration and favour on the part of those whose cause he had espoused, began to speak with a certain authority concerning the Order and even intimated changes that had taken place within it. There came a time when its purpose, dedication and concern were raised in his expositions towards a purely spiritual sphere,¹ so that it passed from the occult order of things, their monstrosities and crudities, in the direction of mystical doctrine. It follows that the fact of his initiation is no arbitrary inference from his later memorials, more especially as his personal good faith cannot be called in question by those who know him at first hand. He was a Christian theosophist, dedicated in heart and mind to Divine things, as he was given to understand them.

I speak of course on the hypothesis that there was something corporate into which he could be admitted, however informally such reception might require to be understood at the period. In this connection the counsel is one of caution. We are apt to judge every Secret Order of the past according to the formal standards of modern Masonic procedure. We picture immediately a Lodge, Chapter or Temple which was Opened and

¹ In these connections he continues to unfold and exalt his thesis on spiritual building. *Manus artificis nihil faciunt . . . nisi disponendo et separando superflua, et tunc Spiritus per se agit ad clybanum perfectionis et ad dispositionem cœlestem illius regi palatii. Domum, ait apostolus, non manu factum seu spirituale corpus habemus æternum in cœlis, hoc est domum Sapientiæ super Montem Rationalem sive Petram Spiritualem constructam.* St Paul also is cited: *Fundamentum aliud nemo potest ponere præter id quod positum est, quod est solus Christus, etc.* And then: *Atque hinc est quod in pluribus Scripturæ locis vocatur tam petra offensionis et scandali, videlicet Christianis adulterinis, quam lapis probatus angularis et pretiosus in fundamento fundatus omnibus qui crediderunt in eum, unde non confundatur,* quoting ROMANS ix, 33; 1 ST PETER ii, 6; ISAIAH xxviii, 16; JEREMIAH xxii; PROVERBS xii and xiv; PSALMS v, 7, xxvi, 8, lxxxiv, 10; and ST MATTHEW vii, 24.—
SUMMUM BONUM, p. 40.

THE ACCEPTION AND ROBERT FLUDD

Closed in a manner corresponding—from near or afar—to that which prevails among us ; which had a Ceremonial less or more elaborate for the initiation and advancement of Candidates, and a binding pledge with heavy penal clauses. But we know now that there is no trace of Ritual procedure in the Rosicrucian Order prior to the year 1710, and then it is a mere vestige. We know also that the first Manifesto, called *FAMA FRATERNITATIS*, indicates almost unawares and casually that the sponsor sent his pupil or the Master his heir in grace to perform his devoir in the Holy House ; that he promised to keep secretly that which he learned in secret, and that when he was passing through a period which corresponds to the notion of a novitiate he “performed his school,” or in other words went through a course of training.¹ But Fludd was trained already and had performed school enough in long years of reflection and research which led up to his honourable folios, full of occult learning if not of occult knowledge, in the course of which he spiritualised most things that pass under the dubious and disdainful name of occult science. Given the hypothesis that he was joined on to the Order, it would have been with little or next to nothing of the conventional kind. He would have been admitted very much as the Protestant persuasions represented by the Confession of Augsburg would have recognised those who subscribed to it, intellectually and polemically, as members of their particular body. We cannot carry back the Order under any circumstances further than the

¹ There is no question that the Rosy Cross of the early seventeenth century was a school of training rather than a school of attainment, its surface claims notwithstanding. It looked to profit by experiment performed within the secret circles and took all precautions that possible discoveries should be reserved therein, whether it was physical work—as that of alchemy—whether it was psychical exploration—as the so-called astral operations—or in fine of a spiritual kind. And that which obtained at the beginning is found equally at the end of the eighteenth century, when the Adept Brethren of the Rosy Cross, according to the French Ritual of the Fifth Grade, pledged their Candidates to share the secret of the Great Work with all their associates, supposing that they brought it to perfection. —THE BROTHERHOOD OF THE ROSY CROSS, p. 470.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

year 1604, but the earlier we place it the less it will belong to Ritual. It is quite certain that whatever group of *literati* and Paracelsian *theosophi* put forward the FAMA and CONFESSIO were under nothing other than the rule of a common understanding and that they devised their traditional history as an illustration of their claim in outline. By the hypothesis, they had something to impart under the veil of this pretext, and in proportion as their sincerity was greater it is the more likely that it was or became an understanding and exposition of things occult in the sense of things spiritual, for the liberation and guidance of those who had been misdirected by the "rogues and runagates" of common commercial Alchemy and false Magia. From this point of view there is no question that Robert Fludd was of and belonged to the Order not only before it is antecedently likely that he entered one of its groups but before its rumour reached him.

Moreover, he had dwelt so long upon the subject with perfervid zeal that, as a man of position and influence as well as a king's physician, he is peculiarly likely—as I have intimated—to have drawn others about him. There may have arisen in this manner an informal association of a Hermetic and Rosicrucian kind in England, just as in the days of Ashmole there was a loose grouping of astrologers, who had an annual feast together. It would have been tintured deeply by the personal views and influence of him who led it and would have been therefore a Rose-Cross Circle with the ostensible German claims changed over in the light of his Christian spirit. It might not have affirmed a bond of living connection with any Brotherhood abroad, for it is unlikely that a relation of this kind should have carried the notion of importance which would attach to it for us at this day. It would have taken the traditional history of the FAMA in some kind of literal sense, much as the Hiramic Myth, though an evident allegory in which a morality is taught, came to be regarded from an historical standpoint in the quixotic quests of early Masonic explorers.

THE ACCEPTION AND ROBERT FLUDD

It would have pondered over Rosicrucian parables concerning *Mons Magorum Invisibilis*, with a Hidden Temple on its summit which could be entered only by those who were called and chosen. It would have discussed Alchemy in the spirit which led up to *SUMMUM BONUM* and *CLAVIS PHILOSOPHIÆ FLUDDANÆ*, which had left any physical work altogether behind, had broken the alembics and shut the laboratories up, was concerned with the Corner-Stone and the *latens Deitas* of Christ Mystical, or—as Fludd terms it—with a “Spiritual Chemistry” and “Gold of God.”¹ In a word, it would have been a little group of “philosophers by fire,” such as Anthony à Wood might have loved to memorise, with the characteristic ineptitudes of *ATHENÆ OXONIENSES*. The Minutes of their Proceedings would be pearls of great price for our keeping, though I do not intend to suggest that as regards the real subjects their debates would have been other than “about it and about”; for after all generations the essence and heart of these have still escaped expression. It escaped expositors of the Order in their highest moments, few and far between, even the unknown Sapiens and even Joachim Fritz. There is no need to add that Fludd was in the same position when all his lights were round him, though I am certain—for the rest—that the early Rosicrucians had nothing to tell their Novices or Adepts on “the subject of the Art” which was of better worth or could profit them more than might Fludd in his inspired

¹ According to *SUMMUM BONUM* the true gold is that life which comes forth from Christ, and such also is the proper understanding of *Elixir Vitæ* in the best sense of philosophy, when wisdom has found its end in God. Here is *poculum sapientie*, very life and very food from Divinity: by this Elias was sustained, and Moses also on the Mount of God. It is living water and a bread of life. But as on the soul so also on the body of man *Alchemia mystica* can perform a great work of transmutation, an allusion to the body of adeptship, some later memorials of which are in the writings of Thomas Vaughan. In *CLAVIS PHILOSOPHIÆ ET ALCHYMIÆ FLUDDANÆ* it is said that Christ made or built the world by Divine Alchemy and that the Wisdom of God is the true Theo-Philosophical Stone. But according to *PHILOSOPHIA MOSAICA*, this Wisdom again is the Spiritual Christ, otherwise the essential subject of true philosophy.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

moments. Moreover, and it is not without importance, unlike the Rosicrucian co-heirs in Germany, there would have been no anti-Papal ranters among his circle and no hot gospels baked in post-Lutheran ovens. Fludd was an English gentleman with a Catholic heart in a coat of the liberal Anglo-Catholic fashion.

Here then is the kind of Association which might have met under the name of ACCEPTION at the Hall of the MASONS' COMPANY from 1620 onward, a few metaphysical yards from the London house of Robert Fludd, and this is how it may have arisen. Its foundation does not of necessity belong to the year mentioned,¹ which is that of its first appearance in the Book of Accounts. No one would dream of suggesting that it was started by Robert Fludd, but if anything brought him within it, there is no question that he would have changed it, in view of his dedications and his great zeal concerning them.

¹ According to Gould, the ACCEPTION was in existence not only prior to 1620 but "inferentially from a remote past."—THE CONCISE HISTORY OF FREEMASONRY, 1903, pp. 184, 185. Unfortunately it does not appear on what this inference is founded, and it is in truth highly speculative. The Account Book is our sole source of information and its first records are under date of July 1620. According to Mr Ossian Lang, who is or was the Grand Historian of the GRAND LODGE of New York, there are "vague indications" of its existence early in the fifteenth century and others more definite at various subsequent periods down to the end of the seventeenth. The hypothesis is highly attractive, but, I fear, only as a creation of imaginative genius. It supposes (1) that the Accepted Masons were always distinct from Operatives; (2) that the arts and sciences of the Craft Guild, the geometry and architecture were their distinctive possessions, while Operatives were concerned only about laws, forms and usages; (3) that cathedrals and churches were erected under their guidance according to a fixed code of symbolism, so that they were at once books and Bibles, Solomon's Temple spiritualised; (4) that the key to their symbolism was transmitted from generation to generation by the Secret Brotherhood, who were architects, sculptors, painters, even poets and philosophers; (5) that a time came when they continued to hold the key but had no further jurisdiction over the building craft, which also fell upon evil times about 1530; (6) that the ethical, spiritual, religious side of the symbolism stood henceforth alone; and (7) that out of it there was developed subsequently that sequence of ceremonial and doctrine which we know now as Speculative Masonry. For the sake of the appeal belonging to things beautiful one could wish sometimes that hypothesis were truer than history.

THE ACCEPTION AND ROBERT FLUDD

However and whenever it arose, my thesis is that the ACCEPTION may have included a group of Hermetic Students, of which there were many at the period ;¹ that Fludd drew them together or took his place among them ; and that—after his manner and the manner of the Rosy Cross—they began to speak of spiritual building in a Hall of Masons, of a Hermetic Art in stone ; and that therefore they may have contributed something to our own unfinished sketch of figurative building.²

It came about that Fludd died in his day, and if this my dream is true the ACCEPTION lost its Master. It continued, however, recruited in part from the world without and in part from the Roll of the COMPANY. There came a time when a Master of the COMPANY did actually join the Acception, paid his fees and most probably ate his dinners.³ The days went on, and it may be that the Hermetic element faded out, as the Operative element dissolved in the COMPANY itself. It is not

¹ It should be remembered that the period of Fludd was that also of Francis Bacon, who had taken all knowledge as his province and gives evidence of acquaintance with Hermetic subjects without concern therein. Dr John Dee, who was deeply learned in all, though he leaned to the side of Magia, was also a contemporary, but belonging to an earlier generation, and he died at the beginning of Fludd's professional career. I need not speak of Forman, astrologer and herbalist, except on account of his literary heir, Dr Richard Napier, who dwelt among stars and portents, invocation of angels and unwearied work in prayer. The rabbinical scholar, Dr John Rainoldes, belongs to the subject on the side of Kabalism, but he died in 1607, when Fludd was seeking medical degrees at the hands of the College of Physicians. There were many others.

² I say "unfinished," for unfortunately the makers of Masonic Ritual were too often disposed to forget their own symbolism.

³ The reference is to Nicholas Stone, otherwise described as "the King's Master Mason" and therefore of course an Operative. He was Master of the Masons' Company in 1633 and again in 1634, but it was not until 1639 that he entered the ranks of Accepted Masons. It is to be noted also that when Ashmole attended the Lodge at Masons' Hall he puts on record in his DIARY, *s.v.* March 10, 1682, the fact that among those present there was Thomas Wise, then "Master of the MASONS' COMPANY." Finally, Mr E. Conder notes that the fees of "newly accepted Masons were paid into the funds of the COMPANY, that some or all of them were spent on a banquet and the attendant expenses, and that any further sum required was paid out of the ordinary funds of the COMPANY, proving that the latter had entire control of the Lodge and its funds."

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

heard of after Ashmole's visit, but owing to its admixture of Masons—Operative or non-Operative—with men of its own concern, any so-called speculative vestiges within it would have done their work. The Rosicrucian counsel, *Transmutemini, transmutemini de lapidibus mortuis in lapides vivos philosophicos*, would have been familiar among them in another manner of language, and in the likeness of the "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," they may have laid certain foundations of an Emblematic House of Masonry. The prototypical symbolism would have been that of Robert Fludd on the building of a House of Wisdom, a figurative temple of man, a Spiritual Palace on the Mountain and a Temple of the Rosy Cross.¹

Such is my speculative consideration, and I need not add that it is to be taken or left at will. It is so much the worse for Emblematic Freemasonry if it did not draw in this distant and derivative sense from a protagonist of the Rosy Cross, for in such case—so far as evidence goes, or rather the want thereof—

¹ Compare SUMMUM BONUM, p. 41, on the Temple of Solomon, man as a Temple of the Holy Spirit, and further concerning the Spiritual Palace on the Mountain of Initiation. *Per quem ejus sermonem intelligebat Rex—i.e. David—Templum artificio mere humano constructum, quoniam—teste Scriptura—Dominus non habitabat—2 REG. vii. Per quæ verba intelligat templum materiale : nam testatur sacer Textus quod David habuerit Templi materialis descriptionem spiritualiter a Digno Dei sibi descriptam : unde etiam arguere videtur se vidisse et artificum fuisse in domus super montem rationabilem fundatæ structura : utpote ad cujus exemplar non modo formatum erat tabernaculum fæderis et templum Solomonis, sed etiam ipse homo, qui ideo dicitur templum Spiritus Sancti. Concludimus denique, quod unica domus istius constructio veri fratris adjumento sit occulti manifestatio, hoc est lapis Spiritualis, seu Sapientiæ mysticæ a lapide Patriarchæ (quem vocat Domum Dei) revelatio, hoc est Domus seu Palatii Spiritualis super Montem Rationalem constructio, atque hunc lapidem Castellum mysticum Bethlehem vocamus, de quo sic loquitur Evangelista : Christus erat de Castello Bethlehem. Unde erat David, quod quidem ex Etymologia facillime sit colligendum : nam בֵּית-לֶחֶם. Bethel, quod denotat Domum panis et Domum Belli : at Manna erat panis absconditus et panis seu cibus angelorum, panis de cælo, et verbum, ex quo omnis homo vivere potest sine pane vulgi. The text speaks also—p. 49—of St Paul, more analogico, teaching the perfection of the Mystery under the type of a husbandman or architect, e.g. ut Sapiens Architectus fundamentum poni, alius autem superædificat. Atque sub istiusmodi Architecti typo nos monet Propheta, ut ascendamus montem rationabilem, etc.*

THE ACCEPTION AND ROBERT FLUDD

it is the more manifestly of eighteenth century invention. The consideration, for the rest, is not unlike the shewing of a vision, a tentative hypothesis of a field beyond the ken. As it seems to me, I have indicated that there is at least one possible source from which Masonic typology may have been derived, as to its roots, by him or them who constructed the Craft Degrees *post* 1717. I have offered also a new and reasonable manner of regarding the once alleged influence of the Rosy Cross on the development of Speculative Freemasonry as known and practised among us.

It remains, moreover, that whether or not Robert Fludd had any connection with London Operative Masonry and exercised any influence, directly or indirectly, thereupon, it is to him that we owe what appears to be among the first formal intimations on an art of spiritual building apart from those of Scripture but based thereon.¹ I proceed now to consider another bare possibility, arising from the traditional and actual antiquity of Operative Masonry in the North of England. The question is whether we may look in that direction for early vestiges of Ritual belonging to the Figurative and Emblematic side, for vestiges and root-matter of the MASTER GRADE and the HOLY ROYAL ARCH.

¹ We must remember, however, the RATIONALE of Durandus, *ob.* 1296, which speaks of the faithful predestined to eternal life as stones in the walls of the Church, and between these walls there is a winding staircase, like that in the Temple of Solomon, but this goes up into heaven. Some stones are superposed upon the corner-stone, which is Christ: these and those in contiguity answer to the highest elections—as of apostles, confessors, martyrs and saintly doctors of the Church. There are also polished and squared stones and stones which are larger than others, all signifying greater sanctity and purity of life. I should expect that Fathers of the Church, like Gregory the Great and St Bernard, would give further symbolism on this subject, and were any at the pains of searching it would be found that emblematical and spiritual architecture, like all things else that matter, are in the Sanctuary of the Latin Church.

III

ANCIENT YORK MASONRY

As in the study of Symbolical Masonry at large we are brought up against a stone wall on the question of origin and can only speculate darkly and tentatively as to that which lies beyond, so it proves also in the particular sense if we attempt an historical examination of the MASTER GRADE. It may embody to our thinking the root-matter and may offer a summary or reflection, at whatever distance, of a really great initiation. It seems indeed like a clouded synthesis of things which have gone before it in the wide world of the Ancient Mysteries, while there are some of us who know at first hand that it is an omen of things which came after, a few of which have been or are in evidence and some remain in the hiddenness for those who can find. Apart from the THIRD DEGREE that of ENTERED APPRENTICE seems little and FELLOW CRAFT seems less than little, as if they could not stand alone and yet are not sufficient to one another. They embody the kind of moralities, the conventional typology and figuration which it might be possible to connect with mentalities like those of Desaguliers and even Anderson, in the absence of any vestiges which came into their hands from the past. They are Lesser Mysteries indeed, but leading up to nothing and suggesting nothing beyond them. On the other hand, the MASTER GRADE belongs to another and wider world of symbolism, as if it were a shadow of something which "once in time and somewhere in the world" had its part among Greater Mysteries. We shall look beyond its scope if it be said with a brilliant French writer

ANCIENT YORK MASONRY

of the nineteenth century : “ I also believe in the resurrection of Hiram ” ; but there is at least a sense in which the Master Builder is raised in the person of every Candidate, and every Candidate, by the fact of that raising, becomes a Master Mason.

There are clouds indeed about the Sanctuary of the mystical pageant, but within and behind them there is a light of great intimations, at least for those who have taken the secret life of the Mysteries into their awakened hearts, and it comes about for this reason that they suffer the preliminary experiences which lead up to the central event of the whole Craft system. This event is the raw material, so to speak, of a great symbol in Ritual, and many instances of the past stand about it, with messages of things behind for those who can hear them. It is for this reason also that one is asking continually of oneself and of others : Whence comes this THIRD DEGREE, with all its omens of derived greatness—“ like a straight staff bent in a pool ”—its gaps and contradictions, above all its inexplicable contrast between a given event in the Legend and the chief event in the Lodge ? In the sense of that contrast we know the kind of raising which befell the Master Builder and all that is laid up for the Candidate, that he may be restored to a fellowship of emblematic toil, the company of a mystical quest, in the common achievement of his and their reward. Whence come these strange suggestions ?

Looking back upon the past of our initiation, we remember at the time of our making that Masonry came before us as a thing more ancient than, *e.g.*, the Golden Fleece, not to speak of its enthronement above all other Orders in honour. The validity of such claim on the ages receding behind is part of that which the Craft guarantees to us, in consideration of various guarantees certified on our own part and embodied in the Pledge of an Apprentice. In virtue of what facts and in view of what evidence is such a claim advanced ? If the appeal is to Initiation in history *à travers les temps et les peuples*, it is certain that we carry no titles of descent therefrom. But if

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

it is to Operative Masonry, its trade secrets and its precautions for keeping out the cowan and intruder who did not belong to the Guild, it seems obvious that these things are not of our living concern, while some of us are disposed to think that Emblematic Freemasonry has almost surrendered its title. They are otherwise honourable enough—very sacred too, as we have seen—and historically are of interest within their own measures; the hallows of mediæval English life are about them, and they are admittedly older than the Order of the Golden Fleece, which belongs to the early fifteenth century.¹ But again the titles of our Emblematic Freemasonry do not lie in that direction, as we have moved to another ground. Their part is not our part, who are seeking the records, if any, of a Figurative Mystery, vested in building symbolism, dealing with death and resurrection and recalling therefore the great Osirian Myth, at however far a distance. We remember this and the other speaking connotations, when our eyes are lifted to that bright and Morning Star, whose rising brings peace and salvation.² We remember, it may be, the Sign of Osiris slain, the Sign of the Mourning of Isis, the Sign of Typhon and Apophis, and the Sign of Osiris risen. We remember the rending of Iacchos and his symbolical restoration, when the sun turns in the springtide and seeds and blooms come forth. We remember greater things, *legenda aurea et verissima* of the Great Master of all, concerning Whom it is said: *passus et sepultus est*; but thereafter: *tertia die resurrexit*.

It is not all the same to a past like these that our thoughts are turned in research, as if we expected in our fondness that

¹ It was founded on January 10, 1429, at Bruges by Philip III, Duke of Burgundy, to commemorate his marriage with Isabella, daughter of John, King of Portugal. The suggested attributions are to the Argonautic Quest of the Golden Fleece and to the wool-trade in the Low Countries. The words *Je l'ay empris* would apply to the first and the general motto, *Pretium laborum non vile* to the second.

² Compare the APOCALYPSE, ii, 22: "And I will give him the Morning Star"; also *Ibid.*, xxii, 16: "I am . . . the bright and Morning Star."

ANCIENT YORK MASONRY

Memphis, Eleusis and Thrace transmitted through hidden channels to our modern figuration of morality, "veiled in allegory and illustrated by symbols." We are seeking rather in our modesty for some root-matter or traces of the Hiramic Myth and its personal application in the THIRD DEGREE prior to 1717 and the foundation of the London GRAND LODGE. I have been looking on my own part through all my life of letters, as I have sought for the Rosy Cross behind the Reformation of Luther. But we are up against the stone wall of which I have spoken and have found no open door into realms of possible knowledge which in our hypothesis may lie beyond. The position is therefore this : (1) That a GRAND LODGE was founded in London in the year 1717 by the combination of four so-called old Lodges which had not consulted others in the immediate neighbourhood, and much less any that were scattered over the Kingdom ;¹ (2) That it neither could nor did claim at the beginning anything but local jurisdiction—over the City and immediate places on the South of the Thames ; (3) That the original claim was extended gradually, amidst seeming dissatisfaction on the part of those who had not been consulted and who disliked interference, innovation and the idea of self-constituted headship ; (4) That the new GRAND LODGE had little in the way of old records and was in search of these ; (5) That there is a story at its value of Lodges which burned documents, to prevent them falling into

¹ The researches of Masonic historians have furnished full information as to the history of the Four Lodges after 1717, but we know practically nothing concerning them prior to that event. No. 1, which met at the Goose and Gridiron, was constituted in 1691, according to an ENGRAVED LIST of 1729, and No. 2, meeting at the Crown, Parker's Lane, came into being in 1712. No. 3, of the Apple Tree Tavern, is of unknown date, and, according to Gould—ii, 342—it is "impossible to say whether it was established earlier or later than No. 2." As regards No. 4 we are in much the same position, whence it follows that so far as evidence goes the so-called Four Old Lodges cannot be traced prior to 1691, while one of them was five years old in 1717. With the exception of No. 2, and then presumably because it happened to be extinct, these are the Lodges which Anderson termed of "immemorial constitution" in 1738.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

undesired hands, and that this is suggestive in view of the feeling mentioned;¹ (6) That the kind of Masonry which GRAND LODGE was supposed to "cement" and set in order, *tempus* 1717, was "but one Degree of Initiation," according to the German historian Findel; (7) That in the opinion of G. W. Speth two Degrees had existed centuries before that date, one of them being "purely formal and matter of fact," but the second "mystic and speculative," the two in their combination embodying all "esoteric knowledge of the present time"; (8) That the evidence for this view is wanting;² (9) That it was held in a notably modified form by R. F. Gould, in whose opinion the terms Fellow Craft and Master were interchangeable and had reference to one and the same thing, being a SECOND DEGREE, but he did not suggest that it contained the present elements of the MASTER GRADE;³ (10) That in 1897 W. J. Hughan recorded his inability to understand "how Brethren versed in Craft-lore can see any proof that more than one esoteric ceremony was known to and practised by our forefathers anterior to the GRAND LODGE era."⁴ Elsewhere and much earlier he had spoken of the CRAFT RITE OF THREE DEGREES having been elaborated by the "Revivalists"—being those who took part in the drama

¹ The authority under all the circumstances seems to me above challenge, being that of the second BOOK OF CONSTITUTIONS, and the value depends on that which lies behind the simple matter of fact. Anderson describes the destruction as a work of over solicitous Brethren, making no commentary and suggesting no motive. As the record stands, it has no real title to inclusion, but there is probably much more in the reference than meets the eye in reading: it suggests the hostility and disdain of those Lodges which stood outside the curiously woven circle of the self-constituted Grand Obedience: they would take and they took the most effectual care of all that nothing of theirs should ever pass into its hands. See p. 10.

² It is quoted by Mr W. J. Chetwode Crawley in ARS QUATUOR CORONATORUM, vol. ix, p. 4.

³ He seems to have held this view consistently throughout his career as a Masonic writer, his reasons also being laid out at full length. They are entitled to all respect, for Gould was at least a man of long, patient and exhaustive research, which notwithstanding I do not think that his theory on the particular subject has satisfied anyone.

⁴ ARS QUATUOR CORONATORUM, vol. x, p. 127.

ANCIENT YORK MASONRY

of 1717—and added that in all probability they drew from “the old Guild legends.”¹ Our knowledge of CHARGES and so-called CONSTITUTIONS has increased since these words were written, but they have produced no evidence to justify such a suggestion.

There are some of us who have searched these records with reverent and anxious care and who are acquainted substantially with all that has been said concerning them. On my own part I remember Gould with affection for his open and unbiassed mind. I have gone over the REGIUS MS. line by line, with his script on the subject in my hands,² but have failed to discover the speculative and symbolical elements which he could trace therein or the mystic and esoteric knowledge of Speth’s imagined SECOND DEGREE. I have said elsewhere that “there is no allegory and there is no symbolism,”³ a statement which applies unreservedly to the whole century or more of similar documents. The fact of a Speculative Masonry prior to the first GRAND LODGE is paraded otherwise frequently; but it proves on examination to signify that non-Operative membership of Operative Lodges constitutes a speculative element.⁴ Now, this is a reduction of the term to a mere shibboleth, and we are seeking for early traces of a “system of morality, veiled in allegory and illustrated by symbols.” To suggest, however, that—“lock, stock and barrel”—Emblematic Freemasonry, in the sense that we attach to these words, is *post* 1717, is virtually to be set down as a traitor to the whole cause and its permanent vested interest. Where, notwithstanding, are the

¹ ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH RITE, 1884.

² The reference is to a small pamphlet entitled an ESSAY ON THE EVOLUTION OF FREEMASONRY. It seems to have been issued privately and is now, I believe, very scarce.

³ NEW ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF FREEMASONRY, vol. ii, p. 147.

⁴ Even Gould speaks in an unusually positive mood and much too often of Symbolical Masonry in 1646, on the mere warrant that Ashmole, a non-Operative, was made in that year; in 1641, because of Moray’s initiation; and in 1600 owing to that of John Boswell, laird of Auchinleck. See, among other places, Gould’s ENGLISH FREEMASONRY BEFORE THE ERA OF GRAND LODGE, in ARS QUATUOR CORONATORUM, vol. i, pp. 67 *et seq.*

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

records of its existence previously? Only in casual intimations throughout the world's literature, only in the counsel—already cited—of the old Rosicrucian Order: “Be converted from dead into living philosophical stones.” The balance of light available seems resident, for the rest, in affirmations. One has heard it stated dogmatically that there were three Degrees in Scotland prior to the London GRAND LODGE, and there are other analogous decrees, most of them formulated in terms which indicate that they are to be received and not questioned.¹

If, however, it is true about Scotland in any sense whatever, my desire is to know whether the MASTER GRADE in that archaic period contained the Hiramic Myth, and there is no one to tell me. Can I do otherwise, under these circumstances, than fall back on a rational investigator like Hughan, who says that the earliest allusion in Scotland to the Degree of MASTER MASON is “to be found in the first volume of the Minutes of Canongate Kilwinning, No. 2, and is dated March 31, 1735,”² at which time there is no question that the system of THREE DEGREES was spreading far and wide, presumably from its centre and place of origin in London?

I say “presumably,” awaiting with anxious heart the evidence of an earlier fount and source. I would give another ten years to research, if they are granted by the Great Architect of the

¹ Compare John Yarker: *THE ARCANE SCHOOLS*, p. 415. It is stated (1) that at “a York reception” the Candidate for the FIRST DEGREE “was invested with the Operative Mason's leather apron up to the neck” and was “shewn how to hew the Rough Ashlar”; (2) that in the SECOND DEGREE he was tested by the “Junior Warden, Senior Warden and Worshipful Master” in “the use of the plumb, level and square,” that he had also “to test the columns of the Wardens” and to “prove the Perfect Ashlar with the square”; (3) that the THIRD DEGREE began as Fellow and ended as “Casual Master.” This is Masonic history as it is written by Masons on vital questions belonging to the root-matter of the subject, without a word of reference to the source—if any—from which the tale is derived.

² See A.Q.C., I, 212, *s.v.* FREEMASONRY AND HERMETICISM, a review of Allan Mackenzie's *HISTORY OF THE LODGE CANONGATE KILWINNING*, No. 2, 1888.

ANCIENT YORK MASONRY

Universe, could I find at the end of all that the root-matter came indeed from elsewhere.¹ But if not, then alternatively I am out to find any shadows and vestiges of the THIRD DEGREE in those alleged "old Guild legends" of which Hughan spoke, or anywhere else in the World of Rite and Myth. It is only in the last resource, and then unwillingly, that some of us can put up with London in the first quarter of the eighteenth century as the birthplace of an Emblematic Rite, though I understand well enough if something of antecedent material came into their hands their vocation was to commonise it. I have prayed in these respects to be delivered from the Goose and Gridiron, the Crown Alehouse and that other House Mystical which was called the Rummer and Grapes. Georgian taverns indeed, but they are not Houses of Call for those who dwell under the shadow of Mount Heredom or have stood in the crypt of York Minster.

There is something to be said of this crypt and things connected therewith, and this not only on account of various intimations which have created a disposition on the part of certain Masons in the South of England to turn for light in the direction of York,² its GRAND LODGE and the Old Lodge which preceded it. One is treading, however, upon dangerous ground, because it will be assumed immediately that this disposition signifies belief in the OLD YORK RITE, and it has been settled that this Rite is only the figment of a dream. Mr Thomas Bowman Whytehead, who is of precious memory

¹ A certain class of Masonic writers still claims an historical basis for the myth because of 1 KINGS vii, 14, concerning the "widow's son of the tribe of Naphtali," and 2 CHRONICLES ii, 13 *et seq.*, concerning the "cunning man, endued with understanding." Another forlorn hope is an occasional allusion to Hiram in the OLD CHARGES. It should not be necessary to say that the root-matter mentioned in the text above would be that of the myth proper, namely, the destruction of the alleged Master Builder.

² An attempt at ordered research was planned, for example, from within that new so-called Operative Masonry which was connected originally with the name of Clement E. Stretton; but the term reached was one of suspension only, owing to the death of Mr F. H. Buckmaster, who had been at work in several directions, as he told me on his own part. I believe that he left certain papers behind him and that they contain nothing of importance.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

among Masons in Yorkshire, has said that "York Masonry is in the nature of an unknown quantity,"¹ while the verdict of Hughan as regards the alleged Rite generally is (1) that "there is no such Rite," and (2) that "what it was no one now knows," from which it would seem to follow that there might have been something in the past, so that it is not exactly "the baseless fabric of a vision," though it has left "no wrack behind."² But Whytehead says also, and more strongly, (1) that "so far as any actual proof is concerned, the existence of Speculative Masonry at York at a date prior to the close of the seventeenth century is a myth"; (2) that no records of "gatherings" at York are "so old as the one at Warrington—that is, 1646"; (3) that there is no evidence for "anything in the nature of a Lodge of Speculative Masons" in York prior to 1693, but unfortunately even his citation under that date testifies only to the membership of non-Operative Masons, otherwise "well-known local *cognomenta*"; (4) that the extant York Minutes begin in 1712;³ (5) that they are literally of the baldest kind, "bare facts of meetings and names of persons received," who are described as "sworn and admitted"; (6) that there are "no traces of anything like a Degree, as we should understand it."⁴

¹ See an important study of THE GRAND LODGE AT YORK in A.Q.C., I, pp. 110 *et seq.*

² One is disposed to speculate what kind of workings might have been discoverable at York in 1705, supposing it were possible to accept the statement with which I shall deal shortly in the text, namely, that there was a GRAND LODGE existing at that date, and perhaps earlier, in the ancient city.

³ One of the Minute Books is missing, being that which started—according to one account—in 1704, but according to Gould the first entry was dated March 7, 1705-6. See THE HISTORY OF FREEMASONRY, vol. ii, p. 408, 1887. The same date is given by Whytehead and still earlier by Woodford in his ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF FREEMASONRY.

⁴ See Whytehead's account of THE GRAND LODGE AT YORK, published in A.Q.C., vol. ii, pp. 110 *et seq.* There is no question that this is important testimony. It goes to prove that the procedure followed in York, "previously to the year 1693," is comparable to that which is found in some of the OLD CHARGES and did not exceed their measures. As regards 1693, it is thought that the fact of a body of non-Operative or Geomatic Masons is shewn by a manuscript so dated and purporting to be a copy of the ANCIENT CONSTITUTIONS.

ANCIENT YORK MASONRY

These are the findings of Whytehead in 1888, but in 1899 he had revised his view in at least one respect and affirmed that the old York Lodge was "the most ancient Speculative Masonic Body in this country." The evidence does not emerge.¹

Gould is in specific agreement as regards York workings, for he says that "before and after 1726, as the existing records shew, there was an extreme simplicity of ceremonial. . . . Candidates were merely 'sworn and admitted' or 'admitted and sworn.'" ² The statement, being almost indubitably founded on research at first hand in the records, seems to dispose once and for all of a counter-affirmation in a recent edition of Mackey's *ENCYCLOPÆDIA*,³ according to which (1) the YORK RITE was the oldest of all the Rites "and consisted originally only of THREE DEGREES"; (2) the Third "included a part which contained the True Word, disrupted from it by Dunckerley and never restored." It disposes also of a hypothesis hazarded in the same work but excluded otherwise by the citations just made, namely, that the YORK RITE was "that Rite which was most probably organised or modified at the Revival in 1717." There is not the least evidence that the men of the Revival at the specific date mentioned organised or modified anything in the way of Ritual. Whatsoever inventions or revisions took place belonged to a later period, to 1725 or thereabouts. It is

¹ T. B. Whytehead: *RELICS OF THE GRAND LODGE AT YORK*. See *Ibid.*, vol. xiii, pp. 93 *et seq.* He says, a little vaguely, that it "has remaining to its memory sufficient to prove" this.

² R. F. Gould: *DEGREES OF PURE AND ANCIENT FREEMASONRY*, *Ibid.*, vol. xvi.

³ *AN ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF FREEMASONRY*. By Albert G. Mackey. New and Revised Edition. 2 vols., 1917. On the basis of my citations in the text it is affirmed further that had the GRAND LODGE of 1813 "abolished the ROYAL ARCH Degree which was then practised as an independent Order in England, and reincorporated its secrets in the Degree of Master Mason, the YORK RITE would have been revived." As it is, that "Rite in its purity does not now exist anywhere." Its nearest extant kin is Scottish St John's Masonry, "but the MASTER'S DEGREE of Scotland is not the MASTER'S DEGREE of the YORK RITE." See vol. ii, p. 871. One would think that the Rite in question lay open on the table of the man of imagination who created this myth.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

suggested further that the alleged Rite—of York or London, as you please—“was carried in its purity into France in 1725 and into America at a later period.” But the French and Americans superposed others upon it, the THIRD DEGREE being mutilated. Now it happens that all French Rituals have been so transformed that it is impossible to speculate as to how they stood originally, but it is entirely gratuitous to suggest a dismemberment either there or in America, more especially at a period which, according to the confused hypothesis, was long prior to the alleged disruption of Thomas Dunckerley, who was not made a Mason till 1754.¹

Having parted with these confusions, a further word may be said—as a clearance of issues—on the alleged dissemination of a YORK RITE, about which I have mentioned already the decisions of Whytehead and Hughan. It is of common knowledge that the AMERICAN RITE, now so called, used to be denominated the YORK RITE and consists of nine Degrees, classified in an illogical order. It is admitted on all hands that there was no warrant for the title, and the only question is therefore how it arose. Mr W. J. Chetwode Crawley tells us—and there are other sources of information—that the Ancients came to be called York Masons,² apparently wheresoever they lived and worked. He says further that “English Brethren who adhered to the old standards were called York Masons in Ireland.”³ We learn also from James Vroom of New Brunswick that the expression “Ancient York Masons” is found in

¹ It should be understood that in so far as the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA* which still passes under the honoured name of Mackey contains any work of his pen it belongs too often to the part of dream, and its inclusion within the same covers containing occasional results of recent research makes a curious patchwork of the collection as a whole. It is sometimes “in the foremost files of time” and sometimes in the backwaters and byways of a remote period.

² See *A.Q.C.*, vol. xvi, pp. 73 *et seq.*

³ *Ibid.* The object was “to distinguish them from their more progressive brethren, the London and Westminster Masons, who formed the Regular GRAND LODGE.” The questions under Crawley’s consideration are (1) that the HOLY ROYAL ARCH “once formed part of the Craft work,” and (2) that it was “the completion of the Master’s Part.”

ANCIENT YORK MASONRY

early warrants, presumably Colonial, which were signed by Laurence Dermott as Grand Secretary of the Ancients. We know, moreover—and it is mentioned by Gould—that the AHIMAN REZON of 1756, under Dermott's editorship, was for the use of "Ancient York Masons in England."¹ It is under such auspices that the name passed on into British America, that is to say, Upper and Lower Canada and New England, where—according to Vroom—"nothing could be further from the thoughts of American Craftsmen than to profess submission to any real or supposed headship at York."²

They are said to have held "that the supreme authority in Masonry is a Lodge of Master Masons," and it is suggested somewhat unthinkably that in those places and at that time the York style and title represented "a spirit opposed to the centralisation of power"; but it is difficult to see what evidence exists for this view, while the doctrine under notice seems to strike at the validity and indeed the very existence of any Grand Obedience. It appears much more simple and an adequate explanation enough to suppose that those who held Charters which termed them Ancient York Masons should have adopted that description, and this is apparently what they did. The self-identification of the Ancients with York is another question, the less easy to account for in view of the fact that they came over or held from Ireland, as proved by Henry Sadler,³ but more

¹ HISTORY OF FREEMASONRY, vol. ii, p. 455. Compare also Gould's CONCISE HISTORY, p. 344: "So there is really no doubt that the 'Ancients' wished to be regarded as 'York Masons,' though without an atom of justification for the claim." In his ILLUSTRATIONS OF MASONRY Preston suggests that "discontented" London Masons—*circa* 1738-1739—took "advantage of the breach between the GRAND LODGES of London and York" to assume "the character of York Masons" without authority—meaning presumably the authority of the York GRAND LODGE. *Ibid.*, p. 339.

² See A.Q.C., vol. xxiv, pp. 268 *et seq.*, *s.v.* ANCIENT YORK MASONRY IN BRITISH AMERICA.

³ See MASONIC FACTS AND FICTIONS, described as "comprising a new theory of the origin of the Ancient GRAND LODGE," 1887. In Laurence Dermott's AHIMAN REZON the reference to "York Masons in England," *s.v.* REGULATIONS FOR CHARITY, is a reference to the London Ancients. The

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

especially if Woodford is right in affirming that York "was always opposed to the 'Athol Masons' of London, with whose GRAND LODGE, formed about 1753, it never associated."¹ For the present purpose I am content to regard the denomination, wheresoever and whenever it originated and developed in use, among Ancients and other bodies, as a reflection of the majesty of York in time-immemorial tradition.

About this at least there is no question, however the testimony varies on the subjects of Rites and Degrees. Has not Gould told us that York was regarded long as the earliest centre of the Building Art in England?² Whytehead considers it unquestionable that "tradition does frequently point" thereto as to "a great Masonic centre, from which Masonry spread" and to which Masons looked up. He says also: "That Masonry had an early existence in York is indisputable." In his view the antique tradition "gave a flavouring and colouring . . . to the subject throughout the world."³ It is in this light that he accounts for the "delusions" about "the old York working" and explains the title of Ancient York Masons, assumed by the so-called Athols.⁴ There are statements, moreover, of Woodford which appertain to this aspect of the subject: (1) That the Annual Assembly was "held by Masons in the City of York for centuries"; (2) That this is "acknowledged virtually by all MSS. from the fourteenth century"—which, however, is not the case; (3) That by a general agreement of legend and actual history "the home of the claim has been characterised as "a pernicious fiction" by Hughan and others. It was omitted in the edition of 1778, possibly because there was no recognition on the part of York.

¹ KENNING'S MASONIC CYCLOPÆDIA, p. 651.

² There is a considerable collection of material for the York subject in the chaos of his large HISTORY. He speculates also on the existence of an ancestor of the Old York Lodge in the first half of the fourteenth century.

³ Compare W. J. Hughan in A.Q.C., vol. xiii, s.v. THE YORK GRAND LODGE, pp. 4 *et seq.* "York is the Mecca of English Freemasonry, just as Kilwinning has long been for the Scottish Craft."

⁴ A.Q.C., vol. ii, s.v. THE GRAND LODGE AT YORK, already cited.

ANCIENT YORK MASONRY

Mason Craft " was York until modern times.¹ It was in virtue of such authority—and citing the Edwin Legend as acknowledged history—that on St John's Day in the winter, 1726, Dr Francis Drake, the future author of *EBORACUM*,² published in 1736, claimed for the York Assembly the title of GRAND LODGE OF ALL ENGLAND, that of GRAND LODGE simply having been arrogated apparently to itself on the corresponding Festival in the previous year.³ There is no call to consider in this place what reliance, if any, can be placed on the written testimony of Jacob Bussy, York Grand Secretary in 1778, deposing for the benefit of Benjamin Bradley and William Preston that the GRAND LODGE at York anteceded the Lodge of London by twelve or more years.⁴ His authority is a missing Minute Book, beginning in 1704 or 1705, and the question unhappily is likely to remain in suspension for ever and ever. In any case, we find Anderson placing on record in his second BOOK OF CONSTITUTIONS, 1738, the fact that York was under its own Grand Master. The last institution to challenge such a position at the period would have been the GRAND LODGE of 1717.

With the history of the GRAND LODGE at York I am not

¹ KENNING'S CYCLOPÆDIA, *s.v.* YORK GRAND LODGE.

² Francis Drake: *EBORACUM: or, The History and Antiquities of the City of York*, from its original to the present time. London, 1736.

³ See OLD RULES OF THE GRAND LODGE AT YORK, 1725, printed in Hughan's MASONIC SKETCHES AND REPRINTS, 1871-79, pp. 44, 45. Drake was Junior Grand Warden at the date in question, and his speech was printed in 1727 and several times thereafter. "We can boast," he says, "that the first GRAND LODGE ever held in England was held in this City, when Edwin the first Christian King of the Northumbrians, about the 600th year after Christ, and who laid the foundation of our Cathedral, sat as Grand Master. This is sufficient to make us dispute the superiority with the Lodges at London. But as nought of that kind ought to be amongst so amicable a Fraternity we are content they enjoy the Title of GRAND LODGE, but the TOTIUS ANGLIÆ we claim as our undoubted right."

⁴ It must be said that the account is (1) explicit, (2) circumstantial and (3) conveys an impression of its sincerity; but in the absence of the all-important Minute Book one can only reserve judgment. My suggestion however is that, for reasons which satisfied the writer, it is possible that as from 1705 to 1706 the words Grand Master and GRAND LODGE were substituted for those of President and Lodge in the lost Minute Book; but this also is submitted tentatively.

EMBLEMATIC FREEMASONRY

concerned here ; we know that there is a long gap in its records, as from 1730, though Whytehead speaks of "very strong evidence that meetings were still held" for something like fifteen years after that date.¹ Whether it fell asleep about 1745 I suppose that no one can say certainly ; but Dr Francis Drake was alive and destined to come again into evidence when he "reconstructed" the GRAND LODGE in 1761 and became its Grand Master.² In 1767 the revived Body sent a manifesto to the London GRAND LODGE, laying claim to a "time-immemorial existence as a GRAND LODGE,"³ acknowledging no superior and "asserting their ancient rights," without detriment to those of London. The authority is again Whytehead,⁴ who in his later study of the subject cites a BRIEF ACCOUNT of the York GRAND LODGE, under date of November 2, 1779, and in this it is affirmed that the Four London Lodges of 1717 originated from the Ancient York Masons and regarded the fact as their peculiar honour. Whatever we may think of the claim, not excepting its sincerity,⁵ there is interest in the fact that it was made, because it indicates that York at the period

¹ So also Gould, who suggests that it may have remained in activity till *circa* 1750. Moreover, Fifield Dassigny, writing in 1744, alludes to an Assembly of Master Masons under the title of ROYAL ARCH Masons in York.—SERIOUS AND IMPARTIAL ENQUIRY INTO THE CAUSE OF THE PRESENT DECAY OF FREEMASONRY IN THE KINGDOM OF IRELAND.

² The reconstruction took place on March 17 of the year in question, Drake being supported by five other survivors of the old GRAND LODGE and a number of visiting Brethren.

³ Thus supporting the testimony of Jacob Bussy.

⁴ A.Q.C., ii, *s.v.* THE GRAND LODGE AT YORK, and *Ibid.*, xiii, *s.v.* RELICS OF THE GRAND LODGE AT YORK, both already cited. In the first of these articles Whytehead states (1) that "not a trace of evidence can be found either in Masonic or contemporary profane records of any of the events described," meaning events referable to the time-immemorial existence of a GRAND LODGE at York ; (2) that "it was not, in reality, until 1761, so far as we know, that the GRAND LODGE of all England . . . assumed the position of a MOTHER LODGE and issued authorities for dependent bodies."

⁵ It is comparable to the claim that the York Lodge arrogated to itself the title of Grand prior to 1725. The issue of Drake's thesis is that it was Grand *ipso facto* in the tenth century because Prince Edwin presided over one of its Meetings, according to legend.